

Course-Section: MUSC 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO MUSIC
 Instructor: COX, FRANKLIN
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1188
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	1309/1674	3.92	4.73	4.27	4.07	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	931/1674	4.25	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	845/1423	4.25	4.79	4.27	4.16	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	2	1	2	4	3.60	1411/1609	3.60	4.64	4.22	4.05	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1049/1585	3.75	4.44	3.96	3.88	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	3	2	1	2	2	2.80	1487/1535	2.80	4.45	4.08	3.89	2.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	1044/1651	4.08	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1300/1673	4.42	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	1177/1656	3.83	4.50	4.07	3.96	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	1260/1586	4.08	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	510/1585	4.92	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	0	3	7	4.25	935/1582	4.25	4.61	4.26	4.17	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	1040/1575	4.17	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	447/1380	4.30	4.52	3.94	3.78	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	1507/1520	2.00	4.32	4.01	3.76	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1460/1515	2.75	4.41	4.24	3.97	2.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1420/1511	3.00	4.44	4.27	4.00	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 4				
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General	2	Under-grad 14	Non-major 5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 1				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0				
			I 0	Other	1		
			? 0				

Course-Section: MUSC 101 0101
 Title: FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR
 Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1189
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	792/1674	4.28	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	176/1674	4.74	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	132/1423	4.84	4.79	4.27	4.16	4.90		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	930/1609	4.48	4.64	4.22	4.05	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	352/1585	4.30	4.44	3.96	3.88	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	0	4	8	4.21	715/1535	4.21	4.45	4.08	3.89	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	175/1651	4.79	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	10	5	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	301/1586	4.60	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	811/1585	4.84	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	438/1582	4.50	4.61	4.26	4.17	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	4	14	4.38	838/1575	4.33	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	1	5	0	7	4.00	666/1380	3.69	4.52	3.94	3.78	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1353/1520	3.48	4.32	4.01	3.76	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1024/1515	3.98	4.41	4.24	3.97	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	1050/1511	4.18	4.44	4.27	4.00	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	4.33	3.94	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 101 0201
 Title: FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR
 Instructor: HAWLEY, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 75
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1190
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	5	8	22	4.18	1046/1674	4.28	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	7	28	4.63	419/1674	4.74	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	31	4.77	250/1423	4.84	4.79	4.27	4.16	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	26	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	212/1609	4.48	4.64	4.22	4.05	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	4	1	1	7	19	4.13	682/1585	4.30	4.44	3.96	3.88	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	31	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	****/1535	4.21	4.45	4.08	3.89	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	33	4.77	220/1651	4.79	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	10	12	10	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	9	7	22	4.34	1064/1586	4.60	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	34	4.87	664/1585	4.84	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	5	9	21	4.32	861/1582	4.50	4.61	4.26	4.17	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	5	3	6	23	4.27	940/1575	4.33	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	18	2	2	5	5	4	3.39	1103/1380	3.69	4.52	3.94	3.78	3.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	1	4	2	11	3.95	867/1520	3.48	4.32	4.01	3.76	3.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	1	4	2	11	3.95	1080/1515	3.98	4.41	4.24	3.97	3.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	4	2	13	4.35	798/1511	4.18	4.44	4.27	4.00	4.35	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	15	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/ 994	****	4.33	3.94	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 29	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	13	2.00-2.99 7	C 0	General 10	Under-grad 39 Non-major 2
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0101
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB I
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1191
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	214/1674	4.77	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	191/1674	4.77	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	298/1423	4.76	4.79	4.27	4.16	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	222/1609	4.59	4.64	4.22	4.05	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	185/1585	4.60	4.44	3.96	3.88	4.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	268/1535	4.28	4.45	4.08	3.89	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	372/1651	4.42	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	1124/1673	4.72	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	912/1656	4.29	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	1004/1586	4.67	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	1200/1585	4.71	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	690/1582	4.64	4.61	4.26	4.17	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	579/1575	4.73	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	114/1380	4.66	4.52	3.94	3.78	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	338/1520	4.40	4.32	4.01	3.76	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	483/1515	4.61	4.41	4.24	3.97	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	507/1511	4.37	4.44	4.27	4.00	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	312/ 994	4.02	4.33	3.94	3.73	4.36	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0101
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB I
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1192
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	214/1674	4.77	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	191/1674	4.77	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	298/1423	4.76	4.79	4.27	4.16	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	222/1609	4.59	4.64	4.22	4.05	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	185/1585	4.60	4.44	3.96	3.88	4.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	268/1535	4.28	4.45	4.08	3.89	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	372/1651	4.42	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	1124/1673	4.72	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	239/1656	4.29	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	603/1586	4.67	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	896/1585	4.71	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	380/1582	4.64	4.61	4.26	4.17	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	343/1575	4.73	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	426/1380	4.66	4.52	3.94	3.78	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	338/1520	4.40	4.32	4.01	3.76	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	483/1515	4.61	4.41	4.24	3.97	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	507/1511	4.37	4.44	4.27	4.00	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	312/ 994	4.02	4.33	3.94	3.73	4.36	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0201
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB I
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1193
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	432/1674	4.77	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	406/1674	4.77	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	188/1423	4.76	4.79	4.27	4.16	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	839/1609	4.59	4.64	4.22	4.05	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	482/1585	4.60	4.44	3.96	3.88	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1240/1535	4.28	4.45	4.08	3.89	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	3	8	4.00	1097/1651	4.42	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	424/1673	4.72	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	894/1656	4.29	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	192/1586	4.67	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	713/1585	4.71	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	313/1582	4.64	4.61	4.26	4.17	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	246/1575	4.73	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	96/1380	4.66	4.52	3.94	3.78	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	810/1520	4.40	4.32	4.01	3.76	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	629/1515	4.61	4.41	4.24	3.97	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	2	0	1	5	3.78	1210/1511	4.37	4.44	4.27	4.00	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	811/ 994	4.02	4.33	3.94	3.73	3.33	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.75	4.19	3.97	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.56	4.26	3.91	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	4
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	9

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 112 0301
 Title: MUSIC REPERTOIRE
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1194
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.05	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.44	3.96	3.88	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.45	4.08	3.89	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.50	4.07	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.61	4.26	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.17	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.32	4.01	3.76	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.41	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	4.33	3.94	3.73	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 117 0101
 Title PEP BAND
 Instructor: VILLANEUVA, JAR
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1195
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	298/1674	4.75	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	776/1674	4.38	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1609	****	4.64	4.22	4.05	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	136/1656	4.83	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.61	4.26	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.52	3.94	3.78	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.32	4.01	3.76	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.41	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.33	3.94	3.73	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	3.87	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.56	4.44	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 125 0101
 Title THEORY I:BASICS OF MUS
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1196
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	320/1674	4.87	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	96/1674	4.97	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	121/1609	4.95	4.64	4.22	4.05	4.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	326/1585	4.75	4.44	3.96	3.88	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.45	4.08	3.89	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	998/1651	4.13	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	4.50	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	345/1656	4.78	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	826/1586	4.53	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	397/1585	4.93	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	339/1582	4.73	4.61	4.26	4.17	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	225/1575	4.86	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	303/1380	4.50	4.52	3.94	3.78	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	0	11	4.57	355/1520	4.79	4.32	4.01	3.76	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	432/1515	4.86	4.41	4.24	3.97	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	525/1511	4.82	4.44	4.27	4.00	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	591/ 994	3.86	4.33	3.94	3.73	3.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.75	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.75	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 259	****	4.75	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	5.00	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.56	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.56	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 31	****	4.50	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 125 0101
 Title THEORY I:BASICS OF MUS
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1196
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 125 0201
 Title THEORY I:BASICS OF MUS
 Instructor: SMITH, STUART S
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1197
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	4.87	4.73	4.27	4.07	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	4.97	4.76	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	4.95	4.64	4.22	4.05	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	4.75	4.44	3.96	3.88	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.50	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	4.78	4.50	4.07	3.96	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	4.79	4.32	4.01	3.76	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	4.86	4.41	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	4.82	4.44	4.27	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 170 0201
 Title BEGINNING VOICE CLASS
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1198
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	954/1674	4.25	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	830/1674	4.33	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	950/1423	4.11	4.79	4.27	4.16	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	343/1609	4.64	4.64	4.22	4.05	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	907/1585	3.91	4.44	3.96	3.88	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	1398/1535	3.22	4.45	4.08	3.89	3.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	1345/1651	3.73	4.34	4.18	4.10	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	1	4.08	1533/1673	4.08	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	871/1656	4.13	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	1409/1586	3.78	4.64	4.43	4.37	3.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	567/1585	4.90	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1233/1582	3.88	4.61	4.26	4.17	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	635/1575	4.56	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1217/1380	3.00	4.52	3.94	3.78	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	645/1520	4.25	4.32	4.01	3.76	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	788/1515	4.38	4.41	4.24	3.97	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	544/1511	4.63	4.44	4.27	4.00	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	4.33	3.94	3.73	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.75	4.19	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.56	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.56	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.50	4.34	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	Graduate 1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	Under-grad 11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Non-major 5
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 2
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	0
?	1		

Course-Section: MUSC 171 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE VOICE CLA
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1199
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	558/1674	4.55	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	303/1674	4.73	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	238/1423	4.78	4.79	4.27	4.16	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	173/1609	4.80	4.64	4.22	4.05	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	926/1585	3.89	4.44	3.96	3.88	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1083/1535	3.83	4.45	4.08	3.89	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	843/1651	4.27	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	310/1656	4.60	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	581/1586	4.71	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	199/1582	4.86	4.61	4.26	4.17	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	423/1575	4.71	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1380	****	4.52	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	****	4.32	4.01	3.76	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1515	****	4.41	4.24	3.97	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1511	****	4.44	4.27	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 172A 0101
 Title Diction
 Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1200
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.05	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.44	3.96	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.45	4.08	3.89	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1442/1651	3.50	4.34	4.18	4.10	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1225/1585	4.50	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.61	4.26	4.17	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	666/1380	4.00	4.52	3.94	3.78	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.32	4.01	3.76	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.41	4.24	3.97	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.44	4.27	4.00	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.33	3.94	3.73	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 173 0101
 Title INTRO TO CHORAL SINGIN
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1201
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	406/1674	4.67	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	248/1674	4.78	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	517/1423	4.56	4.79	4.27	4.16	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.05	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	956/1585	3.86	4.44	3.96	3.88	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	508/1535	4.40	4.45	4.08	3.89	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1310/1651	3.78	4.34	4.18	4.10	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1518/1673	4.11	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	185/1656	4.75	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1144/1586	4.25	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	640/1585	4.88	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	808/1582	4.38	4.61	4.26	4.17	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	303/1380	4.50	4.52	3.94	3.78	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	645/1520	4.25	4.32	4.01	3.76	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.41	4.24	3.97	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.44	4.27	4.00	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	322/ 994	4.33	4.33	3.94	3.73	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 178A 0101
 Title Beginning Keyboard Ski
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1202
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	703/1674	4.28	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	673/1674	4.53	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	431/1423	4.69	4.79	4.27	4.16	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	490/1609	4.67	4.64	4.22	4.05	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1585	4.67	4.44	3.96	3.88	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1535	4.50	4.45	4.08	3.89	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	0	7	4.22	901/1651	4.55	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1442/1673	4.30	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	493/1656	4.11	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1191/1586	4.10	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1354/1585	4.42	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1272/1582	3.90	4.61	4.26	4.17	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1445/1575	3.63	4.63	4.27	4.17	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1380	4.75	4.52	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	1507/1520	2.88	4.32	4.01	3.76	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	1420/1515	3.20	4.41	4.24	3.97	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1487/1511	3.04	4.44	4.27	4.00	2.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 178A 0201
 Title Beginning Keyboard Ski
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1203
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1095/1674	4.28	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	433/1674	4.53	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1423	4.69	4.79	4.27	4.16	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1609	4.67	4.64	4.22	4.05	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	224/1585	4.67	4.44	3.96	3.88	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.45	4.08	3.89	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	133/1651	4.55	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1332/1673	4.30	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1200/1656	4.11	4.50	4.07	3.96	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1300/1586	4.10	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1225/1585	4.42	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1129/1582	3.90	4.61	4.26	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1138/1575	3.63	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1380	4.75	4.52	3.94	3.78	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1027/1520	2.88	4.32	4.01	3.76	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1341/1515	3.20	4.41	4.24	3.97	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1221/1511	3.04	4.44	4.27	4.00	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	4.33	3.94	3.73	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.75	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.75	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.75	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	5.00	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.56	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.56	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.50	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 178A 0201
 Title: Beginning Keyboard Ski
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1203
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 179A 0101
 Title Intermediate Keybrd Sk
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1204
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	4.94	4.73	4.27	4.07	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	4.94	4.76	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1609	4.88	4.64	4.22	4.05	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	231/1651	4.76	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1203/1673	4.56	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	955/1656	4.30	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1539/1586	3.00	4.64	4.43	4.37	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1504/1582	3.00	4.61	4.26	4.17	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1487/1575	3.00	4.63	4.27	4.17	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	4.32	4.01	3.76	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1420/1515	3.00	4.41	4.24	3.97	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1420/1511	3.00	4.44	4.27	4.00	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/ 61	4.38	4.54	4.09	3.87	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	4.83	4.56	4.26	3.91	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	36/ 50	4.17	4.56	4.44	4.39	4.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	23/ 35	4.00	4.00	4.36	3.92	4.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.50	4.34	3.88	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 179A 0201
 Title Intermediate Keybrd Sk
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1205
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	167/1674	4.94	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	153/1674	4.94	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1609	4.88	4.64	4.22	4.05	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1585	****	4.44	3.96	3.88	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1535	****	4.45	4.08	3.89	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	208/1651	4.76	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	4.63	1114/1673	4.56	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	310/1656	4.30	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1586	3.00	4.64	4.43	4.37	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.60	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1582	3.00	4.61	4.26	4.17	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1575	3.00	4.63	4.27	4.17	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	****	4.52	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	3.00	4.32	4.01	3.76	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1515	3.00	4.41	4.24	3.97	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1511	3.00	4.44	4.27	4.00	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	4.33	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.75	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.75	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.75	4.33	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	21/ 61	4.38	4.54	4.09	3.87	4.75	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	23/ 52	4.83	4.56	4.26	3.91	4.67	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	32/ 50	4.17	4.56	4.44	4.39	4.33	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	4.00	4.00	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	5.00	4.50	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 179A 0201
 Title Intermediate Keybrd Sk
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1205
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0101
 Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1206
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	854/1674	4.40	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	270/1674	4.79	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	262/1423	4.81	4.79	4.27	4.16	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	131/1609	4.67	4.64	4.22	4.05	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	482/1585	4.14	4.44	3.96	3.88	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	169/1535	4.22	4.45	4.08	3.89	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	1037/1651	4.32	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	381/1656	4.36	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	336/1586	4.88	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	917/1585	4.81	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	438/1582	4.77	4.61	4.26	4.17	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	692/1575	4.66	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	278/1380	4.52	4.52	3.94	3.78	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	810/1520	4.16	4.32	4.01	3.76	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	759/1515	4.66	4.41	4.24	3.97	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	751/1511	4.51	4.44	4.27	4.00	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 994	****	4.33	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.75	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.75	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.75	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	5.00	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.56	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.56	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.50	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0101
 Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1206
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	12	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0201
 Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1207
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	1	8	4.08	1139/1674	4.40	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	446/1674	4.79	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	335/1423	4.81	4.79	4.27	4.16	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	552/1609	4.67	4.64	4.22	4.05	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	4	0	3	3.33	1329/1585	4.14	4.44	3.96	3.88	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1332/1535	4.22	4.45	4.08	3.89	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	843/1651	4.32	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	615/1656	4.36	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	371/1586	4.88	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	0	11	4.67	1071/1585	4.81	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	481/1582	4.77	4.61	4.26	4.17	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	407/1575	4.66	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	472/1380	4.52	4.52	3.94	3.78	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	743/1520	4.16	4.32	4.01	3.76	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	568/1515	4.66	4.41	4.24	3.97	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	2	0	0	5	4.14	990/1511	4.51	4.44	4.27	4.00	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 994	****	4.33	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 278	****	4.75	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.75	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.75	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	5.00	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.56	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.56	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.50	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0201
 Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1207
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0301
 Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1208
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1674	4.40	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1674	4.79	4.76	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1423	4.81	4.79	4.27	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	312/1609	4.67	4.64	4.22	4.05	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	167/1585	4.14	4.44	3.96	3.88	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1535	4.22	4.45	4.08	3.89	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	393/1651	4.32	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	719/1656	4.36	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1586	4.88	4.64	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	4.81	4.87	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1582	4.77	4.61	4.26	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	359/1575	4.66	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1380	4.52	4.52	3.94	3.78	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	572/1520	4.16	4.32	4.01	3.76	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1515	4.66	4.41	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	4.51	4.44	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	4.33	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.75	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.75	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.75	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	5.00	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.56	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.56	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.50	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0301
 Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1208
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 181 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE PIANO CLA
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1209
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	570/1674	4.54	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	446/1674	4.62	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	238/1423	4.78	4.79	4.27	4.16	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	157/1609	4.83	4.64	4.22	4.05	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1585	****	4.44	3.96	3.88	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	643/1535	4.27	4.45	4.08	3.89	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1050/1651	4.08	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	522/1656	4.40	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	389/1586	4.80	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	152/1582	4.90	4.61	4.26	4.17	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	453/1575	4.70	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	2	0	0	1	5	3.88	817/1380	3.88	4.52	3.94	3.78	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	700/1520	4.20	4.32	4.01	3.76	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.41	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	563/1511	4.60	4.44	4.27	4.00	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	4.33	3.94	3.73	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.75	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.75	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.75	4.33	4.19	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.18	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	3.87	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.56	4.44	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	5
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 188 0101
 Title PERCUSSION CLASS
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1210
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	485/1674	4.55	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	870/1674	4.28	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	771/1423	4.17	4.79	4.27	4.16	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	743/1609	4.17	4.64	4.22	4.05	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1585	4.00	4.44	3.96	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1097/1651	3.67	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1463/1673	4.43	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	757/1656	4.11	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	1168/1586	4.28	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	615/1585	4.78	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1129/1582	4.00	4.61	4.26	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	327/1575	4.39	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1380	4.50	4.52	3.94	3.78	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	700/1520	3.85	4.32	4.01	3.76	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	325/1515	4.15	4.41	4.24	3.97	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	563/1511	4.05	4.44	4.27	4.00	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	115/ 994	4.13	4.33	3.94	3.73	4.75	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	4.00	4.54	4.09	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 188 0201
 Title PERCUSSION CLASS
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1211
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	607/1674	4.55	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	931/1674	4.28	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1016/1423	4.17	4.79	4.27	4.16	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1094/1609	4.17	4.64	4.22	4.05	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.44	3.96	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1295/1535	3.50	4.45	4.08	3.89	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1504/1651	3.67	4.34	4.18	4.10	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1072/1673	4.43	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	955/1656	4.11	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1074/1586	4.28	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1071/1585	4.78	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1129/1582	4.00	4.61	4.26	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1138/1575	4.39	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	666/1380	4.50	4.52	3.94	3.78	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1169/1520	3.85	4.32	4.01	3.76	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1303/1515	4.15	4.41	4.24	3.97	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1308/1511	4.05	4.44	4.27	4.00	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	732/ 994	4.13	4.33	3.94	3.73	3.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/ 61	4.00	4.54	4.09	3.87	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/ 52	4.00	4.56	4.26	3.91	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	36/ 50	4.00	4.56	4.44	4.39	4.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	23/ 35	4.00	4.00	4.36	3.92	4.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	20/ 31	4.00	4.50	4.34	3.88	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 189 0101
 Title GUITAR CLASS
 Instructor: KING, TROY
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1212
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.07	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	207/1674	4.82	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1423	****	4.79	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1609	****	4.64	4.22	4.05	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	136/1585	4.80	4.44	3.96	3.88	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1103/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	345/1656	4.56	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	266/1586	4.88	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	917/1585	4.75	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	313/1582	4.75	4.61	4.26	4.17	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	359/1575	4.75	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.52	3.94	3.78	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1092/1520	3.67	4.32	4.01	3.76	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.41	4.24	3.97	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.44	4.27	4.00	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190C 0101
 Title VIOLIN
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1213
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.07	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.16	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.05	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.44	3.96	3.88	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.45	4.08	3.89	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.50	4.07	3.96	5.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.32	4.01	3.76	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190E 0101
 Title CELLO
 Instructor: COX, FRANKLIN
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1214
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.07	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.16	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1557/1609	3.00	4.64	4.22	4.05	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.60	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.61	4.26	4.17	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1575	4.00	4.63	4.27	4.17	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	4.32	4.01	3.76	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1420/1515	3.00	4.41	4.24	3.97	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1420/1511	3.00	4.44	4.27	4.00	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190F 0101
 Title ELECTRIC GUITAR
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1215
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.05	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1440/1585	3.00	4.44	3.96	3.88	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.45	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.61	4.26	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.17	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.32	4.01	3.76	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.41	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1495/1511	2.00	4.44	4.27	4.00	2.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 61	5.00	4.54	4.09	3.87	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.56	4.44	4.39	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190G 0101
 Title CLASSICAL GUITAR
 Instructor: KING, TROY
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1216
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.07	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.16	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.50	4.07	3.96	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190I 0101
 Title FLUTE
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1217
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	406/1674	4.67	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.05	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1440/1585	3.00	4.44	3.96	3.88	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1636/1651	2.00	4.34	4.18	4.10	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	257/1656	4.67	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.67	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.61	4.26	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	666/1380	4.00	4.52	3.94	3.78	4.00	

Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 61	5.00	4.54	4.09	3.87	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190K 0101
 Title CLARINET
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1218
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.07	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.50	4.07	3.96	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190L 0101
 Title TABLA
 Instructor: HOSSAIN, HAMID
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1219
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1557/1609	3.00	4.64	4.22	4.05	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1435/1535	3.00	4.45	4.08	3.89	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1636/1651	2.00	4.34	4.18	4.10	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.50	4.07	3.96	5.00	

Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/ 61	4.00	4.54	4.09	3.87	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.56	4.44	4.39	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190M 0101
 Title BASSOON
 Instructor: SPITTEL, RICHA
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1220
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.07	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190U 0101
 Title HARP
 Instructor: INGLEFIELD, SON
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1221
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.07	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.16	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.05	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1562/1651	3.00	4.34	4.18	4.10	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

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

Course-Section: MUSC 191 0101
 Title RECITAL PREPARATION
 Instructor: DUSMAN, LINDA J
 Enrollment: 75
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1222
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	3	7	3.94	1284/1674	3.94	4.73	4.27	4.07	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	2	7	3.88	1291/1674	3.88	4.76	4.23	4.16	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1423	****	4.79	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	1007/1609	4.13	4.64	4.22	4.05	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	809/1651	4.31	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	778/1673	4.87	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	465/1656	4.44	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	1495/1586	3.43	4.64	4.43	4.37	3.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	1328/1585	4.38	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	0	4	0	2	3.29	1467/1582	3.29	4.61	4.26	4.17	3.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	1309/1575	3.71	4.63	4.27	4.17	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1217/1380	3.00	4.52	3.94	3.78	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	330/1520	4.62	4.32	4.01	3.76	4.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	266/1515	4.86	4.41	4.24	3.97	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	195/1511	4.92	4.44	4.27	4.00	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	699/ 994	3.60	4.33	3.94	3.73	3.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1223
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	167/1674	4.89	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	153/1674	4.89	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.05	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	136/1585	4.80	4.44	3.96	3.88	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	578/1535	4.33	4.45	4.08	3.89	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	768/1651	4.33	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1332/1673	4.38	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.50	4.07	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1586	****	4.64	4.43	4.37	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1585	****	4.87	4.69	4.60	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1582	****	4.61	4.26	4.17	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1575	****	4.63	4.27	4.17	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1520	****	4.32	4.01	3.76	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1515	****	4.41	4.24	3.97	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1511	****	4.44	4.27	4.00	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	****	4.33	3.94	3.73	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	3.87	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.56	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.50	4.34	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1224
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	167/1674	4.89	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	153/1674	4.89	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.05	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	136/1585	4.80	4.44	3.96	3.88	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	578/1535	4.33	4.45	4.08	3.89	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	768/1651	4.33	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1332/1673	4.38	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.50	4.07	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1586	****	4.64	4.43	4.37	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1585	****	4.87	4.69	4.60	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1582	****	4.61	4.26	4.17	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1575	****	4.63	4.27	4.17	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	****	4.52	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1520	****	4.32	4.01	3.76	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1515	****	4.41	4.24	3.97	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1511	****	4.44	4.27	4.00	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	****	4.33	3.94	3.73	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	3.87	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.56	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.50	4.34	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1225
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.73	4.27	4.07	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.16	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.50	4.07	3.96	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.32	4.01	3.76	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.41	4.24	3.97	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.33	3.94	3.73	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193D 0101
 Title VIOLA
 Instructor: BUSCHEK, KIMBER
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1226
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.07	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1562/1651	3.00	4.34	4.18	4.10	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1663/1673	3.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	3.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.50	4.07	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1129/1582	4.00	4.61	4.26	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.52	3.94	3.78	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.32	4.01	3.76	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.41	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	4.33	3.94	3.73	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193F 0101
 Title GUITAR
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1227
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.07	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	176/1674	4.86	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.79	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1609	4.80	4.64	4.22	4.05	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.44	3.96	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	767/1535	4.17	4.45	4.08	3.89	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	231/1651	4.75	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1155/1673	4.57	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.50	4.07	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.61	4.26	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	489/1380	4.25	4.52	3.94	3.78	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.32	4.01	3.76	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	827/1515	4.33	4.41	4.24	3.97	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.00	5.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.75	4.19	3.97	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.75	4.33	4.19	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 61	5.00	4.54	4.09	3.87	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.56	4.44	4.39	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.50	4.34	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193I 0101
 Title FLUTE
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1228
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.07	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.05	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.61	4.26	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.17	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.32	4.01	3.76	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.41	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193K 0101
 Title CLARINET
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1229
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.07	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.44	3.96	3.88	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.34	4.18	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.50	4.07	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.61	4.26	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.52	3.94	3.78	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.32	4.01	3.76	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.41	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193V 0101
 Title ELECTRIC BASS
 Instructor: KEMP, WILLIAM M
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1230
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.07	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.76	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.79	4.27	4.16	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.64	4.22	4.05	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1636/1651	2.00	4.34	4.18	4.10	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.64	4.43	4.37	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1129/1582	4.00	4.61	4.26	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.17	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.32	4.01	3.76	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.41	4.24	3.97	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 193W 0101
 Title UPRIGHT BASS
 Instructor: BALDWIN, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1231
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.07	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.16	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1641/1656	2.00	4.50	4.07	3.96	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 210 0101
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB III
 Instructor: COX, FRANKLIN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1232
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	509/1674	4.59	4.73	4.27	4.32	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	8	4.12	1068/1674	4.12	4.76	4.23	4.26	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	431/1423	4.63	4.79	4.27	4.36	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	455/1609	4.53	4.64	4.22	4.23	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	642/1585	4.17	4.44	3.96	3.91	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	310/1535	4.57	4.45	4.08	4.03	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	7	3	5	3.87	1252/1651	3.87	4.34	4.18	4.20	3.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	1015/1673	4.71	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	507/1656	4.42	4.50	4.07	4.10	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.64	4.43	4.48	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1025/1582	4.17	4.61	4.26	4.35	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	886/1575	4.33	4.63	4.27	4.39	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1380	****	4.52	3.94	4.03	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1520	4.80	4.32	4.01	4.03	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	563/1511	4.60	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 994	****	4.33	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.75	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.75	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.75	4.33	4.42	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.22	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	4.23	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.56	4.44	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	13
?	0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	7	14	55	4.60	497/1674	4.60	4.73	4.27	4.32	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	10	9	20	38	4.08	1097/1674	4.08	4.76	4.23	4.26	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	4	9	21	41	4.23	861/1423	4.23	4.79	4.27	4.36	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	63	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	****/1609	****	4.64	4.22	4.23	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	27	7	8	10	8	16	3.37	1315/1585	3.37	4.44	3.96	3.91	3.37	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	67	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	****/1535	****	4.45	4.08	4.03	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	4	7	11	55	4.52	510/1651	4.52	4.34	4.18	4.20	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	76	4.99	142/1673	4.99	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.99	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	0	4	10	27	19	4.02	948/1656	4.02	4.50	4.07	4.10	4.02	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	14	60	4.71	581/1586	4.71	4.64	4.43	4.48	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	72	4.92	453/1585	4.92	4.87	4.69	4.76	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	10	21	45	4.42	762/1582	4.42	4.61	4.26	4.35	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	8	65	4.79	295/1575	4.79	4.63	4.27	4.39	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	5	13	13	42	4.26	480/1380	4.26	4.52	3.94	4.03	4.26	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	45	0	11	2	7	4	10	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	4.32	4.01	4.03	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	46	0	22	1	8	0	2	1.76	1505/1515	1.76	4.41	4.24	4.28	1.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	46	0	14	4	8	3	4	2.36	1486/1511	2.36	4.44	4.27	4.28	2.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	44	30	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/ 994	****	4.33	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	74	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	75	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 278	****	4.75	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	75	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.75	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	75	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 259	****	4.75	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	75	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	5.00	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	74	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	74	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	74	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	74	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	74	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	76	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	76	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	76	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	76	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	76	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	76	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	76	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.56	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	76	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.56	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	76	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	76	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.50	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 217 0101
 Title ROCK & RELATED MUSIC
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 173
 Questionnaires: 79

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1233
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	3	A	28	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	12	General	33	Under-grad	78	Non-major	49
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	10	F	1	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MUSC 218 0101
 Title RECORDING TECHNOLOGY L
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1234
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	243/1674	4.80	4.73	4.27	4.32	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	215/1674	4.80	4.76	4.23	4.26	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	160/1423	4.87	4.79	4.27	4.36	4.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.23	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	360/1585	4.46	4.44	3.96	3.91	4.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	346/1535	4.54	4.45	4.08	4.03	4.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	220/1651	4.77	4.34	4.18	4.20	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1182/1673	4.54	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.50	4.07	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.64	4.43	4.48	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1225/1585	4.50	4.87	4.69	4.76	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	935/1582	4.25	4.61	4.26	4.35	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.63	4.27	4.39	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	379/1380	4.40	4.52	3.94	4.03	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	295/1520	4.67	4.32	4.01	4.03	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	325/1515	4.80	4.41	4.24	4.28	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	195/1511	4.93	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	322/ 994	4.33	4.33	3.94	3.98	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 1	A 7	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 15 Non-major 1
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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 224 0101
 Title INSTRUMENTATION
 Instructor: DUSMAN, LINDA J
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1235
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1674	4.80	4.73	4.27	4.32	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	460/1674	4.60	4.76	4.23	4.26	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	697/1423	4.40	4.79	4.27	4.36	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	645/1609	4.40	4.64	4.22	4.23	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	413/1585	4.40	4.44	3.96	3.91	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.45	4.08	4.03	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.34	4.18	4.20	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	958/1673	4.75	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	185/1656	4.75	4.50	4.07	4.10	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	753/1586	4.60	4.64	4.43	4.48	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	811/1585	4.80	4.87	4.69	4.76	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	777/1582	4.40	4.61	4.26	4.35	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	279/1575	4.80	4.63	4.27	4.39	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.52	3.94	4.03	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.32	4.01	4.03	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.41	4.24	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	896/1511	4.25	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	4.33	3.94	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 225 0101
 Title THEORY III:COUNTERPOIN
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1236
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	954/1674	4.25	4.73	4.27	4.32	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	5	4.06	1104/1674	4.06	4.76	4.23	4.26	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	349/1423	4.69	4.79	4.27	4.36	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	443/1609	4.55	4.64	4.22	4.23	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	3	5	3.73	1066/1585	3.73	4.44	3.96	3.91	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	643/1535	4.27	4.45	4.08	4.03	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	6	3	4	3.60	1403/1651	3.60	4.34	4.18	4.20	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	2	4.13	1504/1673	4.13	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.50	4.07	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	1024/1586	4.38	4.64	4.43	4.48	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1130/1585	4.62	4.87	4.69	4.76	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	599/1582	4.54	4.61	4.26	4.35	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	886/1575	4.33	4.63	4.27	4.39	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	341/1380	4.45	4.52	3.94	4.03	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	760/1520	4.13	4.32	4.01	4.03	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	523/1515	4.63	4.41	4.24	4.28	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	278/1511	4.88	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	1	0	3	0	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	4.33	3.94	3.98	3.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.75	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.75	4.46	4.51	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	5.00	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.45	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.56	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.56	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	4.63	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 225 0101
 Title THEORY III:COUNTERPOIN
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1236
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 227 0101
 Title THRY V:20TH CENT MUS A
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1237
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.44	3.96	3.91	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.45	4.08	4.03	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.20	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	118/1656	4.88	4.50	4.07	4.10	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.61	4.26	4.35	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.39	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.52	3.94	4.03	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.32	4.01	4.03	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.33	3.94	3.98	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	9
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		0
			? 1		Other
					8

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 230 0101
 Title MUSICS OF THE WORLD
 Instructor: HUANG, YI-PING
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1238
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	509/1674	4.58	4.73	4.27	4.32	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	6	15	4.42	721/1674	4.42	4.76	4.23	4.26	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	2	16	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.79	4.27	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	17	4.58	397/1609	4.58	4.64	4.22	4.23	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	2	1	5	12	3.91	893/1585	3.91	4.44	3.96	3.91	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	283/1535	4.60	4.45	4.08	4.03	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	2	3	17	4.38	713/1651	4.38	4.34	4.18	4.20	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	987/1673	4.74	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	10	11	4.45	451/1656	4.45	4.50	4.07	4.10	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	107/1586	4.96	4.64	4.43	4.48	4.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	259/1582	4.79	4.61	4.26	4.35	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	359/1575	4.75	4.63	4.27	4.39	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	40/1380	4.95	4.52	3.94	4.03	4.95	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	367/1520	4.56	4.32	4.01	4.03	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/ 994	****	4.33	3.94	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 4	Under-grad 25 Non-major 5
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 303 0101
 Title MD CAMERATA--CHAMBER C
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1239
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	265/1674	4.78	4.73	4.27	4.26	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	20	4.78	237/1674	4.78	4.76	4.23	4.21	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1423	4.86	4.79	4.27	4.27	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	18	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1585	****	4.44	3.96	3.95	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	21	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1535	****	4.45	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	12	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	727/1651	4.36	4.34	4.18	4.16	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	2	2	8	9	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	0	2	18	4.71	214/1656	4.71	4.50	4.07	4.07	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	266/1586	4.88	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	615/1585	4.89	4.87	4.69	4.66	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	180/1582	4.88	4.61	4.26	4.26	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1575	4.86	4.63	4.27	4.25	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1380	****	4.52	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1520	****	4.32	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1515	****	4.41	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1511	****	4.44	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 994	****	4.33	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 19	Required for Majors	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 1		

Course-Section: MUSC 304 0101
 Title UMBC JUBILEE SINGERS
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1240
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	254/1674	4.79	4.73	4.27	4.26	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	23	4.92	124/1674	4.92	4.76	4.23	4.21	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	19	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1423	****	4.79	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1585	****	4.44	3.96	3.95	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	23	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1535	****	4.45	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	145/1651	4.85	4.34	4.18	4.16	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	19	5	4.21	1457/1673	4.21	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	185/1656	4.75	4.50	4.07	4.07	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	150/1586	4.93	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	106/1582	4.93	4.61	4.26	4.26	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.25	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	8	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	96/1380	4.86	4.52	3.94	4.01	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	162/1520	4.86	4.32	4.01	4.09	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.41	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	586/1511	4.57	4.44	4.27	4.34	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	148/ 994	4.67	4.33	3.94	3.96	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.75	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.75	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.75	4.33	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	5.00	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.54	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.56	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	4.56	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	4.50	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 304 0101
 Title UMBC JUBILEE SINGERS
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1240
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	13	Under-grad	24	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 307B 0101
 Title SMALL ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: VILLANEUVA, JAR
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1241
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.26	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	830/1674	4.33	4.76	4.23	4.21	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.44	3.96	3.95	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.50	4.07	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.61	4.26	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.25	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.52	3.94	4.01	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.32	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1515	4.67	4.41	4.24	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.33	3.94	3.96	5.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 278	5.00	4.75	4.19	4.24	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 260	5.00	4.75	4.46	4.49	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 259	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.33	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	5.00	4.20	4.18	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.10	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	5.00	4.48	4.30	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 95	5.00	5.00	4.31	3.91	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	5.00	4.39	4.29	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307C 0101
 Title SMALL ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1242
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1674	4.80	4.73	4.27	4.26	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	215/1674	4.80	4.76	4.23	4.21	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.79	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1585	****	4.44	3.96	3.95	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1535	****	4.45	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.34	4.18	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1311/1673	4.40	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.50	4.07	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.61	4.26	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.25	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	200/1380	4.67	4.52	3.94	4.01	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.32	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	325/1515	4.80	4.41	4.24	4.32	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	955/1511	4.20	4.44	4.27	4.34	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	115/ 994	4.75	4.33	3.94	3.96	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 307D 0101
 Title SMALL ENSEMBLE - GUITA
 Instructor: KING, TROY
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1243
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	954/1674	4.25	4.73	4.27	4.26	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	270/1674	4.75	4.76	4.23	4.21	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.44	3.96	3.95	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.45	4.08	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	257/1656	4.67	4.50	4.07	4.07	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.61	4.26	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.63	4.27	4.25	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.52	3.94	4.01	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.32	4.01	4.09	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.44	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	4.33	3.94	3.96	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 307F 0101
 Title SMALL ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1244
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	406/1674	4.67	4.73	4.27	4.26	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.21	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1361/1673	4.33	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.50	4.07	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.61	4.26	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1575	4.00	4.63	4.27	4.25	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.32	4.01	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.41	4.24	4.32	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.44	4.27	4.34	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307G 0101
 Title SMALL ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1245
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.73	4.27	4.26	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	931/1674	4.25	4.76	4.23	4.21	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.64	4.22	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.44	3.96	3.95	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.45	4.08	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.50	4.07	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.61	4.26	4.26	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.25	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.52	3.94	4.01	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.32	4.01	4.09	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.33	3.94	3.96	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307K 0101
 Title VOCAL ARTS ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: SMITH, David
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1246
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.26	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.21	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.45	4.08	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.34	4.18	4.16	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1361/1673	4.33	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.50	4.07	4.07	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1247
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.26	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.21	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.44	3.96	3.95	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.45	4.08	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.50	4.07	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.61	4.26	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.25	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.32	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.33	3.94	3.96	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 308 0101
 Title UMBC CONCERT BAND
 Instructor: VILLANEUVA, JAR
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1248
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.73	4.27	4.26	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	14	4.69	352/1674	4.69	4.76	4.23	4.21	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	408/1609	4.57	4.64	4.22	4.27	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1585	****	4.44	3.96	3.95	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1535	****	4.45	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	9	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	276/1651	4.71	4.34	4.18	4.16	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1162/1673	4.56	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	680/1656	4.29	4.50	4.07	4.07	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	581/1586	4.71	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	1002/1585	4.71	4.87	4.69	4.66	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	366/1582	4.71	4.61	4.26	4.26	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.25	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	303/1380	4.50	4.52	3.94	4.01	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.32	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.44	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	****	4.33	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 1		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 10	Under-grad 16 Non-major 2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 313 0101
 Title ADVANCED GAMELAN
 Instructor: BECK, GINA C
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1249
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	331/1674	4.73	4.73	4.27	4.26	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	138/1674	4.91	4.76	4.23	4.21	4.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	167/1585	4.75	4.44	3.96	3.95	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	169/1535	4.75	4.45	4.08	4.15	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	458/1651	4.56	4.34	4.18	4.16	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	283/1656	4.64	4.50	4.07	4.07	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.61	4.26	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.25	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.52	3.94	4.01	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	****	4.32	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1515	****	4.41	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1511	****	4.44	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	4.33	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 316 0101
 Title SESSION MUSICIANSHIP
 Instructor: KEMP, WILLIAM M
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1250
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.26	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.21	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1585	4.83	4.44	3.96	3.95	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	131/1535	4.80	4.45	4.08	4.15	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	175/1651	4.80	4.34	4.18	4.16	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	185/1656	4.75	4.50	4.07	4.07	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1586	****	4.64	4.43	4.42	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1585	****	4.87	4.69	4.66	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1582	****	4.61	4.26	4.26	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1575	****	4.63	4.27	4.25	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	****	4.32	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1515	****	4.41	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1511	****	4.44	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	4.33	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 318 0101
 Title RECORDING PRACTICUM I
 Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1251
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	214/1674	4.83	4.73	4.27	4.26	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.76	4.23	4.21	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	459/1423	4.60	4.79	4.27	4.27	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	326/1585	4.50	4.44	3.96	3.95	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.45	4.08	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.34	4.18	4.16	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	310/1656	4.60	4.50	4.07	4.07	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1415/1586	3.75	4.64	4.43	4.42	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.61	4.26	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.63	4.27	4.25	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.52	3.94	4.01	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	****	4.32	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1515	****	4.41	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1511	****	4.44	4.27	4.34	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 321 0101
 Title: MUSIC HISTORY I
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1252
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.26	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	215/1674	4.80	4.76	4.23	4.21	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	374/1609	4.60	4.64	4.22	4.27	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	326/1585	4.50	4.44	3.96	3.95	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	154/1535	4.78	4.45	4.08	4.15	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	458/1651	4.56	4.34	4.18	4.16	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	214/1656	4.71	4.50	4.07	4.07	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	214/1586	4.90	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	246/1582	4.80	4.61	4.26	4.26	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	453/1575	4.70	4.63	4.27	4.25	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	447/1380	4.30	4.52	3.94	4.01	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1520	4.88	4.32	4.01	4.09	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/994	5.00	4.33	3.94	3.96	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 380 0101
 Title INTRO TO CONDUCTING
 Instructor: LOVE, JASON
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1253
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	533/1674	4.56	4.73	4.27	4.26	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	433/1674	4.63	4.76	4.23	4.21	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	174/1423	4.85	4.79	4.27	4.27	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	222/1609	4.75	4.64	4.22	4.27	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	378/1585	4.44	4.44	3.96	3.95	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	691/1535	4.23	4.45	4.08	4.15	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	5	8	4.27	855/1651	4.27	4.34	4.18	4.16	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1182/1673	4.54	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	522/1656	4.40	4.50	4.07	4.07	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	214/1586	4.91	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	136/1582	4.92	4.61	4.26	4.26	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	171/1575	4.91	4.63	4.27	4.25	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	241/1380	4.60	4.52	3.94	4.01	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	191/1520	4.80	4.32	4.01	4.09	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.41	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	266/1511	4.89	4.44	4.27	4.34	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	178/ 994	4.57	4.33	3.94	3.96	4.57	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 390A 0101
 Title PIANO
 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1254
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1674	4.75	4.73	4.27	4.26	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.76	4.23	4.21	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.79	4.27	4.27	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	852/1609	4.25	4.64	4.22	4.27	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	326/1585	4.50	4.44	3.96	3.95	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.45	4.08	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.34	4.18	4.16	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.50	4.07	4.07	5.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.64	4.43	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1225/1585	4.50	4.87	4.69	4.66	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.61	4.26	4.26	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.63	4.27	4.25	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	426/1380	4.33	4.52	3.94	4.01	4.33	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	229/1520	4.75	4.32	4.01	4.09	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.41	4.24	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	414/1511	4.75	4.44	4.27	4.34	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	360/ 994	4.25	4.33	3.94	3.96	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 390B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1255
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.26	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.50	4.07	4.07	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390C 0101
 Title VIOLIN
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1256
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.26	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.21	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	4.00	4.50	4.07	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.61	4.26	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.25	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Title VIOLIN

Baltimore County

JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: (Instr. D)

Fall 2005

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.26	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.21	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390F 0101
 Title ELECTRIC GUITAR
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1258
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.26	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.21	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.27	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.44	3.96	3.95	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.45	4.08	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390I 0101
 Title FLUTE
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1259
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.26	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.50	4.07	4.07	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390V 0101
 Title ELECTRIC BASS
 Instructor: KEMP, WILLIAM M
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1260
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.26	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.21	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.44	3.96	3.95	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.45	4.08	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.50	4.07	4.07	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 400 0201
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS
 Instructor: RICHARDS, KAZUK
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1261
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 401 0101
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS: COMP
 Instructor: SMITH, STUART S
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1262
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.31	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.45	4.08	4.18	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.50	4.07	4.19	5.00	

Discussion															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1493/1515	2.00	4.41	4.24	4.40	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 427 0101
 Title ELECTRONIC MUSIC
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA I.
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1263
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1674	4.80	4.73	4.27	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	215/1674	4.80	4.76	4.23	4.31	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1423	4.75	4.79	4.27	4.34	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	930/1609	4.20	4.64	4.22	4.30	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	413/1585	4.40	4.44	3.96	4.01	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	667/1535	4.25	4.45	4.08	4.18	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.34	4.18	4.23	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	185/1656	4.75	4.50	4.07	4.19	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1004/1586	4.40	4.64	4.43	4.46	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	811/1585	4.80	4.87	4.69	4.76	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1582	4.60	4.61	4.26	4.31	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	579/1575	4.60	4.63	4.27	4.35	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	114/1380	4.80	4.52	3.94	4.04	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.32	4.01	4.18	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.41	4.24	4.40	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.44	4.27	4.45	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	4.33	3.94	4.19	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	86/ 278	4.50	4.75	4.19	4.21	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	137/ 260	4.50	4.75	4.46	4.24	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	115/ 259	4.50	4.75	4.33	4.31	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	5.00	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	5.00	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.48	4.65	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 480 0101
 Title TOPICS IN MUSC/ART/SOC
 Instructor: SMITH, STUART S
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1264
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.31	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.30	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.44	3.96	4.01	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	238/1535	4.67	4.45	4.08	4.18	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.34	4.18	4.23	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1361/1673	4.33	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.50	4.07	4.19	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.61	4.26	4.31	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.35	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.32	4.01	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.45	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 492 0101
 Title SENIOR PROJECT
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1265
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.30	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.44	3.96	4.01	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.45	4.08	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.23	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.64	4.43	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.61	4.26	4.31	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.35	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.52	3.94	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.32	4.01	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.45	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 492 0101
 Title SENIOR PROJECT
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1266
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.31	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.44	3.96	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.45	4.08	4.18	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.23	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.32	4.01	4.18	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.40	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.45	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 690 8010
 Title SEM: AMER CHAMBER MUSI
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1267
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.73	4.27	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.76	4.23	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.64	4.22	4.34	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.34	4.18	4.32	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.50	4.07	4.15	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 693 8010
 Title SOLO PERFORMANCE STUDY
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1268
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.34	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.32	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 693 8010
 Title SOLO PERFORMANCE STUDY
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1269
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.76	4.23	4.34	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.32	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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