

Course-Section: DANC 110 1
 Title Begin Mod Danc Tech I
 Instructor: Flanigan, Meghan
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 424
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	778/1509	4.36	4.17	4.31	4.18	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.43	4.30	4.24	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	686/1459	4.33	4.52	4.22	4.11	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	****	4.03	4.09	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	570/1384	4.31	4.15	4.11	3.98	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	1106/1489	3.91	3.93	4.17	4.20	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	1	4.07	1357/1506	4.07	3.85	4.67	4.66	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	648/1463	4.23	3.74	4.09	4.02	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	700/1438	4.58	4.18	4.46	4.44	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	716/1421	4.83	4.44	4.73	4.66	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	520/1411	4.58	4.13	4.31	4.27	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	0	10	4.58	558/1405	4.58	4.16	4.32	4.27	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	936/1236	3.60	4.32	4.00	3.87	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	982/1260	3.67	4.27	4.14	3.95	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	723/1255	4.33	4.41	4.33	4.15	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	620/1258	4.50	4.34	4.38	4.18	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	87/ 873	4.83	4.78	4.03	3.89	4.83

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors		1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General		7	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: DANC 116 1
 Title Ballet I (Elementary)
 Instructor: Lacy,Sandra L
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 425
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	218/1509	4.83	4.17	4.31	4.18	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	141/1509	4.88	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.43	4.30	4.24	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	602/1459	4.42	4.52	4.22	4.11	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	21	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	****	4.03	4.09	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1384	****	4.15	4.11	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	0	1	4	3	10	4.22	791/1489	4.22	3.93	4.17	4.20	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	8	4.33	1205/1506	4.33	3.85	4.67	4.66	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	216/1463	4.65	3.74	4.09	4.02	4.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	305/1438	4.84	4.18	4.46	4.44	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	322/1421	4.95	4.44	4.73	4.66	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	267/1411	4.79	4.13	4.31	4.27	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	0	0	1	16	4.72	381/1405	4.72	4.16	4.32	4.27	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	10	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.32	4.00	3.87	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1260	****	4.27	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1255	****	4.41	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1258	****	4.34	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	4.78	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: DANC 202 1
 Title Dance Hist II: Contemp
 Instructor: Leblanc, Elizabe
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 426
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	3	4	20	4.63	458/1509	4.63	4.17	4.31	4.34	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	574/1509	4.48	4.16	4.26	4.32	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	7	18	4.56	472/1287	4.56	4.43	4.30	4.35	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	356/1459	4.59	4.52	4.22	4.30	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	10	15	4.41	446/1406	4.41	4.03	4.09	4.09	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	13	13	4.44	403/1384	4.44	4.15	4.11	4.09	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	1	8	17	4.62	330/1489	4.62	3.93	4.17	4.19	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	233/1506	4.96	3.85	4.67	4.61	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	1	0	1	14	5	4.05	831/1463	4.05	3.74	4.09	4.08	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	379/1438	4.79	4.18	4.46	4.48	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	614/1421	4.88	4.44	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	303/1411	4.75	4.13	4.31	4.37	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	251/1405	4.83	4.16	4.32	4.39	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	90/1236	4.83	4.32	4.00	4.11	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	621/1260	4.25	4.27	4.14	4.19	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	783/1255	4.25	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	818/1258	4.25	4.34	4.38	4.44	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	19	6	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/ 873	****	4.78	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: DANC 202 1
 Title Dance Hist II: Contemp
 Instructor: Leblanc,Elizabe
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 426
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	31	Non-major	23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: DANC 216 1
 Title Ballet II (Intermediat
 Instructor: Oda,Misako
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 427
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	976/1509	4.17	4.17	4.31	4.34	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.16	4.26	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	826/1287	4.20	4.43	4.30	4.35	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.52	4.22	4.30	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1406	****	4.03	4.09	4.09	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1247/1384	3.38	4.15	4.11	4.09	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	1106/1489	3.91	3.93	4.17	4.19	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1506	5.00	3.85	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	786/1463	4.11	3.74	4.09	4.08	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.18	4.46	4.48	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	1014/1421	4.67	4.44	4.73	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	810/1411	4.33	4.13	4.31	4.37	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.16	4.32	4.39	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1078/1236	3.25	4.32	4.00	4.11	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	908/1260	3.80	4.27	4.14	4.19	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1154/1255	3.40	4.41	4.33	4.37	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1170/1258	3.40	4.34	4.38	4.44	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	4.78	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: DANC 216 1
 Title Ballet II (Intermediat
 Instructor: Oda,Misako
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 427
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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: DANC 220 1
 Title Begin Mod Dance Tech I
 Instructor: Hess-Vait, Carol
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 428
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.17	4.31	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	175/1509	4.83	4.16	4.26	4.32	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1287	****	4.43	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	367/1459	4.58	4.52	4.22	4.30	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	****	4.03	4.09	4.09	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	394/1384	4.45	4.15	4.11	4.09	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	674/1489	4.33	3.93	4.17	4.19	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1156/1506	4.42	3.85	4.67	4.61	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	271/1463	4.57	3.74	4.09	4.08	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.18	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.44	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.13	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	194/1405	4.89	4.16	4.32	4.39	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	421/1236	4.33	4.32	4.00	4.11	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.27	4.14	4.19	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	443/1255	4.67	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	507/1258	4.67	4.34	4.38	4.44	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	93/ 873	4.80	4.78	4.03	4.04	4.80
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: DANC 230 1
 Title Improvisation
 Instructor: Flanigan, Meghan
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 429
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	1	7	3.92	1194/1509	3.92	4.17	4.31	4.34	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.16	4.26	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	779/1287	4.25	4.43	4.30	4.35	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	536/1459	4.45	4.52	4.22	4.30	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	1	5	2	3.60	1140/1406	3.60	4.03	4.09	4.09	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	3	2	3.17	1302/1384	3.17	4.15	4.11	4.09	3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	5	5	2	3.75	1197/1489	3.75	3.93	4.17	4.19	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.00	3.85	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1268/1463	3.45	3.74	4.09	4.08	3.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1203/1438	4.00	4.18	4.46	4.48	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.44	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.13	4.31	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.16	4.32	4.39	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	****	4.32	4.00	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	****	4.27	4.14	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	****	4.41	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1258	****	4.34	4.38	4.44	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.78	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 13	Non-major 9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: DANC 310 1
 Title Interm Modern Dance I
 Instructor: Lacy,Sandra L
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 430
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	193/1509	4.87	4.17	4.31	4.32	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	278/1509	4.73	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.43	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	209/1459	4.73	4.52	4.22	4.26	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1406	****	4.03	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.15	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	376/1489	4.57	3.93	4.17	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	4	4.27	1251/1506	4.27	3.85	4.67	4.67	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	151/1463	4.75	3.74	4.09	4.08	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	480/1438	4.73	4.18	4.46	4.43	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	376/1421	4.93	4.44	4.73	4.73	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	416/1411	4.67	4.13	4.31	4.29	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	120/1405	4.93	4.16	4.32	4.32	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.32	4.00	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1260	****	4.27	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1255	****	4.41	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1258	****	4.34	4.38	4.42	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: DANC 316 1
 Title Ballet III
 Instructor: Oda,Misako
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 431
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	686/1509	4.44	4.17	4.31	4.32	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	333/1509	4.69	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	857/1287	4.14	4.43	4.30	4.33	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.52	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1406	****	4.03	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	726/1384	4.13	4.15	4.11	4.15	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	802/1489	4.21	3.93	4.17	4.14	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1506	5.00	3.85	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	815/1463	4.08	3.74	4.09	4.08	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.18	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.44	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	617/1411	4.50	4.13	4.31	4.29	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	205/1405	4.88	4.16	4.32	4.32	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	126/1236	4.75	4.32	4.00	4.07	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	505/1260	4.40	4.27	4.14	4.22	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	262/1255	4.83	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	850/1258	4.20	4.34	4.38	4.42	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 873	****	4.78	4.03	4.08	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: DANC 320 1
 Title Interm Modern Dance II
 Instructor: Martinell,Nicol
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 432
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.17	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.16	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1287	4.86	4.43	4.30	4.33	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.52	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	164/1406	4.75	4.03	4.09	4.12	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	225/1384	4.67	4.15	4.11	4.15	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	399/1489	4.56	3.93	4.17	4.14	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	622/1506	4.89	3.85	4.67	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	99/1463	4.86	3.74	4.09	4.08	4.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.18	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.44	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.13	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.16	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	****	4.32	4.00	4.07	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	2
84-150	1	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	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: DANC 326 1
 Title Mthds Of Teaching Danc
 Instructor: Hess-Vait,Carol
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 433
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.17	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	116/1509	4.90	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	96/1459	4.90	4.52	4.22	4.26	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	135/1406	4.80	4.03	4.09	4.12	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.15	4.11	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	243/1489	4.70	3.93	4.17	4.14	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	917/1506	4.70	3.85	4.67	4.67	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	209/1463	4.67	3.74	4.09	4.08	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.18	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.44	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	138/1411	4.90	4.13	4.31	4.29	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.16	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	354/1236	4.40	4.32	4.00	4.07	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.41	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	130/ 873	4.71	4.78	4.03	4.08	4.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: DANC 331 1
 Title Dance Composition II
 Instructor: Rethorst, Susan
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 434
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	5	2	2	3	0	2.25	1507/1509	2.25	4.17	4.31	4.32	2.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	5	4	3	0	0	1.83	1507/1509	1.83	4.16	4.26	4.25	1.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1287	****	4.43	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	10	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1459	****	4.52	4.22	4.26	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	3	1	1	0	0	1.60	1406/1406	1.60	4.03	4.09	4.12	1.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1384	****	4.15	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	9	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1489	****	3.93	4.17	4.14	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	12	0	0	0	0	1.00	1505/1506	1.00	3.85	4.67	4.67	1.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	6	2	2	0	0	1.60	1458/1463	1.60	3.74	4.09	4.08	1.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	1432/1438	2.00	4.18	4.46	4.43	2.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	1419/1421	2.00	4.44	4.73	4.73	2.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	1407/1411	1.75	4.13	4.31	4.29	1.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	3	0	0	0	1.75	1401/1405	1.75	4.16	4.32	4.32	1.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1236	****	4.32	4.00	4.07	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 12	Graduate	0	Major	12	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	0				
				? 0						

Course-Section: DANC 410 1
 Title Adv Dance Technique I
 Instructor: Rethorst, Susan
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 435
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	7	1	1	0	0	1.33	1509/1509	1.33	4.17	4.31	4.39	1.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	3	0	0	0	1.33	1509/1509	1.33	4.16	4.26	4.26	1.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1406	****	4.03	4.09	4.11	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1384	****	4.15	4.11	4.23	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	1487/1489	1.00	3.93	4.17	4.18	1.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	1.00	1505/1506	1.00	3.85	4.67	4.67	1.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	6	0	1	0	0	1.29	1460/1463	1.29	3.74	4.09	4.18	1.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	1.00	1438/1438	1.00	4.18	4.46	4.50	1.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	5	1	0	2	0	1.88	1420/1421	1.88	4.44	4.73	4.76	1.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	6	1	0	1	0	1.50	1409/1411	1.50	4.13	4.31	4.35	1.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	6	1	0	0	0	1.14	1404/1405	1.14	4.16	4.32	4.34	1.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1236	****	4.32	4.00	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1260	****	4.27	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1255	****	4.41	4.33	4.46	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: DANC 416 1
 Title Advanced Ballet
 Instructor: Lacy,Sandra L
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 436
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	339/1509	4.73	4.17	4.31	4.39	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	289/1509	4.73	4.16	4.26	4.26	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	183/1287	4.83	4.43	4.30	4.38	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	191/1459	4.75	4.52	4.22	4.32	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.03	4.09	4.11	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	939/1384	3.91	4.15	4.11	4.23	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	1	8	4.36	641/1489	4.36	3.93	4.17	4.18	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	1222/1506	4.30	3.85	4.67	4.67	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	786/1463	4.11	3.74	4.09	4.18	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	588/1438	4.67	4.18	4.46	4.50	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.44	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	416/1411	4.67	4.13	4.31	4.35	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.16	4.32	4.34	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	274/1236	4.50	4.32	4.00	4.03	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: DANC 450 1
 Title Repertory
 Instructor: Rethorst, Susan
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 437
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	1265/1509	3.83	4.17	4.31	4.39	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1208/1509	3.83	4.16	4.26	4.26	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1204/1287	3.33	4.43	4.30	4.38	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1314/1459	3.50	4.52	4.22	4.32	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1406	****	4.03	4.09	4.11	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1384	****	4.15	4.11	4.23	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1403/1489	3.00	3.93	4.17	4.18	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	4	0	1	0	1	2.00	1504/1506	2.00	3.85	4.67	4.67	2.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	1454/1463	2.00	3.74	4.09	4.18	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1388/1438	3.33	4.18	4.46	4.50	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1345/1421	4.00	4.44	4.73	4.76	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1320/1411	3.33	4.13	4.31	4.35	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1306/1405	3.33	4.16	4.32	4.34	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	274/1236	4.50	4.32	4.00	4.03	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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