

Course-Section: DANC 110 1
 Title Begin Mod Danc Tech I
 Instructor: Martinell,Nicol
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 433
 JUN 28, 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 | 17 | 4.84 | 211/1447 | 4.84 | 4.33 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 4.84 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 15 | 4.78 | 228/1447 | 4.78 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.30 | 4.78 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/1241 | **** | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.25 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 4.33 | 685/1402 | 4.33 | 4.09 | 4.24 | 4.15 | 4.33 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.13 | 727/1358 | 4.13 | 3.95 | 4.11 | 4.03 | 4.13 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 4.13 | 738/1316 | 4.13 | 3.68 | 4.14 | 3.99 | 4.13 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 4.06 | 942/1427 | 4.06 | 3.65 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.06 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 5.00 | 1/1447 | 5.00 | 4.69 | 4.69 | 4.68 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 3.88 | 1003/1434 | 3.88 | 4.03 | 4.10 | 4.10 | 3.88 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|------|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.58 | 684/1387 | 4.58 | 4.29 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.58 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4.75 | 859/1387 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.73 | 4.71 | 4.75 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.33 | 811/1386 | 4.33 | 4.22 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.33 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.33 | 815/1380 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.33 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 8 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.67 | ****/1193 | **** | 4.07 | 4.02 | 3.99 | **** |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3.67 | 925/1172 | 3.67 | 4.26 | 4.15 | 3.95 | 3.67 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3.67 | 1037/1182 | 3.67 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 3.67 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.00 | 864/1170 | 4.00 | 4.27 | 4.38 | 4.17 | 4.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 13 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3.50 | 655/ 800 | 3.50 | 4.39 | 4.06 | 3.95 | 3.50 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---|--------------|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 11 | Required for Majors 2 | Graduate 0 | Major 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 2 | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C 0 | General 6 | Under-grad 19 | Non-major 19 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D 0 | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F 0 | Electives 8 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | |
| | | | | P 5 | | | |
| | | | | I 0 | Other 1 | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | |

Course-Section: DANC 201 1
 Title Dance Hist I:Cult/Clas
 Instructor: Hess-Vait,Carol
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 434
 JUN 28, 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 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 4.05 | 1037/1447 | 4.05 | 4.33 | 4.31 | 4.31 | 4.05 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 9 | 4.27 | 834/1447 | 4.27 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.27 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 10 | 4.23 | 806/1241 | 4.23 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.23 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 8 | 4.05 | 949/1402 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.24 | 4.24 | 4.05 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 10 | 4.09 | 751/1358 | 4.09 | 3.95 | 4.11 | 4.12 | 4.09 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 4.10 | 763/1316 | 4.10 | 3.68 | 4.14 | 4.08 | 4.10 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 12 | 4.41 | 596/1427 | 4.41 | 3.65 | 4.19 | 4.14 | 4.41 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 4.82 | 727/1447 | 4.82 | 4.69 | 4.69 | 4.70 | 4.82 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 4.06 | 823/1434 | 4.06 | 4.03 | 4.10 | 3.97 | 4.06 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 4.27 | 1023/1387 | 4.27 | 4.29 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.27 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 19 | 4.90 | 528/1387 | 4.90 | 4.75 | 4.73 | 4.71 | 4.90 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 4.00 | 1047/1386 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.32 | 4.24 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 11 | 4.36 | 791/1380 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.30 | 4.36 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 4.15 | 564/1193 | 4.15 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.04 | 4.15 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1172 | **** | 4.26 | 4.15 | 4.12 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1182 | **** | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.30 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/1170 | **** | 4.27 | 4.38 | 4.32 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 20 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 800 | **** | 4.39 | 4.06 | 4.01 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 12 | Required for Majors 15 | Graduate 0 Major 14 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 7 | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 1 | C 0 | General 2 | Under-grad 22 Non-major 8 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 1 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 11 | F 0 | Electives 1 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 0 | |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: DANC 216 1
 Title Ballet II (Intermediat
 Instructor: Oda,Misako
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 435
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | 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 | 8 | 4.58 | 496/1447 | 4.58 | 4.33 | 4.31 | 4.31 | 4.58 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4.58 | 447/1447 | 4.58 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.58 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/1241 | **** | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.35 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 4.10 | 910/1402 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.24 | 4.24 | 4.10 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/1358 | **** | 3.95 | 4.11 | 4.12 | **** |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4.00 | 812/1316 | 4.00 | 3.68 | 4.14 | 4.08 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3.90 | 1077/1427 | 3.90 | 3.65 | 4.19 | 4.14 | 3.90 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1447 | 5.00 | 4.69 | 4.69 | 4.70 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 4.20 | 701/1434 | 4.20 | 4.03 | 4.10 | 3.97 | 4.20 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.70 | 521/1387 | 4.70 | 4.29 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.70 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1387 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.73 | 4.71 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.67 | 431/1386 | 4.67 | 4.22 | 4.32 | 4.24 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1380 | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.30 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | 420/1193 | 4.33 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.04 | 4.33 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 377/1172 | 4.50 | 4.26 | 4.15 | 4.12 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 737/1182 | 4.25 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.30 | 4.25 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3.75 | 988/1170 | 3.75 | 4.27 | 4.38 | 4.32 | 3.75 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 800 | **** | 4.39 | 4.06 | 4.01 | **** |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 189 | **** | **** | 4.34 | 4.47 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 192 | **** | **** | 4.34 | 4.38 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 186 | **** | **** | 4.48 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 187 | **** | **** | 4.33 | 4.46 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 168 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.15 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 66 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.43 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 62 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.28 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 58 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 3.79 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 65 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.36 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 64 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 3.70 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 38 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 2.25 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 36 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 3.25 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 28 | **** | **** | 4.52 | **** | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 30 | **** | **** | 4.30 | **** | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 27 | **** | **** | 4.43 | **** | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 4.00 | 4.72 | **** | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.57 | **** | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 3.00 | 4.64 | **** | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 20 | **** | **** | 4.60 | **** | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 15 | **** | **** | 4.61 | **** | **** |

Course-Section: DANC 216 1
 Title Ballet II (Intermediat
 Instructor: Oda,Misako
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 435
 JUN 28, 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 | 5 | Required for Majors | 4 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 2 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 12 | Non-major | 10 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | 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 | 3 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: DANC 290 1
 Title Indep Studies In Dance
 Instructor: Leblanc,Elizabe
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 436
 JUN 28, 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 | 0 | 3.50 | 1339/1447 | 3.50 | 4.33 | 4.31 | 4.31 | 3.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 1053/1447 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 976/1402 | 4.00 | 4.09 | 4.24 | 4.24 | 4.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 392/1316 | 4.50 | 3.68 | 4.14 | 4.08 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | 1259/1427 | 3.50 | 3.65 | 4.19 | 4.14 | 3.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1447 | 5.00 | 4.69 | 4.69 | 4.70 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 849/1434 | 4.00 | 4.03 | 4.10 | 3.97 | 4.00 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---|-------------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 2 | Required for Majors 1 | Graduate 0 | Major 1 |
| 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 | 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 | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | |

Course-Section: DANC 301 1
 Title Special Studies In Dan
 Instructor: Lacy,Sandra L
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 437
 JUN 28, 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 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 4.44 | 667/1447 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 4.31 | 4.32 | 4.44 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 3.47 | 1331/1447 | 3.47 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 3.47 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 4.19 | 833/1241 | 4.19 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.33 | 4.19 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 3.93 | 1046/1402 | 3.93 | 4.09 | 4.24 | 4.24 | 3.93 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 4.39 | 474/1358 | 4.39 | 3.95 | 4.11 | 4.10 | 4.39 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 3.47 | 1149/1316 | 3.47 | 3.68 | 4.14 | 4.13 | 3.47 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2.06 | 1417/1427 | 2.06 | 3.65 | 4.19 | 4.15 | 2.06 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 4.94 | 291/1447 | 4.94 | 4.69 | 4.69 | 4.65 | 4.94 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 4.00 | 849/1434 | 4.00 | 4.03 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 4.00 | 1176/1387 | 4.00 | 4.29 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 4.94 | 369/1387 | 4.94 | 4.75 | 4.73 | 4.71 | 4.94 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 4.00 | 1047/1386 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.32 | 4.30 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4.50 | 659/1380 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 4.20 | 526/1193 | 4.20 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.20 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/1172 | **** | 4.26 | 4.15 | 4.24 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/1182 | **** | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.42 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1170 | **** | 4.27 | 4.38 | 4.49 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 800 | **** | 4.39 | 4.06 | 4.12 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---|-------------|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 15 | Required for Majors 4 | Graduate 0 | Major 13 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 1 | | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C 0 | General 0 | Under-grad 18 | Non-major 5 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D 0 | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F 0 | Electives 13 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | |
| | | | | P 0 | | | |
| | | | | I 0 | Other 1 | | |
| | | | | ? 2 | | | |

Course-Section: DANC 310 1
 Title Interm Modern Dance I
 Instructor: Martinell,Nicol
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 438
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | 5 | Instructor | | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|------|------|------------|------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Mean | | Rank | | | | | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1447 | 5.00 | 4.33 | 4.31 | 4.32 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1447 | 5.00 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1241 | 5.00 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.33 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 129/1402 | 4.86 | 4.09 | 4.24 | 4.24 | 4.86 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1358 | 5.00 | 3.95 | 4.11 | 4.10 | 5.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 322/1316 | 4.57 | 3.68 | 4.14 | 4.13 | 4.57 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1427 | 5.00 | 3.65 | 4.19 | 4.15 | 5.00 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1447 | 5.00 | 4.69 | 4.69 | 4.65 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1434 | 5.00 | 4.03 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 5.00 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1387 | 5.00 | 4.29 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1387 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.73 | 4.71 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1386 | 5.00 | 4.22 | 4.32 | 4.30 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1380 | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1193 | 5.00 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 5.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1172 | **** | 4.26 | 4.15 | 4.24 | **** | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1182 | **** | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.42 | **** | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1170 | **** | 4.27 | 4.38 | 4.49 | **** | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 800 | **** | 4.39 | 4.06 | 4.12 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 189 | **** | **** | 4.34 | 4.26 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 192 | **** | **** | 4.34 | 4.20 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 186 | **** | **** | 4.48 | 4.36 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 187 | **** | **** | 4.33 | 4.11 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 168 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.02 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 66 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.17 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 62 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.21 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 58 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 2.87 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 65 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.01 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 64 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 3.38 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 38 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 4.73 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 36 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 3.81 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 28 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 4.46 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 30 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.42 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 27 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.50 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 4.00 | 4.72 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 3.00 | 4.64 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 20 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 15 | **** | **** | 4.61 | 5.00 | **** | |

Course-Section: DANC 310 1
 Title Interm Modern Dance I
 Instructor: Martinell,Nicol
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 438
 JUN 28, 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 | 5 | Required for Majors | 5 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 5 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 0 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 8 | 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 | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: DANC 316 1
 Title Ballet III
 Instructor: Lacy,Sandra L
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 439
 JUN 28, 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 | 3 | 13 | 4.81 | 243/1447 | 4.81 | 4.33 | 4.31 | 4.32 | 4.81 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 4.75 | 249/1447 | 4.75 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.75 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1241 | 5.00 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.33 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.33 | 685/1402 | 4.33 | 4.09 | 4.24 | 4.24 | 4.33 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1358 | 5.00 | 3.95 | 4.11 | 4.10 | 5.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 3.69 | 1032/1316 | 3.69 | 3.68 | 4.14 | 4.13 | 3.69 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 4.27 | 763/1427 | 4.27 | 3.65 | 4.19 | 4.15 | 4.27 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 4.13 | 1321/1447 | 4.13 | 4.69 | 4.69 | 4.65 | 4.13 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4.67 | 230/1434 | 4.67 | 4.03 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.67 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 353/1387 | 4.80 | 4.29 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1387 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.73 | 4.71 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1386 | 5.00 | 4.22 | 4.32 | 4.30 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1380 | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 12 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1193 | **** | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.05 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1172 | **** | 4.26 | 4.15 | 4.24 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1182 | **** | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.42 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1170 | **** | 4.27 | 4.38 | 4.49 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 800 | **** | 4.39 | 4.06 | 4.12 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|------------------------|----------|---|-------|-------------|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 15 | Required for Majors 16 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 13 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 1 | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 16 | Non-major 3 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | 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 | 0 | | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | | | |

Course-Section: DANC 320 1
 Title Interm Modern Dance II
 Instructor: Hamby,Douglas
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 440
 JUN 28, 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 | 1 | 9 | 4.58 | 496/1447 | 4.58 | 4.33 | 4.31 | 4.32 | 4.58 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4.58 | 447/1447 | 4.58 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.58 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4.00 | 923/1241 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.33 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3.78 | 1153/1402 | 3.78 | 4.09 | 4.24 | 4.24 | 3.78 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4.00 | 799/1358 | 4.00 | 3.95 | 4.11 | 4.10 | 4.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/1316 | **** | 3.68 | 4.14 | 4.13 | **** |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3.80 | 1144/1427 | 3.80 | 3.65 | 4.19 | 4.15 | 3.80 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 4.09 | 1334/1447 | 4.09 | 4.69 | 4.69 | 4.65 | 4.09 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 4.18 | 712/1434 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.18 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 656/1387 | 4.60 | 4.29 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.60 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1387 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.73 | 4.71 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.20 | 927/1386 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.32 | 4.30 | 4.20 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1380 | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 288/1193 | 4.50 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.50 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 580/1172 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.15 | 4.24 | 4.25 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1182 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.42 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 390/1170 | 4.75 | 4.27 | 4.38 | 4.49 | 4.75 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/ 800 | 5.00 | 4.39 | 4.06 | 4.12 | 5.00 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 189 | **** | **** | 4.34 | 4.26 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 192 | **** | **** | 4.34 | 4.20 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 186 | **** | **** | 4.48 | 4.36 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 187 | **** | **** | 4.33 | 4.11 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 168 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.02 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 66 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.17 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 62 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.21 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 58 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 2.87 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 65 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.01 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 64 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 3.38 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 38 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 4.73 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 36 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 3.81 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 28 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 4.46 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 30 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.42 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 27 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.50 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 4.00 | 4.72 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 3.00 | 4.64 | 5.00 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 20 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 15 | **** | **** | 4.61 | 5.00 | **** |

Course-Section: DANC 320 1
 Title Interm Modern Dance II
 Instructor: Hamby, Douglas
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 440
 JUN 28, 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 | 9 | Required for Majors | 10 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 10 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 2 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 0 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 12 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: DANC 330 1
 Title Dance Composition I
 Instructor: Hamby,Douglas
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 441
 JUN 28, 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 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 3.73 | 1269/1447 | 3.73 | 4.33 | 4.31 | 4.32 | 3.73 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3.55 | 1308/1447 | 3.55 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 3.55 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3.50 | 1143/1241 | 3.50 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.33 | 3.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3.33 | 1307/1402 | 3.33 | 4.09 | 4.24 | 4.24 | 3.33 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.33 | 1231/1358 | 3.33 | 3.95 | 4.11 | 4.10 | 3.33 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/1316 | **** | 3.68 | 4.14 | 4.13 | **** |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2.40 | 1403/1427 | 2.40 | 3.65 | 4.19 | 4.15 | 2.40 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 4.73 | 885/1447 | 4.73 | 4.69 | 4.69 | 4.65 | 4.73 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 3.64 | 1169/1434 | 3.64 | 4.03 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 3.64 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.33 | 1325/1387 | 3.33 | 4.29 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 3.33 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 1380/1387 | 3.00 | 4.75 | 4.73 | 4.71 | 3.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.67 | 1357/1386 | 2.67 | 4.22 | 4.32 | 4.30 | 2.67 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.33 | 1363/1380 | 2.33 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 2.33 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 7 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.00 | 1177/1193 | 2.00 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 2.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 377/1172 | 4.50 | 4.26 | 4.15 | 4.24 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 553/1182 | 4.50 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.42 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 763/1170 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.38 | 4.49 | 4.25 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 800 | **** | 4.39 | 4.06 | 4.12 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|------------------------|----------|---|-------|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 10 | Required for Majors 11 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 9 | |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 0 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 11 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: DANC 340 1
 Title Dance And Technology
 Instructor: Hess-Vait,Carol
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 442
 JUN 28, 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 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 4.46 | 640/1447 | 4.46 | 4.33 | 4.31 | 4.32 | 4.46 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 4.55 | 489/1447 | 4.55 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.55 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/1241 | **** | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.33 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4.36 | 655/1402 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.24 | 4.24 | 4.36 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1358 | **** | 3.95 | 4.11 | 4.10 | **** |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | 812/1316 | 4.00 | 3.68 | 4.14 | 4.13 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4.00 | 971/1427 | 4.00 | 3.65 | 4.19 | 4.15 | 4.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 4.75 | 836/1447 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.69 | 4.65 | 4.75 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 4.20 | 701/1434 | 4.20 | 4.03 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.20 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4.10 | 1144/1387 | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.10 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 784/1387 | 4.80 | 4.75 | 4.73 | 4.71 | 4.80 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 4.20 | 927/1386 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.32 | 4.30 | 4.20 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 4.40 | 759/1380 | 4.40 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.40 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1193 | 5.00 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 5.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1172 | **** | 4.26 | 4.15 | 4.24 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1182 | **** | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.42 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1170 | **** | 4.27 | 4.38 | 4.49 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|--|------|---|--------|-----------|----|
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 11 | Required for Majors | | 12 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 10 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 2 | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 0 | General | | 0 | Under-grad | 13 | Non-major | 3 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | 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 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: DANC 350 1
 Title Dance Workshop
 Instructor: Leblanc, Elizabe
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 443
 JUN 28, 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 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4.10 | 1007/1447 | 4.10 | 4.33 | 4.31 | 4.32 | 4.10 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.60 | 426/1447 | 4.60 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.60 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 231/1241 | 4.80 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.33 | 4.80 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 217/1402 | 4.75 | 4.09 | 4.24 | 4.24 | 4.75 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/1358 | **** | 3.95 | 4.11 | 4.10 | **** |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 812/1316 | 4.00 | 3.68 | 4.14 | 4.13 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3.89 | 1090/1427 | 3.89 | 3.65 | 4.19 | 4.15 | 3.89 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4.20 | 1286/1447 | 4.20 | 4.69 | 4.69 | 4.65 | 4.20 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4.11 | 786/1434 | 4.11 | 4.03 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.11 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.67 | 566/1387 | 4.67 | 4.29 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.67 | 982/1387 | 4.67 | 4.75 | 4.73 | 4.71 | 4.67 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1386 | 5.00 | 4.22 | 4.32 | 4.30 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 273/1380 | 4.80 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.80 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 478/1193 | 4.25 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.25 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 463/1172 | 4.40 | 4.26 | 4.15 | 4.24 | 4.40 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 638/1182 | 4.40 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.42 | 4.40 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 522/1170 | 4.60 | 4.27 | 4.38 | 4.49 | 4.60 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 133/ 800 | 4.67 | 4.39 | 4.06 | 4.12 | 4.67 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 189 | **** | **** | 4.34 | 4.26 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 192 | **** | **** | 4.34 | 4.20 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 186 | **** | **** | 4.48 | 4.36 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 187 | **** | **** | 4.33 | 4.11 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 168 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.02 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 66 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.17 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 62 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.21 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 58 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 2.87 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 65 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.01 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 64 | **** | **** | 4.09 | 3.38 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 38 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 4.73 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 36 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 3.81 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 28 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 4.46 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 30 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.42 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 27 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.50 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 4.00 | 4.72 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 3.00 | 4.64 | 5.00 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 20 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 15 | **** | **** | 4.61 | 5.00 | **** |

Course-Section: DANC 350 1
 Title Dance Workshop
 Instructor: Leblanc, Elizabe
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 443
 JUN 28, 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 | 9 | Required for Majors | 10 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 4 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 1 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 10 | Non-major | 6 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 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 | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: DANC 399 1
 Title Dance Practicum
 Instructor: Chan, Enoch
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 444
 JUN 28, 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 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 3.00 | 1411/1447 | 3.00 | 4.33 | 4.31 | 4.32 | 3.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2.30 | 1439/1447 | 2.30 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 2.30 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3.00 | 1215/1241 | 3.00 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.33 | 3.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.00 | 1359/1402 | 3.00 | 4.09 | 4.24 | 4.24 | 3.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1.63 | 1356/1358 | 1.63 | 3.95 | 4.11 | 4.10 | 1.63 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2.67 | 1288/1316 | 2.67 | 3.68 | 4.14 | 4.13 | 2.67 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 3.22 | 1337/1427 | 3.22 | 3.65 | 4.19 | 4.15 | 3.22 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 4.20 | 1286/1447 | 4.20 | 4.69 | 4.69 | 4.65 | 4.20 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.00 | 1427/1434 | 2.00 | 4.03 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 2.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2.33 | 1380/1387 | 2.33 | 4.29 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 2.33 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.67 | 982/1387 | 4.67 | 4.75 | 4.73 | 4.71 | 4.67 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2.25 | 1376/1386 | 2.25 | 4.22 | 4.32 | 4.30 | 2.25 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1.88 | 1375/1380 | 1.88 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 1.88 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3.20 | 1050/1193 | 3.20 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 3.20 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1172 | **** | 4.26 | 4.15 | 4.24 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1182 | **** | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.42 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1170 | **** | 4.27 | 4.38 | 4.49 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 800 | **** | 4.39 | 4.06 | 4.12 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|------------------------|----------|---|-------|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 10 | Required for Majors 10 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 10 | |
| 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 | 0 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: DANC 400 1
 Title Indep Studies In Dance
 Instructor: Leblanc,Elizabe
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 445
 JUN 28, 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 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1447 | 5.00 | 4.33 | 4.31 | 4.43 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 1053/1447 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.31 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 976/1402 | 4.00 | 4.09 | 4.24 | 4.34 | 4.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 1310/1316 | 2.00 | 3.68 | 4.14 | 4.27 | 2.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 1418/1427 | 2.00 | 3.65 | 4.19 | 4.20 | 2.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1447 | 5.00 | 4.69 | 4.69 | 4.72 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | 1238/1434 | 3.50 | 4.03 | 4.10 | 4.17 | 3.50 |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 28/ 31 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.72 | 4.80 | 4.00 |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 28/ 31 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 4.64 | 4.60 | 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 1 |
| 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 2 | #### - 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: Abel, Charles E
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 446
 JUN 28, 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 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 4.62 | 463/1447 | 4.62 | 4.33 | 4.31 | 4.43 | 4.62 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.46 | 590/1447 | 4.46 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.31 | 4.46 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.50 | 1143/1241 | 3.50 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.41 | 3.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3.80 | 1139/1402 | 3.80 | 4.09 | 4.24 | 4.34 | 3.80 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/1358 | **** | 3.95 | 4.11 | 4.15 | **** |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1316 | **** | 3.68 | 4.14 | 4.27 | **** |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 4.15 | 874/1427 | 4.15 | 3.65 | 4.19 | 4.20 | 4.15 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 388/1447 | 4.92 | 4.69 | 4.69 | 4.72 | 4.92 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4.55 | 315/1434 | 4.55 | 4.03 | 4.10 | 4.17 | 4.55 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 429/1387 | 4.75 | 4.29 | 4.46 | 4.48 | 4.75 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1387 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.73 | 4.76 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1386 | 5.00 | 4.22 | 4.32 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1380 | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/1193 | **** | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.00 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1172 | **** | 4.26 | 4.15 | 4.25 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1182 | **** | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.49 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1170 | **** | 4.27 | 4.38 | 4.51 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 38 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 4.68 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 36 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.42 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 28 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 4.72 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 30 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.38 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 27 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.62 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 4.00 | 4.72 | 4.80 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 3.00 | 4.64 | 4.60 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 20 | **** | **** | 4.60 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 15 | **** | **** | 4.61 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---|-------------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 7 | Required for Majors 9 | Graduate 0 | Major 9 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 4 | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 1 | General 1 | Under-grad 13 | Non-major 4 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D 0 | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F 0 | Electives 3 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | |
| | | | | P 1 | | | |
| | | | | I 0 | Other 0 | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | |

Course-Section: DANC 420 1
 Title Adv Dance Technique II
 Instructor: Lacy, Sandra L
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 447
 JUN 28, 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 | 9 | 6 | 4.25 | 869/1447 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 4.31 | 4.43 | 4.25 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 4.38 | 715/1447 | 4.38 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.31 | 4.38 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1241 | 5.00 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.41 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 4.69 | 281/1402 | 4.69 | 4.09 | 4.24 | 4.34 | 4.69 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/1358 | **** | 3.95 | 4.11 | 4.15 | **** |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3.10 | 1249/1316 | 3.10 | 3.68 | 4.14 | 4.27 | 3.10 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 4.13 | 890/1427 | 4.13 | 3.65 | 4.19 | 4.20 | 4.13 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 4.50 | 1079/1447 | 4.50 | 4.69 | 4.69 | 4.72 | 4.50 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 4.42 | 442/1434 | 4.42 | 4.03 | 4.10 | 4.17 | 4.42 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 626/1387 | 4.63 | 4.29 | 4.46 | 4.48 | 4.63 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1387 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.73 | 4.76 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 4.50 | 607/1386 | 4.50 | 4.22 | 4.32 | 4.34 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 193/1380 | 4.88 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.34 | 4.88 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1193 | **** | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.00 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1172 | **** | 4.26 | 4.15 | 4.25 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1182 | **** | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.49 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1170 | **** | 4.27 | 4.38 | 4.51 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 800 | **** | 4.39 | 4.06 | 4.19 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|------------------------|---|-------------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 12 | Required for Majors 15 | Graduate 1 | Major 12 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 3 | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 0 | General 0 | Under-grad 15 | Non-major 4 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D 0 | | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F 0 | Electives 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | |
| | | | | P 0 | | | |
| | | | | I 0 | Other 0 | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | |