

Course-Section: MUSC 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO MUSIC
 Instructor: GENDELMAN, MART
 Enrollment: 110
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1125
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	7	3	13	7	10	3.25	1565/1639	3.25	4.66	4.27	4.08	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	3	12	7	12	3.40	1522/1639	3.40	4.62	4.22	4.17	3.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	0	9	11	15	3.78	1165/1397	3.78	4.72	4.28	4.18	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	24	2	1	6	3	4	3.38	1455/1583	3.38	4.67	4.19	4.01	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	9	3	4	14	9	3.28	1350/1532	3.28	4.40	4.01	3.88	3.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	29	0	2	1	7	1	3.64	1135/1504	3.64	4.23	4.05	3.78	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	2	9	12	13	3.70	1305/1612	3.70	4.36	4.16	4.10	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	11	27	4.64	1023/1635	4.64	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	7	13	8	3	3.16	1450/1579	3.16	4.55	4.08	3.95	3.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	5	4	12	15	3.87	1331/1518	3.87	4.70	4.43	4.38	3.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	1	3	7	25	4.46	1230/1520	4.46	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	2	12	12	9	3.51	1343/1517	3.51	4.65	4.27	4.20	3.51	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	7	4	5	9	13	3.45	1352/1550	3.45	4.60	4.22	4.17	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	4	4	7	9	12	3.58	938/1295	3.58	4.45	3.94	3.84	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	4	1	3	3	1	2.67	1342/1398	2.67	4.25	4.07	3.85	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1146/1391	3.75	4.36	4.30	4.07	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1162/1388	3.58	4.42	4.28	4.01	3.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	28	9	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 2	A 12	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 16		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 6	General 14	Under-grad 41 Non-major 41
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 101 0101
 Title: FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR
 Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE
 Enrollment: 75
 Questionnaires: 75

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1126
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	51	0	2	2	2	6	12	4.00	1138/1639	3.86	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	51	0	1	0	4	3	16	4.38	722/1639	4.44	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	51	0	0	1	2	4	17	4.54	477/1397	4.60	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	51	7	5	0	3	1	8	3.41	****/1583	3.82	4.67	4.19	4.01	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	51	4	1	0	4	6	9	4.10	700/1532	4.10	4.40	4.01	3.88	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	51	4	7	2	6	2	3	2.60	1474/1504	2.60	4.23	4.05	3.78	2.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	51	0	0	3	1	3	17	4.42	617/1612	4.48	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	51	1	0	0	0	18	5	4.22	1382/1635	4.54	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	54	0	1	2	4	11	3	3.62	1263/1579	3.89	4.55	4.08	3.95	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	51	0	0	2	5	0	17	4.33	1021/1518	4.38	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	52	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	1213/1520	4.60	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	51	0	1	3	2	5	13	4.08	1036/1517	4.25	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	51	1	1	2	4	3	13	4.09	1038/1550	4.06	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	52	15	3	0	1	1	3	3.13	****/1295	3.82	4.45	3.94	3.84	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	67	0	3	0	1	2	2	3.00	****/1398	3.35	4.25	4.07	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	67	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	****/1391	3.88	4.36	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	67	0	2	1	2	1	2	3.00	****/1388	3.76	4.42	4.28	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	67	6	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 5	Under-grad 75 Non-major 75
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 101 0201
 Title: FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR
 Instructor: HAWLEY, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 79
 Questionnaires: 77

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1127
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	4	0	6	6	17	18	26	3.71	1384/1639	3.86	4.66	4.27	4.08	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	0	6	20	45	4.50	517/1639	4.44	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	2	5	8	57	4.67	367/1397	4.60	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	51	1	3	4	5	9	3.82	1219/1583	3.82	4.67	4.19	4.01	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	9	3	3	10	16	32	4.11	700/1532	4.10	4.40	4.01	3.88	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	59	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	****/1504	2.60	4.23	4.05	3.78	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1	0	4	5	10	52	4.55	449/1612	4.48	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	2	0	0	2	6	62	4.86	736/1635	4.54	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	2	10	26	24	4.16	760/1579	3.89	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	2	8	19	42	4.42	919/1518	4.38	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	5	9	56	4.73	943/1520	4.60	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	1	7	19	40	4.41	713/1517	4.25	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	6	5	3	11	11	34	4.03	1062/1550	4.06	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.03	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	25	4	2	12	6	20	3.82	798/1295	3.82	4.45	3.94	3.84	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	6	4	8	4	12	3.35	1177/1398	3.35	4.25	4.07	3.85	3.35	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	3	2	8	4	17	3.88	1076/1391	3.88	4.36	4.30	4.07	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	44	0	1	3	12	4	13	3.76	1095/1388	3.76	4.42	4.28	4.01	3.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	44	22	4	1	2	0	4	2.91	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	76	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	1.00	4.11	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	76	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	76	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	76	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	4.83	4.75	4.79	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	57	Required for Majors	50	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	11	C	2	General	19	Under-grad	77	Non-major	77
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	18	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0101
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB I
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1128
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	7	6	3.89	1259/1639	4.09	4.66	4.27	4.08	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	617/1639	4.57	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	767/1397	4.56	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	832/1583	4.46	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	13	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1532	4.50	4.40	4.01	3.88	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	964/1504	4.07	4.23	4.05	3.78	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	767/1612	4.40	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	4	4.24	1366/1635	4.44	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	691/1579	4.11	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	877/1518	4.61	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.49	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1074/1520	4.73	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	335/1517	4.76	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	522/1550	4.72	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	265/1295	4.59	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1398	4.13	4.25	4.07	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1391	4.75	4.36	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1388	4.38	4.42	4.28	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 958	4.67	4.18	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	1.00	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	3.50	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	4.83	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	4.40	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	4.69	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0101
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB I
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1128
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	7
84-150	1	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0101
 Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB I
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1129
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	7	6	3.89	1259/1639	4.09	4.66	4.27	4.08	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	617/1639	4.57	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	767/1397	4.56	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	832/1583	4.46	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	13	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1532	4.50	4.40	4.01	3.88	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	964/1504	4.07	4.23	4.05	3.78	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	767/1612	4.40	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	4	4.24	1366/1635	4.44	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	795/1579	4.11	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	782/1518	4.61	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.49	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	750/1520	4.73	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	287/1517	4.76	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	265/1550	4.72	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	129/1295	4.59	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1398	4.13	4.25	4.07	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1391	4.75	4.36	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1388	4.38	4.42	4.28	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 958	4.67	4.18	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	1.00	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	3.50	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	4.83	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	4.40	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	4.69	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0101
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB I
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1129
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	7
84-150	1	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0201
 Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB I
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1130
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	860/1639	4.09	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	295/1639	4.57	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	209/1397	4.56	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	371/1583	4.46	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1532	4.50	4.40	4.01	3.88	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	824/1504	4.07	4.23	4.05	3.78	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	166/1612	4.40	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1235/1635	4.44	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	725/1579	4.11	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.40	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1518	4.61	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	4.73	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1517	4.76	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1550	4.72	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	623/1295	4.59	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.43	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0201
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB I
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1131
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	860/1639	4.09	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	295/1639	4.57	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	209/1397	4.56	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	371/1583	4.46	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1532	4.50	4.40	4.01	3.88	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	824/1504	4.07	4.23	4.05	3.78	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	166/1612	4.40	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1235/1635	4.44	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1579	4.11	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.40

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1518	4.61	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.73	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1517	4.76	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	231/1550	4.72	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	95/1295	4.59	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.43

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0301
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB I
 Instructor: LAMON-ANDERSON
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1132
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1082/1639	4.09	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	486/1639	4.57	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	487/1397	4.56	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	323/1583	4.46	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	335/1532	4.50	4.40	4.01	3.88	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	291/1504	4.07	4.23	4.05	3.78	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	0	1	4	5	3.83	1229/1612	4.40	4.36	4.16	4.10	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	662/1635	4.44	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	0	6	0	3.38	1375/1579	4.11	4.55	4.08	3.95	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	1118/1518	4.61	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1318/1520	4.73	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	674/1517	4.76	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	832/1550	4.72	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	100/1295	4.59	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	721/1398	4.13	4.25	4.07	3.85	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.36	4.30	4.07	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	758/1388	4.38	4.42	4.28	4.01	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	155/ 958	4.67	4.18	3.93	3.71	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	1.00	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	3.50	4.05	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	4.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 112 0301
 Title MUSIC REPERTOIRE
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1133
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	4.64	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	4.54	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	4.63	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	4.64	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.23	4.05	3.78	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	4.36	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	4.64	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	4.62	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 112 0601
 Title: MUSIC REPERTOIRE
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1134
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	860/1639	4.64	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1036/1639	4.54	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	795/1397	4.63	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	771/1583	4.64	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	222/1504	4.85	4.23	4.05	3.78	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	6	2	3	3.73	1294/1612	4.36	4.36	4.16	4.10	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	1326/1635	4.64	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	680/1579	4.62	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1162/1518	4.17	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1033/1520	4.67	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	973/1517	4.17	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	832/1550	4.33	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	929/1295	3.60	4.45	3.94	3.84	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	426/1398	4.50	4.25	4.07	3.85	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.36	4.30	4.07	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1065/1388	3.83	4.42	4.28	4.01	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	119/ 958	4.75	4.18	3.93	3.71	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 113 0101
 Title ITALIAN FOR MUSICIANS
 Instructor: MASTRIAN, STACE
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1135
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1212/1504	3.50	4.23	4.05	3.78	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1576/1612	2.50	4.36	4.16	4.10	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1618/1635	3.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	3.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 125 0101
 Title THEORY I:BASICS OF MUS
 Instructor: SMITH, STUART S
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1136
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	391/1639	4.56	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	435/1639	4.45	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	202/1397	4.52	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	741/1583	4.22	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	774/1532	4.11	4.40	4.01	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1092/1504	4.11	4.23	4.05	3.78	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	207/1612	4.01	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1225/1635	4.63	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	302/1579	4.10	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	670/1518	4.34	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	437/1520	4.89	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	560/1517	4.14	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	338/1550	4.44	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	623/1295	4.17	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	539/1398	4.23	4.25	4.07	3.85	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	655/1391	4.56	4.36	4.30	4.07	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	328/1388	4.54	4.42	4.28	4.01	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	935/ 958	2.96	4.18	3.93	3.71	2.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 125 0201
 Title THEORY I:BASICS OF MUS
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1137
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	239/1639	4.56	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	241/1639	4.45	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	175/1397	4.52	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	3	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	281/1583	4.22	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	223/1532	4.11	4.40	4.01	3.88	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	3	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	176/1504	4.11	4.23	4.05	3.78	4.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	218/1612	4.01	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1094/1635	4.63	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	205/1579	4.10	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1518	4.34	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	382/1520	4.89	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	181/1517	4.14	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	122/1550	4.44	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	129/1295	4.17	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	386/1398	4.23	4.25	4.07	3.85	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	441/1391	4.56	4.36	4.30	4.07	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	593/1388	4.54	4.42	4.28	4.01	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	610/ 958	2.96	4.18	3.93	3.71	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 240	****	1.00	4.11	4.01	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 53	****	3.50	4.05	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.40	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	4.69	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 14
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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 16		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 125 0301
 Title THEORY I:BASICS OF MUS
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1138
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	990/1639	4.56	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	1090/1639	4.45	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1131/1397	4.52	4.72	4.28	4.18	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1345/1583	4.22	4.67	4.19	4.01	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1160/1532	4.11	4.40	4.01	3.88	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	964/1504	4.11	4.23	4.05	3.78	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	0	4	2	1	2.50	1576/1612	4.01	4.36	4.16	4.10	2.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	595/1635	4.63	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	4	5	0	2	3.00	1477/1579	4.10	4.55	4.08	3.95	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	2	5	1	3.40	1442/1518	4.34	4.70	4.43	4.38	3.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	802/1520	4.89	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	2	2	2	3.00	1453/1517	4.14	4.65	4.27	4.20	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1297/1550	4.44	4.60	4.22	4.17	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	838/1295	4.17	4.45	3.94	3.84	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	965/1398	4.23	4.25	4.07	3.85	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	616/1391	4.56	4.36	4.30	4.07	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	834/1388	4.54	4.42	4.28	4.01	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 958	2.96	4.18	3.93	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 170 0201
 Title BEGINNING VOICE CLASS
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1139
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	196/1639	4.88	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	149/1639	4.88	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	173/1583	4.83	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	506/1532	4.33	4.40	4.01	3.88	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	291/1504	4.60	4.23	4.05	3.78	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	315/1518	4.83	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.86	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1517	4.86	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	832/1550	4.33	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1295	****	4.45	3.94	3.84	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.25	4.07	3.85	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.07	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.42	4.28	4.01	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	155/ 958	4.67	4.18	3.93	3.71	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 172A 0101
 Title DICTION
 Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1140
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.23	4.05	3.78	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 174 0101
 Title: BEG VOCAL METHODS
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1141
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1497/1639	3.50	4.66	4.27	4.08	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	1536/1639	3.33	4.62	4.22	4.17	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1397	****	4.72	4.28	4.18	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1324/1583	3.67	4.67	4.19	4.01	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1504	****	4.23	4.05	3.78	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	4	0	0	1	0	1.60	1603/1612	1.60	4.36	4.16	4.10	1.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1364/1579	3.40	4.55	4.08	3.95	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1083/1517	4.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	457/1550	4.67	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	3.85	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.07	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.01	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.71	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	6
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 178A 0101
 Title: BEG KEYBOARD SKILLS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1142
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	469/1639	4.54	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	476/1639	4.72	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	517/1397	4.75	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	402/1583	4.79	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1532	****	4.40	4.01	3.88	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	1494/1504	2.00	4.23	4.05	3.78	2.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	449/1612	4.66	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	1402/1635	4.20	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1071/1579	3.78	4.55	4.08	3.95	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	1318/1520	4.33	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	973/1517	4.17	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1328/1550	3.50	4.60	4.22	4.17	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	459/1295	4.25	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1373/1398	2.33	4.25	4.07	3.85	2.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	1385/1391	2.00	4.36	4.30	4.07	2.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1388	****	4.42	4.28	4.01	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	4.40	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.69	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 178A 0201
 Title: BEG KEYBOARD SKILLS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1143
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	698/1639	4.54	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	142/1639	4.72	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1397	4.75	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1583	4.79	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1532	****	4.40	4.01	3.88	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1504	2.00	4.23	4.05	3.78	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	197/1612	4.66	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1374/1635	4.20	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1232/1579	3.78	4.55	4.08	3.95	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1518	4.50	4.70	4.43	4.38	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1520	4.33	4.85	4.70	4.61	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1517	4.17	4.65	4.27	4.20	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1550	3.50	4.60	4.22	4.17	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1295	4.25	4.45	3.94	3.84	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1398	2.33	4.25	4.07	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1391	2.00	4.36	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1388	****	4.42	4.28	4.01	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.40	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.69	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 179A 0101
 Title INTER KEYBOARD SKILLS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1144
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	870/1639	4.31	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	13	4.50	517/1639	4.53	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1397	4.75	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	128/1583	4.63	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1532	4.20	4.40	4.01	3.88	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	1477/1504	2.83	4.23	4.05	3.78	2.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	293/1612	4.51	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	6	4.33	1288/1635	4.39	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	7	6	3	3.65	1245/1579	3.97	4.55	4.08	3.95	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1518	4.67	4.70	4.43	4.38	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1520	4.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1517	3.67	4.65	4.27	4.20	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1550	3.67	4.60	4.22	4.17	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1295	****	4.45	3.94	3.84	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.40	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 43	****	4.69	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 179A 0201
 Title INTER KEYBOARD SKILLS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1145
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	814/1639	4.31	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	466/1639	4.53	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	517/1397	4.75	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	697/1583	4.63	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	633/1532	4.20	4.40	4.01	3.88	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1371/1504	2.83	4.23	4.05	3.78	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	718/1612	4.51	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1195/1635	4.39	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	623/1579	3.97	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1414/1520	4.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1292/1517	3.67	4.65	4.27	4.20	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1274/1550	3.67	4.60	4.22	4.17	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1295	****	4.45	3.94	3.84	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1207/1398	3.25	4.25	4.07	3.85	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1220/1391	3.50	4.36	4.30	4.07	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	1320/1388	3.00	4.42	4.28	4.01	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	786/ 958	3.33	4.18	3.93	3.71	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	9
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
					7

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0101
 Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1146
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	10	4	4.13	1029/1639	4.24	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	415/1639	4.65	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	302/1397	4.73	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	524/1583	4.63	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	0	5	2	2	3.40	1300/1532	3.73	4.40	4.01	3.88	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	9	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1051/1504	4.14	4.23	4.05	3.78	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	340/1612	4.50	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	9	2	4.00	889/1579	4.09	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	684/1518	4.67	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	1115/1520	4.83	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	648/1517	4.68	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	1	11	4.33	832/1550	4.57	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	5	2	6	3.93	709/1295	4.15	4.45	3.94	3.84	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	728/1398	3.91	4.25	4.07	3.85	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	662/1391	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.07	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	783/1388	4.10	4.42	4.28	4.01	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	399/ 958	4.17	4.18	3.93	3.71	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	1.00	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.50	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	4.83	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.40	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	4.69	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 0		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0201
 Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1147
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	740/1639	4.24	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	115/1639	4.65	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	145/1397	4.73	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1583	4.63	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	934/1532	3.73	4.40	4.01	3.88	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	245/1504	4.14	4.23	4.05	3.78	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	617/1612	4.50	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	725/1579	4.09	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	454/1518	4.67	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1520	4.83	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	141/1517	4.68	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	457/1550	4.57	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	513/1295	4.15	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1271/1398	3.91	4.25	4.07	3.85	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	863/1391	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.07	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1157/1388	4.10	4.42	4.28	4.01	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 958	4.17	4.18	3.93	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0301
 Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1148
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	9	7	4.17	990/1639	4.24	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	617/1639	4.65	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	497/1397	4.73	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	584/1583	4.63	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	911/1532	3.73	4.40	4.01	3.88	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	824/1504	4.14	4.23	4.05	3.78	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	575/1612	4.50	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	847/1579	4.09	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	597/1520	4.83	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	428/1517	4.68	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	388/1550	4.57	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	398/1295	4.15	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	355/1398	3.91	4.25	4.07	3.85	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	393/1391	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.07	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	758/1388	4.10	4.42	4.28	4.01	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 958	4.17	4.18	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	1.00	4.11	4.01	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	4.40	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.69	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D 0	Electives 4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Other 1
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 181 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE PIANO CLA
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1149
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1136/1532	3.67	4.40	4.01	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	245/1504	4.67	4.23	4.05	3.78	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	766/1635	4.83	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	496/1579	4.40	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1518	4.80	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1115/1520	4.60	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	726/1517	4.40	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	944/1550	4.20	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	398/1295	4.33	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.25	4.07	3.85	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.36	4.30	4.07	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1130/1388	3.67	4.42	4.28	4.01	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.18	3.93	3.71	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 188 0101
 Title PERCUSSION CLASS
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1150
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	366/1639	4.71	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	163/1639	4.86	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	202/1397	4.85	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	2	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	392/1583	4.58	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	469/1532	4.38	4.40	4.01	3.88	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1504	****	4.23	4.05	3.78	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	924/1612	4.15	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	538/1579	4.36	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	757/1518	4.55	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	439/1517	4.64	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	388/1550	4.73	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	185/1295	4.67	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	625/1398	4.25	4.25	4.07	3.85	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	919/1391	4.13	4.36	4.30	4.07	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.42	4.28	4.01	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.18	3.93	3.71	4.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	1.00	4.11	4.01	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.50	4.05	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	4.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 189 0101
 Title GUITAR CLASS
 Instructor: FORSHEE, ZANE
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1151
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	880/1639	4.27	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	156/1639	4.87	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	230/1397	4.80	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	128/1583	4.92	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	178/1532	4.75	4.40	4.01	3.88	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1504	****	4.23	4.05	3.78	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	837/1612	4.23	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	11	0	3.73	1591/1635	3.73	4.54	4.65	4.56	3.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	623/1579	4.29	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	301/1518	4.85	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	872/1520	4.77	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	299/1517	4.75	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	511/1550	4.62	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	398/1295	4.33	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1398	****	4.25	4.07	3.85	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1391	****	4.36	4.30	4.07	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1388	****	4.42	4.28	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190A 0101
 Title PIANO
 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1152
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	4.75	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	349/1639	4.46	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1288/1635	4.42	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1579	4.67	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	3.84	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	3.85	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.07	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.01	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	4.67	4.78	4.45	4.54	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 43	4.67	4.69	4.69	4.69	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190A 0101
 Title PIANO
 Instructor: HAWLEY, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1153
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	615/1639	4.75	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	859/1639	4.46	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1135/1635	4.42	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	569/1579	4.67	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.33	

Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	37/ 50	4.67	4.78	4.45	4.54	4.33	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	4.40	4.51	4.67	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	34/ 43	4.67	4.69	4.69	4.69	4.33	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.37	4.67	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.52	5.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1154
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	257/1639	4.90	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	415/1639	4.80	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	718/1612	4.67	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1067/1635	4.30	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1579	4.80	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	3.85	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	****	4.36	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	****	4.42	4.28	4.01	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.78	4.45	4.54	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.40	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.69	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1155
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	4.90	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	4.80	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.23	4.05	3.78	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1612	4.67	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.30	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	4.80	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	3.85	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190C 0101
 Title VIOLIN
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1156
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.72	4.28	4.18	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1583	****	4.67	4.19	4.01	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1532	****	4.40	4.01	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	814/1612	4.25	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1295	****	4.45	3.94	3.84	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.78	4.45	4.54	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.40	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.69	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.37	4.67	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190D 0101
 Title VIOLA
 Instructor: BUSCHEK, KIMBER
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1157
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.78	4.45	4.54	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.69	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190I 0101
 Title FLUTE
 Instructor: KESNER, LORI
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1158
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190K 0101
 Title CLARINET
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1159
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 1900 0101
 Title RECORDER
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1160
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	3.84	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190S 0101
 Title PERCUSSION
 Instructor: HUMPHREYS, MICH
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1161
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1606/1612	1.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	1.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1001/1635	4.67	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.25	4.07	3.85	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.01	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.78	4.45	4.54	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	4.40	4.51	4.67	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	37/ 43	4.00	4.69	4.69	4.69	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190U 0101
 Title HARP
 Instructor: POLLAUF, JACQUE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1162
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.23	4.05	3.78	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 191 0301
 Title RECITAL PREPARATION
 Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1163
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	814/1639	4.33	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	371/1583	4.60	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	245/1504	4.67	4.23	4.05	3.78	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	122/1579	4.86	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	3.84	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	3.85	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.07	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.18	3.93	3.71	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 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 9 Non-major 1
84-150	0	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 6	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 193A 0101
 Title PIANO
 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1164
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.23	4.05	3.78	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1165
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	615/1639	4.75	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	252/1639	4.88	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1010/1583	4.50	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1044/1612	4.50	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1135/1635	4.45	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00

Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.78	4.45	4.54	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.69	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1166
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1639	4.75	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1639	4.88	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1583	4.50	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1504	****	4.23	4.05	3.78	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1612	4.50	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1235/1635	4.45	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1295	****	4.45	3.94	3.84	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1398	****	4.25	4.07	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	****	4.36	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	****	4.42	4.28	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	1.00	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.50	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.83	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	5.00	4.78	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.40	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 193B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1166
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193C 0101
 Title VIOLIN
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1167
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.23	4.05	3.78	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1001/1635	4.67	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	3.84	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	3.85	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.07	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.18	3.93	3.71	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193F 0101
 Title GUITAR
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1168
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	859/1639	4.25	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	850/1397	4.20	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	281/1583	4.71	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	506/1532	4.33	4.40	4.01	3.88	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	313/1504	4.57	4.23	4.05	3.78	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	955/1612	4.13	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1441/1635	4.13	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	623/1579	4.29	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1021/1518	4.33	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	398/1295	4.33	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	260/1398	4.75	4.25	4.07	3.85	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	616/1391	4.50	4.36	4.30	4.07	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.42	4.28	4.01	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.18	3.93	3.71	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.78	4.45	4.54	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.40	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.69	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1169
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00	

Lecture															
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	3.84	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193S 0101
 Title PERCUSSION
 Instructor: HUMPHREYS, MICH
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1170
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	3.84	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	3.85	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.07	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.18	3.93	3.71	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193W 0101
 Title UPRIGHT BASS
 Instructor: RUAS, LAURA
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1171
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1288/1635	4.33	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.67

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 194A 0101
 Title PIANO
 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1172
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1515/1517	1.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	1.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1549/1550	1.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	1.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	3.85	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.07	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.01	5.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	234/ 240	1.00	1.00	4.11	4.01	1.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	48/ 52	1.00	3.50	4.04	3.61	1.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	52/ 53	1.00	3.50	4.05	3.51	1.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.78	4.45	4.54	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.69	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.37	4.67	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 194B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1173
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.23	4.05	3.78	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	3.85	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.07	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.18	3.93	3.71	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 194F 0101
 Title GUITAR
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1174
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	824/1504	4.00	4.23	4.05	3.78	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.50	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1077/1550	4.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 194G 0101
 Title CLASSICAL GUITAR
 Instructor: FORSHEE, ZANE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1175
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 194S 0101
 Title PERCUSSION
 Instructor: HUMPHREYS, MICH
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1176
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	3.85	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 210 0101
 Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB III
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1177
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	257/1639	4.82	4.66	4.27	4.35	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1639	4.92	4.62	4.22	4.27	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1397	4.92	4.72	4.28	4.39	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	4	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1583	4.82	4.67	4.19	4.28	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	178/1532	4.88	4.40	4.01	4.09	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	667/1504	4.41	4.23	4.05	4.09	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	756/1612	4.33	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.31	4.54	4.65	4.63	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	205/1579	4.72	4.55	4.08	4.14	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1518	4.80	4.70	4.43	4.48	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	725/1520	4.83	4.85	4.70	4.78	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	239/1517	4.80	4.65	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1295	****	4.45	3.94	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1398	****	4.25	4.07	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1391	****	4.36	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1388	****	4.42	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 210 0201
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB III
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1178
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	222/1639	4.82	4.66	4.27	4.35	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	170/1639	4.92	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	202/1397	4.92	4.72	4.28	4.39	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	347/1583	4.82	4.67	4.19	4.28	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1532	4.88	4.40	4.01	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	275/1504	4.41	4.23	4.05	4.09	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	681/1612	4.33	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1056/1635	4.31	4.54	4.65	4.63	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	197/1579	4.72	4.55	4.08	4.14	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1518	4.80	4.70	4.43	4.48	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1520	4.83	4.85	4.70	4.78	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1517	4.80	4.65	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.33	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1295	****	4.45	3.94	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1398	****	4.25	4.07	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	****	4.36	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	****	4.42	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	3.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.69	4.69	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 217 0101
 Title ROCK & RELATED MUSIC
 Instructor: BOYD, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 183
 Questionnaires: 78

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1179
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	10	18	47	4.37	780/1639	4.37	4.66	4.27	4.35	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	12	26	35	4.17	948/1639	4.17	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	6	10	22	38	4.13	916/1397	4.13	4.72	4.28	4.39	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	37	0	3	5	7	25	4.35	669/1583	4.35	4.67	4.19	4.28	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	4	17	20	32	3.97	815/1532	3.97	4.40	4.01	4.09	3.97	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	56	2	1	5	2	9	3.79	****/1504	****	4.23	4.05	4.09	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	8	10	53	4.42	617/1612	4.42	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	4	0	0	0	33	39	4.54	1107/1635	4.54	4.54	4.65	4.63	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	3	14	34	17	3.96	972/1579	3.96	4.55	4.08	4.14	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	11	60	4.75	472/1518	4.75	4.70	4.43	4.48	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	12	60	4.72	943/1520	4.72	4.85	4.70	4.78	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	5	19	51	4.55	547/1517	4.55	4.65	4.27	4.34	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	8	11	56	4.61	522/1550	4.61	4.60	4.22	4.33	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	2	10	11	52	4.51	265/1295	4.51	4.45	3.94	4.07	4.51	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	49	0	6	4	4	8	7	3.21	1222/1398	3.21	4.25	4.07	4.14	3.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	48	0	4	4	4	4	14	3.67	1177/1391	3.67	4.36	4.30	4.35	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	49	0	1	4	5	4	15	3.97	980/1388	3.97	4.42	4.28	4.37	3.97	
4. Were special techniques successful	50	18	1	2	1	1	5	3.70	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	77	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	4	A	16	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	33						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	33	Under-grad	78	Non-major	75
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	3						

Course-Section: MUSC 218 0101
 Title RECORDING TECHNIQUES
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1180
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.66	4.27	4.35	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	435/1639	4.58	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	437/1397	4.58	4.72	4.28	4.39	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	434/1583	4.55	4.67	4.19	4.28	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	981/1532	3.82	4.40	4.01	4.09	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	824/1504	4.00	4.23	4.05	4.09	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.21	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	1402/1635	4.18	4.54	4.65	4.63	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.55	4.08	4.14	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	315/1518	4.83	4.70	4.43	4.48	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	725/1520	4.83	4.85	4.70	4.78	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	299/1517	4.75	4.65	4.27	4.34	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	457/1550	4.67	4.60	4.22	4.33	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	305/1295	4.45	4.45	3.94	4.07	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	560/1398	4.33	4.25	4.07	4.14	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.42	4.28	4.37	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	4.18	3.93	4.00	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.50	4.05	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	0	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	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 224 0101
 Title INSTRUMENTATION
 Instructor: DUSMAN, LINDA J
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1181
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	252/1639	4.75	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	182/1397	4.88	4.72	4.28	4.39	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.28	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	293/1532	4.57	4.40	4.01	4.09	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	275/1504	4.63	4.23	4.05	4.09	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	603/1612	4.43	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.55	4.08	4.14	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1518	4.80	4.70	4.43	4.48	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	802/1520	4.80	4.85	4.70	4.78	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	288/1550	4.80	4.60	4.22	4.33	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	505/1295	4.20	4.45	3.94	4.07	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	260/1398	4.75	4.25	4.07	4.14	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	387/1388	4.75	4.42	4.28	4.37	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	4.18	3.93	4.00	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	1.00	4.11	4.47	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	4.78	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.40	4.51	4.33	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	3.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	2
84-150	3	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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 225 0101
 Title THEORY III:COUNTERPOIN
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1182
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	7	11	3.96	1183/1639	4.48	4.66	4.27	4.35	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	5	13	4.04	1067/1639	4.19	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.04	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	16	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	282/1397	4.88	4.72	4.28	4.39	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	548/1583	4.73	4.67	4.19	4.28	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	4	3	8	6	3.52	1229/1532	3.93	4.40	4.01	4.09	3.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	0	1	5	13	4.45	441/1504	4.73	4.23	4.05	4.09	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	2	4	4	5	7	3.50	1399/1612	3.75	4.36	4.16	4.21	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	721/1635	4.43	4.54	4.65	4.63	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	5	9	4	3.84	1102/1579	4.09	4.55	4.08	4.14	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	1021/1518	4.33	4.70	4.43	4.48	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	1352/1520	4.63	4.85	4.70	4.78	4.27	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	3	1	5	6	3.93	1152/1517	4.30	4.65	4.27	4.34	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	1	7	5	4.00	1077/1550	4.33	4.60	4.22	4.33	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	1	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	858/1295	4.36	4.45	3.94	4.07	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	2	1	6	3.82	924/1398	4.41	4.25	4.07	4.14	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	983/1391	4.50	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	821/1388	4.64	4.42	4.28	4.37	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	8	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	21
			? 1		

Course-Section: MUSC 225 0201
 Title THEORY III: COUNTERPOIN
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA I.
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1183
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	4.48	4.66	4.27	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	774/1639	4.19	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	4.88	4.72	4.28	4.39	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	4.73	4.67	4.19	4.28	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	506/1532	3.93	4.40	4.01	4.09	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	4.73	4.23	4.05	4.09	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1044/1612	3.75	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.43	4.54	4.65	4.63	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	569/1579	4.09	4.55	4.08	4.14	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1021/1518	4.33	4.70	4.43	4.48	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	4.63	4.85	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	405/1517	4.30	4.65	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	457/1550	4.33	4.60	4.22	4.33	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1295	4.36	4.45	3.94	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	4.41	4.25	4.07	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	4.50	4.36	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	4.64	4.42	4.28	4.37	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 227 0101
 Title THRY V:20TH CENT MUS A
 Instructor: BOYD, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1184
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	342/1639	4.73	4.66	4.27	4.35	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	273/1639	4.73	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	302/1397	4.73	4.72	4.28	4.39	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	371/1583	4.60	4.67	4.19	4.28	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	377/1532	4.47	4.40	4.01	4.09	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	291/1504	4.60	4.23	4.05	4.09	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	166/1612	4.80	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1175/1635	4.47	4.54	4.65	4.63	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	538/1579	4.36	4.55	4.08	4.14	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	360/1518	4.80	4.70	4.43	4.48	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	802/1520	4.80	4.85	4.70	4.78	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.65	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	522/1550	4.60	4.60	4.22	4.33	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	577/1295	4.10	4.45	3.94	4.07	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	695/1398	4.17	4.25	4.07	4.14	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.42	4.28	4.37	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	4.18	3.93	4.00	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 230 0101
 Title MUSICS OF THE WORLD
 Instructor: HUANG, YI-PING
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1185
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	379/1639	4.71	4.66	4.27	4.35	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	567/1639	4.47	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	1	11	4.44	617/1397	4.44	4.72	4.28	4.39	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	1	11	4.12	929/1583	4.12	4.67	4.19	4.28	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	3	2	1	7	3.71	1092/1532	3.71	4.40	4.01	4.09	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	1	8	3.71	1092/1504	3.71	4.23	4.05	4.09	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	2	9	4.19	892/1612	4.19	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	7	3	7	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.54	4.65	4.63	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	725/1579	4.20	4.55	4.08	4.14	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	770/1518	4.53	4.70	4.43	4.48	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	925/1520	4.73	4.85	4.70	4.78	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	405/1517	4.67	4.65	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	457/1550	4.67	4.60	4.22	4.33	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	197/1295	4.64	4.45	3.94	4.07	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/1398	****	4.25	4.07	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1391	****	4.36	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1388	****	4.42	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 1		

Course-Section: MUSC 301 0101
 Title CHAMBERS PLAYERS
 Instructor: LADD, GITA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1186
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	430/1639	4.68	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	231/1639	4.85	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1583	4.50	4.67	4.19	4.24	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1612	4.50	4.36	4.16	4.12	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1135/1635	4.52	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	569/1579	4.73	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1518	****	4.70	4.43	4.39	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	****	4.85	4.70	4.68	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1517	****	4.65	4.27	4.23	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1398	****	4.25	4.07	4.13	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	****	4.36	4.30	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	****	4.42	4.28	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.97	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.69	4.69	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 301 0101
 Title CHAMBERS PLAYERS
 Instructor: BUSCHEK, KIMBER (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1187
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	430/1639	4.68	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	231/1639	4.85	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1583	4.50	4.67	4.19	4.24	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1612	4.50	4.36	4.16	4.12	****	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1135/1635	4.52	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1579	4.73	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1398	****	4.25	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	****	4.36	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	****	4.42	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.69	4.69	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	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	9	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 301 0101
 Title CHAMBERS PLAYERS
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1188
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	366/1639	4.68	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1639	4.85	4.62	4.22	4.20	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.72	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.67	4.19	4.24	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	490/1612	4.50	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1087/1635	4.52	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	122/1579	4.73	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.86	

Lecture															
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1295	****	4.45	3.94	3.95	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	3 Under-grad 7 Non-major 4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	4

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 303 0101
 Title MD CAMERATA--CHAMBER C
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1189
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	188/1639	4.88	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	142/1639	4.88	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	196/1397	4.86	4.72	4.28	4.26	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	186/1583	4.80	4.67	4.19	4.24	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1532	****	4.40	4.01	4.05	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	23	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1504	****	4.23	4.05	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	11	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	418/1612	4.57	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	19	5	4.21	1390/1635	4.21	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	108/1579	4.90	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	191/1518	4.92	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	491/1520	4.92	4.85	4.70	4.68	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	157/1517	4.91	4.65	4.27	4.23	4.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	174/1550	4.91	4.60	4.22	4.20	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	5	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	753/1295	3.88	4.45	3.94	3.95	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	593/1388	4.57	4.42	4.28	4.34	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 1	A 22	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 11
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 13	Under-grad 25 Non-major 14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 5	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 8	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 304 0101
 Title UMBC JUBILEE SINGERS
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1190
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	14	4.56	561/1639	4.56	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	89/1639	4.94	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	276/1532	4.60	4.40	4.01	4.05	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1504	****	4.23	4.05	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	996/1612	4.08	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1094/1635	4.56	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	2	12	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1295	****	4.45	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.25	4.07	4.13	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1388	4.86	4.42	4.28	4.34	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.97	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.50	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	4.83	4.75	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	18	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 305 0101
 Title UMBC COMMUNITY SYMPHON
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1191
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	8	23	4.69	404/1639	4.69	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	10	22	4.69	327/1639	4.69	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	28	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1397	****	4.72	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	25	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	****/1583	****	4.67	4.19	4.24	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	26	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1532	****	4.40	4.01	4.05	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	29	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1504	****	4.23	4.05	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	6	0	1	2	5	17	4.52	469/1612	4.52	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	23	4.72	943/1635	4.72	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	75/1579	4.94	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	257/1518	4.88	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	110/1517	4.93	4.65	4.27	4.23	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	435/1550	4.69	4.60	4.22	4.20	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	7	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	243/1295	4.56	4.45	3.94	3.95	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	426/1398	4.50	4.25	4.07	4.13	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	655/1391	4.45	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	616/1388	4.55	4.42	4.28	4.34	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	5	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	1.00	4.11	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	3.50	4.05	4.31	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 26	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 9	Under-grad 33	Non-major 21
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 12		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 307A 0101
 Title SMALL ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1192
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	177/1639	4.83	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1532	****	4.40	4.01	4.05	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1504	****	4.23	4.05	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	317/1612	4.67	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	496/1579	4.40	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	3.95	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 307F 0101
 Title SMALL ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1193
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	508/1639	4.60	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	415/1639	4.60	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.67	4.19	4.24	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	718/1612	4.33	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1235/1635	4.40	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1188/1520	4.50	4.85	4.70	4.68	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.65	4.27	4.23	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1077/1550	4.00	4.60	4.22	4.20	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1295	****	4.45	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1398	****	4.25	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1391	****	4.36	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1388	****	4.42	4.28	4.34	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 307G 0101
 Title SMALL ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1194
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	231/1639	4.83	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.20	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1504	****	4.23	4.05	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.12	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	3.95	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1398	****	4.25	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	****	4.36	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	****	4.42	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307L 0101
 Title COLLABORATIVE PIANO
 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1195
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1321/1391	3.00	4.36	4.30	4.35	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	4.18	3.93	3.97	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 308 0101
 Title UMBC WIND ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: VILLANUEVA, JAR
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1196
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	656/1639	4.47	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	142/1639	4.89	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.23	4.05	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	8	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1612	4.89	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	1045/1635	4.63	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	231/1550	4.86	4.60	4.22	4.20	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	100/1295	4.83	4.45	3.94	3.95	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	708/1398	4.14	4.25	4.07	4.13	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	593/1388	4.57	4.42	4.28	4.34	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 8	Under-grad 19 Non-major 18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 313 0101
 Title ADVANCED GAMELAN
 Instructor: BECK, GINA C
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1197
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	257/1639	4.80	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	199/1639	4.80	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	371/1583	4.60	4.67	4.19	4.24	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.23	4.05	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	814/1612	4.25	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1518	****	4.70	4.43	4.39	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	****	4.85	4.70	4.68	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1517	****	4.65	4.27	4.23	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1550	****	4.60	4.22	4.20	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1398	****	4.25	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	****	4.36	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	****	4.42	4.28	4.34	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 315 0101
 Title ALEXANDER TECHNIQUE
 Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1198
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	295/1639	4.71	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	447/1397	4.57	4.72	4.28	4.26	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	281/1583	4.71	4.67	4.19	4.24	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	419/1532	4.43	4.40	4.01	4.05	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1504	4.57	4.23	4.05	4.12	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	603/1612	4.43	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1215/1635	4.43	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	122/1579	4.86	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1518	4.86	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	3.95	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1398	4.80	4.25	4.07	4.13	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	387/1388	4.75	4.42	4.28	4.34	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.18	3.93	3.97	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	4.78	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 318 0101
 Title DIGITAL AUDIO PROCESSI
 Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1199
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	293/1639	4.78	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	774/1639	4.33	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	467/1397	4.56	4.72	4.28	4.26	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	355/1583	4.63	4.67	4.19	4.24	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	2	0	0	3	3.33	1330/1532	3.33	4.40	4.01	4.05	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.23	4.05	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	965/1612	4.11	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	706/1635	4.88	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	2	0	0	4	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.65	4.27	4.23	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	253/1550	4.83	4.60	4.22	4.20	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	623/1295	4.00	4.45	3.94	3.95	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	863/1391	4.20	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 321 0101
 Title: MUSIC HISTORY I
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1200
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	8	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	656/1639	4.47	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	327/1639	4.68	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	250/1397	4.79	4.72	4.28	4.26	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	2	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	871/1583	4.18	4.67	4.19	4.24	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	692/1532	4.11	4.40	4.01	4.05	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	3	3	1	1	3	8	3.75	1051/1504	3.75	4.23	4.05	4.12	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	1	0	1	7	10	4.32	743/1612	4.32	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	855/1635	4.78	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	783/1579	4.14	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	849/1518	4.47	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	979/1520	4.71	4.85	4.70	4.68	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	843/1517	4.29	4.65	4.27	4.23	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	414/1550	4.71	4.60	4.22	4.20	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	513/1295	4.19	4.45	3.94	3.95	4.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	916/1398	3.83	4.25	4.07	4.13	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	945/1391	4.08	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	923/1388	4.08	4.42	4.28	4.34	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	7	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	12
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 7		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 360 0101
 Title SEM:K-12 CHORAL METHOD
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1201
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	231/1639	4.83	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	177/1639	4.83	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.72	4.28	4.26	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/1583	4.67	4.67	4.19	4.24	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	133/1532	4.83	4.40	4.01	4.05	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	245/1504	4.67	4.23	4.05	4.12	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	490/1612	4.50	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1415/1635	4.17	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	684/1518	4.60	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	239/1517	4.80	4.65	4.27	4.23	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.20	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	185/1295	4.67	4.45	3.94	3.95	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	4.13	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.18	3.93	3.97	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.50	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.60	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.08	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	4.78	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	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	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 361 0101
 Title SEM:K-12 INSTRU METHOD
 Instructor: VANDERBEEK, MAX
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1202
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	367/1397	4.67	4.72	4.28	4.26	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	323/1583	4.67	4.67	4.19	4.24	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	506/1532	4.33	4.40	4.01	4.05	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	544/1504	4.33	4.23	4.05	4.12	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	317/1612	4.67	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1288/1635	4.33	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	3.95	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.18	3.93	3.97	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 362 0101
 Title ARTS IN EDUCATION
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1203
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.20	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.23	4.05	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.12	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1273/1295	2.00	4.45	3.94	3.95	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.25	4.07	4.13	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	4.18	3.93	3.97	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	3.50	4.04	4.78	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	3.50	4.05	4.31	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 42	4.50	4.83	4.75	4.63	4.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.52	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	4.33	4.56	4.30	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 380 0101
 Title INTRO TO CONDUCTING
 Instructor: LOVE, JASON
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1204
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	832/1639	4.31	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	1	5	2	8	4.06	1044/1639	4.06	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	1	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.72	4.28	4.26	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	1	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.67	4.19	4.24	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	10	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	506/1532	4.33	4.40	4.01	4.05	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	4	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	780/1504	4.08	4.23	4.05	4.12	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	2	3	1	1	3	5	3.46	1415/1612	3.46	4.36	4.16	4.12	3.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	1257/1635	4.38	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	623/1579	4.29	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	978/1518	4.38	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	758/1517	4.38	4.65	4.27	4.23	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	638/1550	4.50	4.60	4.22	4.20	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1295	****	4.45	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.25	4.07	4.13	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	279/1391	4.86	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.42	4.28	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 22 Non-major 8
84-150	5	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 14	
			? 0		

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1205
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.20	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.07	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390C 0101
 Title VIOLIN
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1206
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1637/1639	2.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	2.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1639/1639	1.00	4.62	4.22	4.20	1.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1363/1397	3.00	4.72	4.28	4.26	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1595/1612	2.00	4.36	4.16	4.12	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1398/1398	1.00	4.25	4.07	4.13	1.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1385/1391	2.00	4.36	4.30	4.35	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1383/1388	2.00	4.42	4.28	4.34	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	937/ 958	2.00	4.18	3.93	3.97	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390F 0101
 Title ELECTRIC GUITAR
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1207
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.07	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390G 0101
 Title CLASSICAL GUITAR
 Instructor: FORSHEE, ZANE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1208
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.20	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.25	4.07	4.13	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.34	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390K 0101
 Title CLARINET
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1209
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.20	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	4.05	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.07	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 400 0101
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1210
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.29	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.31	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.36	4.16	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.21	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 401 0101
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS: COMP
 Instructor: SMITH, STUART (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1211
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.62	4.22	4.29	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.67	4.19	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.40	4.01	4.07	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.36	4.16	4.18	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.72	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 401 0101
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS: COMP
 Instructor: KIM-BOYLE, DAVI (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1212
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.62	4.22	4.29	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.67	4.19	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.40	4.01	4.07	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.36	4.16	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.21	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 417 0101
 Title SPEC TPCS IN MUSC TECH
 Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1213
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	318/1639	4.75	4.66	4.27	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	252/1639	4.75	4.62	4.22	4.29	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.72	4.28	4.38	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	419/1532	4.43	4.40	4.01	4.07	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.23	4.05	4.20	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.18	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	205/1579	4.71	4.55	4.08	4.21	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	4.01	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	119/ 958	4.75	4.18	3.93	4.24	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 418 0101
 Title: MUSIC TECH. INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1214
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.29	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.31	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.21	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						

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

Course-Section: MUSC 690 8010
 Title SEM: AMER CHAMBER MUSI
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1215
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.37	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.31	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.27	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.81	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 690 8010
 Title SEM: AMER CHAMBER MUSI
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1216
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.31	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.17	5.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	3.95	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 693 8010
 Title SOLO PERFORMANCE STUDY
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1217
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1090/1639	4.33	4.62	4.22	4.26	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.33	4.54	4.65	4.81	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1271/1398	3.33	4.25	4.07	4.22	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1321/1391	3.33	4.36	4.30	4.47	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1320/1388	3.67	4.42	4.28	4.49	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	456/ 958	3.00	4.18	3.93	4.01	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	234/ 240	1.00	1.00	4.11	3.96	1.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	32/ 52	4.00	3.50	4.04	3.64	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	31/ 53	4.00	3.50	4.05	4.03	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	4.83	4.75	4.78	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	26/ 32	4.00	4.33	4.56	4.59	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	39/ 50	4.33	4.78	4.45	4.39	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	22/ 32	4.00	4.40	4.51	4.50	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	37/ 43	4.33	4.69	4.69	4.61	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 693 8010
 Title SOLO PERFORMANCE STUDY
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1218
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1090/1639	4.33	4.62	4.22	4.26	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.33	4.54	4.65	4.81	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1271/1398	3.33	4.25	4.07	4.22	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1321/1391	3.33	4.36	4.30	4.47	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1320/1388	3.67	4.42	4.28	4.49	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	456/ 958	3.00	4.18	3.93	4.01	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	234/ 240	1.00	1.00	4.11	3.96	1.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	32/ 52	4.00	3.50	4.04	3.64	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	31/ 53	4.00	3.50	4.05	4.03	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	4.83	4.75	4.78	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	26/ 32	4.00	4.33	4.56	4.59	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	39/ 50	4.33	4.78	4.45	4.39	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	22/ 32	4.00	4.40	4.51	4.50	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	37/ 43	4.33	4.69	4.69	4.61	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 693 8010
 Title SOLO PERFORMANCE STUDY
 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1219
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	4.33	4.62	4.22	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.72	4.28	4.37	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1532/1532	1.00	4.40	4.01	4.10	1.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1499/1504	1.00	4.23	4.05	4.29	1.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1519/1612	3.00	4.36	4.16	4.27	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	4.33	4.54	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.17	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	4.50	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	4.50	4.65	4.27	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1077/1550	3.50	4.60	4.22	4.23	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	3.95	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	770/1398	3.33	4.25	4.07	4.22	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	983/1391	3.33	4.36	4.30	4.47	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	3.67	4.42	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	951/ 958	3.00	4.18	3.93	4.01	1.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	4.33	4.78	4.45	4.39	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	22/ 32	4.00	4.40	4.51	4.50	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 43	4.33	4.69	4.69	4.61	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.37	4.31	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.42	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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