

Course-Section: MUSC 101 1
 Title Fundamentals Music Thr
 Instructor: Richards, Kazuko
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1043
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	9	9	4.29	852/1509	4.17	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	9	8	4.19	922/1509	4.27	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	12	6	4.14	857/1287	4.35	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	0	3	10	4	3.89	1103/1459	4.08	4.64	4.22	4.11	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	4	12	2	3.74	1060/1406	3.97	4.45	4.09	4.02	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	0	5	7	2	3.60	1145/1384	3.86	4.45	4.11	3.98	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	0	3	11	5	3.81	1176/1489	4.13	4.50	4.17	4.20	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	583/1506	4.93	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	12	7	4.24	648/1463	4.11	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	3	2	3	1	2	2.73	1423/1438	3.70	4.66	4.46	4.44	2.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	2	3	2	4	3.73	1381/1421	4.31	4.82	4.73	4.66	3.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	5	4	1	1	0	1.82	1406/1411	3.18	4.66	4.31	4.27	1.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	5	2	3	1	0	2.00	1396/1405	3.31	4.66	4.32	4.27	2.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	2	1	3	2	1	1	2.75	1179/1236	3.38	4.45	4.00	3.87	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1260	3.37	4.57	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1255	3.29	4.75	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1258	4.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors		3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General		9	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives		2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 101 2
 Title Fundamentals Music Thr
 Instructor: Hawley JR,Thoma
 Enrollment: 86
 Questionnaires: 81

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1044
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	30	0	3	4	8	21	15	3.80	1288/1509	4.17	4.66	4.31	4.18	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	30	0	1	1	7	9	33	4.41	683/1509	4.27	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	30	1	0	0	2	11	37	4.70	326/1287	4.35	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	30	29	2	1	2	2	15	4.23	803/1459	4.08	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	31	9	3	1	10	9	18	3.93	909/1406	3.97	4.45	4.09	4.02	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	31	39	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	****/1384	3.86	4.45	4.11	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	30	1	1	0	6	4	39	4.60	341/1489	4.13	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	31	1	0	0	0	3	46	4.94	408/1506	4.93	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	37	1	1	1	13	17	11	3.84	1036/1463	4.11	4.49	4.09	4.02	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	0	2	4	16	27	4.39	950/1438	3.70	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32	0	0	1	2	5	41	4.76	881/1421	4.31	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	0	2	7	12	28	4.35	799/1411	3.18	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	32	0	2	2	4	10	31	4.35	818/1405	3.31	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	19	2	1	6	6	12	3.93	752/1236	3.38	4.45	4.00	3.87	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	60	0	3	0	7	2	9	3.67	982/1260	3.37	4.57	4.14	3.95	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	60	0	5	0	6	4	6	3.29	1175/1255	3.29	4.75	4.33	4.15	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	60	0	1	0	6	5	9	4.00	932/1258	4.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	60	17	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	3.89	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	80	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.39	3.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	42	Required for Majors		2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6							
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General		34	Under-grad	81	Non-major	81
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	14	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives		10	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		1				
				?	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 101 3
 Title Fundamentals Music Thr
 Instructor: Richards, Kazuko
 Enrollment: 69
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1045
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	0	0	6	17	27	4.42	698/1509	4.17	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	3	6	18	23	4.22	901/1509	4.27	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	9	18	22	4.22	811/1287	4.35	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	5	1	0	6	23	15	4.13	885/1459	4.08	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	9	18	21	4.25	587/1406	3.97	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	9	1	1	6	17	16	4.12	734/1384	3.86	4.45	4.11	3.98	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	3	8	22	16	3.98	1010/1489	4.13	4.50	4.17	4.20	3.98
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	3	46	4.94	408/1506	4.93	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	31	16	4.26	618/1463	4.11	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	4	7	10	14	3.97	1222/1438	3.70	4.66	4.46	4.44	3.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	2	4	5	23	4.44	1195/1421	4.31	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	2	5	11	10	6	3.38	1312/1411	3.18	4.66	4.31	4.27	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	4	4	4	14	9	3.57	1248/1405	3.31	4.66	4.32	4.27	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	8	4	2	6	6	8	3.46	1002/1236	3.38	4.45	4.00	3.87	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	42	0	3	2	4	1	4	3.07	1152/1260	3.37	4.57	4.14	3.95	3.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	1	0	5	0	7	3.92	****/1255	3.29	4.75	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	****/1258	4.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	43	1	2	1	5	2	2	3.08	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.48	4.48	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B 14			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C 1	General 15	Under-grad 56	Non-major 56
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 1			

Course-Section: MUSC 110 1
 Title Musicianship Lab I
 Instructor: Cella,Lisa M
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1046
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	953/1509	3.86	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	731/1509	4.24	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	337/1287	4.84	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	715/1459	4.43	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	423/1406	4.34	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	278/1384	4.15	4.45	4.11	3.98	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	2	7	3.88	1127/1489	4.03	4.50	4.17	4.20	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	1305/1506	4.34	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	750/1463	3.86	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	1032/1438	3.92	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	1084/1421	4.32	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	738/1411	4.13	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	634/1405	4.19	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	536/1236	4.03	4.45	4.00	3.87	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	370/1260	4.04	4.57	4.14	3.95	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	526/1255	4.16	4.75	4.33	4.15	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	1033/1258	3.30	4.72	4.38	4.18	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	333/ 873	4.25	4.59	4.03	3.89	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
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	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 110 1
 Title Musicianship Lab I
 Instructor: Parent, James C.
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1047
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	2	1	4	1	1	2.78	1487/1509	3.86	4.66	4.31	4.18	2.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	1391/1509	4.24	4.69	4.26	4.25	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1287	4.84	4.76	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	3	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	979/1459	4.43	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	7	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1406	4.34	4.45	4.09	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	4	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1235/1384	4.15	4.45	4.11	3.98	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	2	0	2	3	0	2	3.29	1370/1489	4.03	4.50	4.17	4.20	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	1383/1506	4.34	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	1413/1463	3.86	4.49	4.09	4.02	2.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	3	2	1	1	1	2.38	1429/1438	3.92	4.66	4.46	4.44	2.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	3	1	1	2	3.29	1406/1421	4.32	4.82	4.73	4.66	3.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	1	3	3	0	3.00	1361/1411	4.13	4.66	4.31	4.27	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	4	2	0	3.00	1348/1405	4.19	4.66	4.32	4.27	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1042/1236	4.03	4.45	4.00	3.87	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1260	4.04	4.57	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1255	4.16	4.75	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1258	3.30	4.72	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 873	4.25	4.59	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 110 2
 Title Musicianship Lab I
 Instructor: Cella,Lisa M
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1048
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	291/1509	3.86	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	93/1509	4.24	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1287	4.84	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1459	4.43	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	269/1406	4.34	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	278/1384	4.15	4.45	4.11	3.98	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	330/1489	4.03	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1177/1506	4.34	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	325/1463	3.86	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1438	3.92	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	4.32	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1411	4.13	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1405	4.19	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1236	4.03	4.45	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	4.04	4.57	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	4.16	4.75	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1258	3.30	4.72	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	4.25	4.59	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 13 Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 110 2
 Title Musicianship Lab I
 Instructor: Parent, James C.
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1049
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	3	0	0	5	5	3.69	1325/1509	3.86	4.66	4.31	4.18	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	880/1509	4.24	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1287	4.84	4.76	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	586/1459	4.43	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	813/1406	4.34	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	807/1384	4.15	4.45	4.11	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	641/1489	4.03	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	832/1506	4.34	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	983/1463	3.86	4.49	4.09	4.02	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1203/1438	3.92	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1234/1421	4.32	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	985/1411	4.13	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	896/1405	4.19	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	274/1236	4.03	4.45	4.00	3.87	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1045/1260	4.04	4.57	4.14	3.95	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1054/1255	4.16	4.75	4.33	4.15	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1244/1258	3.30	4.72	4.38	4.18	2.75
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 873	4.25	4.59	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 112 3
 Title Music Repertoire
 Instructor: Yoshioka,Airi
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1050
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.45	4.09	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.45	4.11	3.98	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1258/1506	4.25	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	151/1463	4.75	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.45	4.00	3.87	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.59	4.03	3.89	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors		2	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	4	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		1				
				?	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 125 1
 Title Theory I:Basics Of Mus
 Instructor: Smith,Stuart S
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1051
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	291/1509	4.71	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	245/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	127/1287	4.90	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	770/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	1	8	4.25	587/1406	4.41	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	767/1384	4.36	4.45	4.11	3.98	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	513/1489	4.50	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	466/1506	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	137/1463	4.66	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	430/1438	4.85	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1421	4.93	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	201/1411	4.85	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	239/1405	4.85	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	354/1236	4.49	4.45	4.00	3.87	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	389/1260	4.57	4.57	4.14	3.95	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	379/1255	4.76	4.75	4.33	4.15	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	456/1258	4.61	4.72	4.38	4.18	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	209/ 873	4.45	4.59	4.03	3.89	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 13 Non-major 6
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 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 125 2
 Title Theory I:Basics Of Mus
 Instructor: Caracciolo,Step
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1052
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	14	4.65	434/1509	4.71	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	245/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	143/1287	4.90	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	191/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	294/1406	4.41	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	243/1384	4.36	4.45	4.11	3.98	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	434/1489	4.50	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	1098/1506	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	301/1463	4.66	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	175/1438	4.85	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	665/1421	4.93	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	190/1411	4.85	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	228/1405	4.85	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	229/1236	4.49	4.45	4.00	3.87	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	352/1260	4.57	4.57	4.14	3.95	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	287/1255	4.76	4.75	4.33	4.15	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	620/1258	4.61	4.72	4.38	4.18	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	261/ 873	4.45	4.59	4.03	3.89	4.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
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	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 170 1
 Title: Beginning Voice Class
 Instructor: Jackson, Janice
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1053
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	303/1509	4.75	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	158/1509	4.85	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	4	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	463/1287	4.56	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	400/1459	4.55	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	4	4	10	4.10	739/1406	4.10	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	8	0	2	2	1	7	4.08	762/1384	4.08	4.45	4.11	3.98	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	458/1489	4.50	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	350/1506	4.95	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	170/1463	4.72	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	603/1438	4.65	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	322/1421	4.95	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	376/1411	4.70	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	419/1405	4.70	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	2	0	0	1	6	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.45	4.00	3.87	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	520/1260	4.38	4.57	4.14	3.95	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	184/1255	4.92	4.75	4.33	4.15	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	421/1258	4.75	4.72	4.38	4.18	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	4.59	4.03	3.89	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 173 1
 Title Intro To Choral Singin
 Instructor: Jackson,Janice
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1054
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	551/1509	4.55	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	495/1509	4.55	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	326/1287	4.70	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	656/1406	4.20	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	701/1384	4.17	4.45	4.11	3.98	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1249/1489	3.64	4.50	4.17	4.20	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	583/1506	4.91	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	786/1463	4.11	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	737/1438	4.56	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	279/1411	4.78	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	100/1236	4.80	4.45	4.00	3.87	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1260	****	4.57	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1255	****	4.75	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1258	****	4.72	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	3.89	****

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 5		Graduate	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	6	
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other		2
			? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 174 1
 Title Beg Vocal Methods
 Instructor: Jackson,Janice
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1055
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.76	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1459	****	4.64	4.22	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.45	4.09	4.02	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1438	****	4.66	4.46	4.44	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.82	4.73	4.66	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1411	****	4.66	4.31	4.27	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1405	****	4.66	4.32	4.27	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	****	4.57	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	****	4.75	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1258	****	4.72	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	4
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 178 1
 Title Begin Keyboard Skills
 Instructor: Beith,Nancy S
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1056
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	410/1509	4.67	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	175/1509	4.92	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	183/1287	4.92	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	131/1459	4.92	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	8	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1406	4.50	4.45	4.09	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	9	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1384	4.00	4.45	4.11	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	308/1489	4.68	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	883/1506	4.86	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	511/1463	4.27	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1071/1438	4.38	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1379/1421	4.29	4.82	4.73	4.66	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1204/1411	4.21	4.66	4.31	4.27	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1265/1405	4.08	4.66	4.32	4.27	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1236	4.50	4.45	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1260	4.00	4.57	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1255	3.50	4.75	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1258	3.50	4.72	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 14 Non-major 4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 178 2
 Title Begin Keyboard Skills
 Instructor: Beith,Nancy S
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1057
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	410/1509	4.67	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1509	4.92	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1287	4.92	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1459	4.92	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	332/1406	4.50	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.45	4.11	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	224/1489	4.68	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	4.86	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	726/1463	4.27	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	800/1438	4.38	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	716/1421	4.29	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	416/1411	4.21	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	459/1405	4.08	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	274/1236	4.50	4.45	4.00	3.87	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.57	4.14	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1127/1255	3.50	4.75	4.33	4.15	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1143/1258	3.50	4.72	4.38	4.18	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
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 179 1
 Title Interm Keyboard Skills
 Instructor: Beith,Nancy S
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1058
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1051/1509	4.26	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	390/1509	4.82	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	6	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	3	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	111/1459	4.94	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1406	5.00	4.45	4.09	4.02	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	2	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	175/1489	4.82	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1118/1506	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	702/1463	4.17	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.27	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1260	5.00	4.57	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	5.00	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	5.00	4.18	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 15	Non-major 5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 179 2
 Title Interm Keyboard Skills
 Instructor: Beith,Nancy S
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1059
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	698/1509	4.26	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1509	4.82	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1459	4.94	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.45	4.09	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.45	4.11	3.98	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	121/1489	4.82	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	682/1506	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	726/1463	4.17	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.22	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.18	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	4.82	4.26	4.28	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.69	4.14	4.13	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	4.83	4.31	4.52	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.83	4.05	4.47	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.21	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 6	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 8	Non-major 4
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 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 180 1
 Title Beginning Piano Class
 Instructor: Beith,Nancy S
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1060
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	673/1509	4.45	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	1	18	4.80	201/1509	4.63	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	76/1287	4.90	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	218/1459	4.56	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	702/1406	4.20	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	807/1384	3.83	4.45	4.11	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	1	14	4.40	597/1489	4.27	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	618/1463	4.35	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	305/1438	4.85	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	691/1421	4.78	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	327/1411	4.59	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	432/1405	4.72	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	2	2	4	9	4.18	554/1236	4.13	4.45	4.00	3.87	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1045/1260	3.46	4.57	4.14	3.95	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1255	3.67	4.75	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/1258	3.27	4.72	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	5.00	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 165	****	5.00	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	5.00	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	19/ 49	4.61	4.82	4.26	4.28	4.60
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	3	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	17/ 41	4.29	4.69	4.14	4.13	4.14
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	1	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	27/ 46	4.38	4.83	4.31	4.52	4.33
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	3	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	23/ 37	4.48	4.83	4.05	4.47	4.29
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	5	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: MUSC 180 1
 Title: Beginning Piano Class
 Instructor: Beith, Nancy S
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1060
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	10	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 180 2
 Title Beginning Piano Class
 Instructor: Beith,Nancy S
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1061
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	661/1509	4.45	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	14	4.45	621/1509	4.63	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	167/1287	4.90	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	619/1459	4.56	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	575/1406	4.20	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1107/1384	3.83	4.45	4.11	3.98	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	3	6	10	4.14	875/1489	4.27	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	424/1463	4.35	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	291/1438	4.85	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	2	18	4.71	950/1421	4.78	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	689/1411	4.59	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	345/1405	4.72	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	0	5	1	6	4.08	625/1236	4.13	4.45	4.00	3.87	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	3	1	4	3	3.42	1086/1260	3.46	4.57	4.14	3.95	3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	1084/1255	3.67	4.75	4.33	4.15	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	2	1	3	3	3.27	1195/1258	3.27	4.72	4.38	4.18	3.27
4. Were special techniques successful	12	9	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	3.89	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	18/ 49	4.61	4.82	4.26	4.28	4.63
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	12/ 41	4.29	4.69	4.14	4.13	4.43
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	25/ 46	4.38	4.83	4.31	4.52	4.43
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	17/ 37	4.48	4.83	4.05	4.47	4.67
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	2	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.27	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 16	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 1
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	12
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 184 1
 Title Beginning Woodwind Cla
 Instructor: Spece, Richard D
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1062
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	673/1509	4.44	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	234/1509	4.78	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	146/1459	4.80	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.45	4.11	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	276/1489	4.67	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	786/1463	4.11	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	675/1438	4.60	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	540/1405	4.60	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	3.87	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 185 1
 Title Interm Woodwind Class
 Instructor: Spece, Richard D
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1063
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	882/1509	4.25	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	731/1509	4.38	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	403/1287	4.63	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	0	5	3.75	1045/1406	3.75	4.45	4.09	4.02	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	531/1384	4.33	4.45	4.11	3.98	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	630/1489	4.38	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1312/1421	4.20	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	758/1405	4.40	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.45	4.00	3.87	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.75	4.33	4.15	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.59	4.03	3.89	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 188 1
 Title Percussion Class
 Instructor: Goldstein,Thoma
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1064
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	1010/1509	4.13	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	201/1509	4.80	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	229/1287	4.79	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	332/1406	4.50	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1384	****	4.45	4.11	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	1	3	7	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	408/1506	4.93	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	3	8	3	3.80	1060/1463	3.80	4.49	4.09	4.02	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	675/1438	4.60	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	419/1405	4.70	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.57	4.14	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	287/1255	4.80	4.75	4.33	4.15	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	850/1258	4.20	4.72	4.38	4.18	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A 10	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 7	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 2				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 15	Non-major 8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	3		
				? 0				

Course-Section: MUSC 190 1
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Franklin,Rachel
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1065
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	4.67	4.76	4.30	4.24	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	4.71	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	986/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	990/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438	4.74	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1411	4.92	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	4.92	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	664/1236	4.33	4.45	4.00	3.87	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	4.46	4.57	4.14	3.95	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	4.80	4.75	4.33	4.15	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1258	4.88	4.72	4.38	4.18	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	5.00	4.59	4.03	3.89	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	3	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	5	Non-major	5
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	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190 10
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Kannen, Maria La
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1066
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	4.74	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	4.92	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	4.92	4.66	4.32	4.27	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	1	F 0	Electives	2	# - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	0				
				? 0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190 11
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Ladd,Gita
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1067
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1306/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	4.67	4.76	4.30	4.24	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	4.71	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	4.82	4.45	4.09	4.02	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.20	****	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1476/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	3.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	209/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1438	4.74	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1411	4.92	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1405	4.92	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	4.33	4.45	4.00	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190 13
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Dunlap,Matthew
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1068
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.71	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	853/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1203/1438	4.74	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	4.92	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	4.92	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1162/1260	4.46	4.57	4.14	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	4.80	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	4.88	4.72	4.38	4.18	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190 15
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Kesner,Lori A.
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1069
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	303/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	325/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438	4.74	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	4.92	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	4.92	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	4.33	4.45	4.00	3.87	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.46	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	4.88	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.59	4.03	3.89	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	4.74	4.82	4.26	4.28	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	4.76	4.69	4.14	4.13	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	4.93	4.83	4.31	4.52	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	4.92	4.83	4.05	4.47	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.21	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190 2
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Hawley JR,Thoma
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1070
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	143/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	495/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1287	4.67	4.76	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1459	4.71	4.64	4.22	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	269/1406	4.82	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1384	4.63	4.45	4.11	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	4	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	674/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	583/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	438/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1438	4.74	4.66	4.46	4.44	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.66	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1411	4.92	4.66	4.31	4.27	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1405	4.92	4.66	4.32	4.27	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	4.33	4.45	4.00	3.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	17/ 49	4.74	4.82	4.26	4.28	4.64
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	14/ 41	4.76	4.69	4.14	4.13	4.29
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	21/ 46	4.93	4.83	4.31	4.52	4.70
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	4	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	15/ 37	4.92	4.83	4.05	4.47	4.83
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.21	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 7	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 1	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 11	Non-major 12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 190 28
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Dove,Barry B
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1071
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	4.67	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	4.82	4.45	4.09	4.02	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	209/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	588/1438	4.74	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1411	4.92	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1405	4.92	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	4.33	4.45	4.00	3.87	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	4.46	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	4.80	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	4.88	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.59	4.03	3.89	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190 37
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Richards,Kazuko
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1072
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	303/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	543/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	924/1287	4.67	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	770/1459	4.71	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	223/1406	4.82	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	619/1384	4.63	4.45	4.11	3.98	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	760/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	853/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1203/1438	4.74	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	881/1421	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	885/1411	4.92	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	896/1405	4.92	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	664/1236	4.33	4.45	4.00	3.87	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	936/1260	4.46	4.57	4.14	3.95	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	904/1255	4.80	4.75	4.33	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	818/1258	4.88	4.72	4.38	4.18	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.59	4.03	3.89	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	25/ 49	4.74	4.82	4.26	4.28	4.33
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	4.76	4.69	4.14	4.13	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 46	4.93	4.83	4.31	4.52	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 1	Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 3	Non-major 3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	1	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 190 4
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Caracciolo,Step
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1073
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190 5
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Jackson,Janice
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1074
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	598/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	543/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	979/1459	4.71	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1303/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.20	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1070/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	325/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	4.74	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	4.92	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	4.92	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1131/1236	4.33	4.45	4.00	3.87	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.46	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	4.80	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	4.88	4.72	4.38	4.18	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	1	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	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190 7
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Markovic-Prakas
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1075
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	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		1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	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 190 8
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Yoshioka,Airi
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1076
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	4.67	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	4.71	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	4.82	4.45	4.09	4.02	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.63	4.45	4.11	3.98	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1205/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	4.74	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	4.92	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	4.92	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	4.33	4.45	4.00	3.87	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.46	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	4.80	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	4.88	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.59	4.03	3.89	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 49	4.74	4.82	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 46	4.93	4.83	4.31	4.52	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 2	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 3	Non-major 3
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 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 190 9
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Tremblay,Christ
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1077
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	598/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1070/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	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	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		1				
				?	1							

Course-Section: MUSC 191 2
 Title Recital Preparation
 Instructor: Bailey,Connie C
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1078
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.64	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.93	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.93	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	853/1463	4.41	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	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	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 191 3
 Title Recital Preparation
 Instructor: Wonneberger,Ala
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1079
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	10	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	852/1509	4.64	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	158/1509	4.93	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	6	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	6	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	9	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1406	****	4.45	4.09	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	8	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.45	4.11	3.98	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	121/1489	4.93	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	114/1463	4.41	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.27	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1260	5.00	4.57	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 24 Non-major 14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 193 1
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Franklin,Rachel
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1080
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	4.60	4.45	4.09	4.02	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.45	4.11	3.98	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	276/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1205/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	209/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.83	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	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 2	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 3	Non-major 1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 1	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 193 11
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Ladd,Gita
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1081
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	800/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	774/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1070/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.45	4.00	3.87	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.83	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	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	3	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 193 12
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Lagana,Thomas V
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1082
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.83	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	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 1	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	1	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 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 193 13
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Dunlap,Matthew
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1083
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	303/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	543/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1422/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.11	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	4.60	4.45	4.09	4.02	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1258/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	325/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.45	4.00	3.87	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	746/1260	4.83	4.57	4.14	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193 14
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Cella,Lisa M
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1084
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	543/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1403/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.20	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	325/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.50

Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	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	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193 15
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Kesner, Lori A.
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1085
 MAR 22, 2010
 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

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 193 17
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Richards, Edwin
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1086
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	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	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 193 18
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Spece, Richard D
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1087
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1422/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.11	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	853/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	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	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193 27
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Goldstein,Thoma
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1088
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	4.60	4.45	4.09	4.02	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.45	4.11	3.98	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.45	4.00	3.87	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.83	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.59	4.03	3.89	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 1	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	0		
				? 0				

Course-Section: MUSC 193 28
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Dove, Barry B
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1089
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	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		1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	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		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 193 33
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Ruas,Laura Mari
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1090
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	598/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1086/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	325/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193 4
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Caracciolo,Step
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1091
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1333/1406	4.60	4.45	4.09	4.02	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	986/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	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 193 6
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: King,Thomas D.
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1092
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1114/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1086/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	853/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 193 7
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Markovic-Prakas
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1093
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	853/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	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		1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	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 193 8
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Yoshioka,Airi
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1094
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	4.60	4.45	4.09	4.02	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.45	4.11	3.98	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	941/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.45	4.00	3.87	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	4.83	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.59	4.03	3.89	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 3	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 3	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 193 9
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Tremblay,Christ
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1095
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	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	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 194 12
 Title Perf Studies: Musc Maj
 Instructor: Lagana, Thomas V
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1096
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	4.75	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	4.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.45	4.09	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.45	4.11	3.98	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1070/1506	4.50	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1463	4.63	4.49	4.09	4.02	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	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	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 194 13
 Title Perf Studies: Musc Maj
 Instructor: Dunlap,Matthew
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1097
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	4.75	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1247/1287	4.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1070/1506	4.50	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1463	4.63	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	4.82	4.26	4.28	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 2	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 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 194 15
 Title Perf Studies: Musc Maj
 Instructor: Kesner, Lori A.
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1098
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	4.75	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	4.50	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	325/1463	4.63	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	4.82	4.26	4.28	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	4.83	4.31	4.52	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.83	4.05	4.47	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors		1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	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	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		1				
				?	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 194 6
 Title Perf Studies: Musc Maj
 Instructor: King, Thomas D.
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1099
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1086/1509	4.75	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.50	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	853/1463	4.63	4.49	4.09	4.02	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	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 0						

Course-Section: MUSC 210 1
 Title Musicianship Lab III
 Instructor: Cella,Lisa M
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1100
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	410/1509	4.61	4.66	4.31	4.34	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	175/1509	4.81	4.69	4.26	4.32	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	127/1287	4.84	4.76	4.30	4.35	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	146/1459	4.73	4.64	4.22	4.30	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	152/1406	4.78	4.45	4.09	4.09	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.45	4.11	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	364/1489	4.60	4.50	4.17	4.19	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1258/1506	4.63	4.69	4.67	4.61	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	118/1463	4.90	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.66	4.31	4.37	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.66	4.32	4.39	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.45	4.00	4.11	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.57	4.14	4.19	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.75	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	620/1258	4.50	4.72	4.38	4.44	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 210 2
 Title Musicianship Lab III
 Instructor: Cella,Lisa M
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1101
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	540/1509	4.61	4.66	4.31	4.34	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	234/1509	4.81	4.69	4.26	4.32	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	240/1287	4.84	4.76	4.30	4.35	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	280/1459	4.73	4.64	4.22	4.30	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1406	4.78	4.45	4.09	4.09	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1384	5.00	4.45	4.11	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	319/1489	4.60	4.50	4.17	4.19	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	4.63	4.69	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1463	4.90	4.49	4.09	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.48	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.76	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1411	4.80	4.66	4.31	4.37	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1405	4.67	4.66	4.32	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 218 1
 Title Recording Techniques
 Instructor: Parent, James C.
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1102
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	159/1509	4.90	4.66	4.31	4.34	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	201/1509	4.80	4.69	4.26	4.32	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	326/1287	4.70	4.76	4.30	4.35	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	106/1459	4.89	4.64	4.22	4.30	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.45	4.09	4.09	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.45	4.11	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	243/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.19	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	658/1463	4.22	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	878/1438	4.44	4.66	4.46	4.48	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	588/1421	4.89	4.82	4.73	4.76	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	556/1411	4.56	4.66	4.31	4.37	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.66	4.32	4.39	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	83/1236	4.86	4.45	4.00	4.11	4.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	244/1260	4.75	4.57	4.14	4.19	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	344/1255	4.75	4.75	4.33	4.37	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	421/1258	4.75	4.72	4.38	4.44	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	152/ 873	4.67	4.59	4.03	4.04	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 5	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 0				

Course-Section: MUSC 221 1
 Title Jazz Thry And Aural Sk
 Instructor: Belzer,Matthew
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1103
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.69	4.26	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.35	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	191/1459	4.75	4.64	4.22	4.30	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.45	4.09	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	349/1384	4.50	4.45	4.11	4.09	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	760/1489	4.25	4.50	4.17	4.19	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.49	4.09	4.08	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.39	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	176/1236	4.67	4.45	4.00	4.11	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.57	4.14	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.59	4.03	4.04	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 223 1
 Title Jazz Composition
 Instructor: Belzer, Matthew
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1104
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4									
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.69	4.26	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.35	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.30	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.45	4.09	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.45	4.11	4.09	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.50	4.17	4.19	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.49	4.09	4.08	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.39	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.45	4.00	4.11	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.57	4.14	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.59	4.03	4.04	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 2
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 2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 224 1
 Title Instrumentation
 Instructor: Dusman,Linda J
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1105
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	201/1509	4.86	4.66	4.31	4.34	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	158/1509	4.86	4.69	4.26	4.32	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	304/1287	4.71	4.76	4.30	4.35	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	77/1459	4.92	4.64	4.22	4.30	4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	423/1406	4.43	4.45	4.09	4.09	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	107/1384	4.80	4.45	4.11	4.09	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	937/1489	4.07	4.50	4.17	4.19	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	466/1506	4.92	4.69	4.67	4.61	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	263/1463	4.58	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	219/1438	4.90	4.66	4.46	4.48	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	138/1411	4.90	4.66	4.31	4.37	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	172/1405	4.90	4.66	4.32	4.39	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	421/1236	4.33	4.45	4.00	4.11	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	308/1260	4.67	4.57	4.14	4.19	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	262/1255	4.83	4.75	4.33	4.37	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	324/1258	4.83	4.72	4.38	4.44	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 225 1
 Title Theory III:Counterpoint
 Instructor: Morin,Joseph C
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1106
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	505/1509	4.58	4.66	4.31	4.34	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	774/1509	4.33	4.69	4.26	4.32	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.76	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	3	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.64	4.22	4.30	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	753/1406	4.08	4.45	4.09	4.09	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	174/1384	4.73	4.45	4.11	4.09	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	1	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	738/1489	4.27	4.50	4.17	4.19	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	11	1	4.08	1353/1506	4.08	4.69	4.67	4.61	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	579/1463	4.30	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	1116/1438	4.20	4.66	4.46	4.48	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	1084/1421	4.60	4.82	4.73	4.76	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	936/1411	4.20	4.66	4.31	4.37	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	285/1405	4.80	4.66	4.32	4.39	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	322/1236	4.44	4.45	4.00	4.11	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1260	****	4.57	4.14	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1255	****	4.75	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1258	****	4.72	4.38	4.44	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 230 1
 Title Musics Of The World
 Instructor: Beck,Gina C
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1107
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	0	5	4	16	4.44	673/1509	4.44	4.66	4.31	4.34	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	245/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.32	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	304/1287	4.72	4.76	4.30	4.35	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	15	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	146/1459	4.80	4.64	4.22	4.30	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	2	1	2	3	7	10	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.45	4.09	4.09	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	18	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	****/1384	****	4.45	4.11	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	3	3	18	4.63	319/1489	4.63	4.50	4.17	4.19	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	233/1506	4.96	4.69	4.67	4.61	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	7	12	5	3.92	970/1463	3.92	4.49	4.09	4.08	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	305/1438	4.84	4.66	4.46	4.48	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	588/1421	4.88	4.82	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	201/1411	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.37	4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	393/1405	4.72	4.66	4.32	4.39	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	76/1236	4.88	4.45	4.00	4.11	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	701/1260	4.13	4.57	4.14	4.19	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	3	0	1	1	3	3.13	1198/1255	3.13	4.75	4.33	4.37	3.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	818/1258	4.25	4.72	4.38	4.44	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	23	1	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 10	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 17	Under-grad 31	Non-major 31
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 2			

Course-Section: MUSC 261 1
 Title Teaching Choral Singin
 Instructor: Jackson,Janice
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1108
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	4.66	4.31	4.34	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.69	4.26	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1333/1406	3.00	4.45	4.09	4.09	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.45	4.11	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.50	4.17	4.19	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1241/1463	3.50	4.49	4.09	4.08	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.66	4.46	4.48	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.66	4.32	4.39	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.57	4.14	4.19	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.44	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	4.59	4.03	4.04	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 301 1
 Title Chambers Players
 Instructor: Yoshioka,Airi (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1109
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	339/1509	4.73	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	390/1509	4.64	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.45	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.45	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	224/1489	4.71	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1118/1506	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	248/1463	4.47	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1014/1421	4.83	4.82	4.73	4.73	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	308/1260	4.67	4.57	4.14	4.22	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	4.08	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.82	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.83	4.31	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	1	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	3
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 301 1
 Title Chambers Players
 Instructor: Ladd,Gita (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1110
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	339/1509	4.73	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	390/1509	4.64	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.45	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.45	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	224/1489	4.71	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1118/1506	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	853/1463	4.47	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	4.83	4.82	4.73	4.73	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	308/1260	4.67	4.57	4.14	4.22	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	4.08	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.82	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.83	4.31	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	Major 7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 301 1
 Title Chambers Players
 Instructor: Tremblay,Christ (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1111
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	339/1509	4.73	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	390/1509	4.64	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.45	4.09	4.12	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.45	4.11	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	224/1489	4.71	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1118/1506	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	209/1463	4.47	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	308/1260	4.67	4.57	4.14	4.22	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.42	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	4.08	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.82	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.83	4.31	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 11	Non-major 4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: MUSC 301 1
 Title Chambers Players
 Instructor: Kannen, Maria La (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1112
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	339/1509	4.73	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	390/1509	4.64	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.45	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.45	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	224/1489	4.71	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1118/1506	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	248/1463	4.47	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	4.83	4.82	4.73	4.73	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	308/1260	4.67	4.57	4.14	4.22	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	4.08	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.82	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.83	4.31	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 303 1
 Title UMBC Camerata--Chamber
 Instructor: Caracciolo,Step
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1113
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	11	0	0	0	1	7	20	4.68	398/1509	4.68	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	47/1509	4.96	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	27	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.76	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	21	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1459	****	4.64	4.22	4.26	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	25	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1406	****	4.45	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	23	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/1384	****	4.45	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	1	0	1	1	1	24	4.78	175/1489	4.78	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	466/1506	4.93	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	110/1463	4.83	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	153/1438	4.94	4.66	4.46	4.43	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	232/1411	4.81	4.66	4.31	4.29	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	120/1405	4.94	4.66	4.32	4.32	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	10	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	2	2	12	4.41	496/1260	4.41	4.57	4.14	4.22	4.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	0	0	1	15	4.71	402/1255	4.71	4.75	4.33	4.37	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	1	0	0	5	11	4.47	650/1258	4.47	4.72	4.38	4.42	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	23	3	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	173/ 873	4.62	4.59	4.03	4.08	4.62

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 1	A 23	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 39 Non-major 29
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 11	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 304 1
 Title UMBC Jubilee Singers
 Instructor: Jackson,Janice
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1114
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	22	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	22	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	652/1509	4.44	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	22	9	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1287	****	4.76	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	22	9	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	****/1459	****	4.64	4.22	4.26	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	24	10	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1406	****	4.45	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	24	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	****	4.45	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	24	3	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	527/1489	4.45	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	24	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1146/1506	4.43	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	1	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	31	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/1438	****	4.66	4.46	4.43	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	31	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/1421	****	4.82	4.73	4.73	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	31	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	****/1411	****	4.66	4.31	4.29	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1405	****	4.66	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1260	****	4.57	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1255	****	4.75	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1258	****	4.72	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	33	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 10	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 38	Non-major 34
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 305 1
 Title UMBC Community Symphon
 Instructor: Richards, Edwin
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1115
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	1	1	4	43	4.82	235/1509	4.82	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	45	4.88	133/1509	4.88	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	25	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.76	4.30	4.33	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	26	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	38	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	****/1406	****	4.45	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	40	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	****/1384	****	4.45	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	10	0	0	3	7	30	4.68	265/1489	4.68	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	49	4.98	117/1506	4.98	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	46	4.92	65/1463	4.92	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	42	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	****/1438	****	4.66	4.46	4.43	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	42	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	****/1421	****	4.82	4.73	4.73	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	42	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	****/1411	****	4.66	4.31	4.29	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	42	1	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	****/1405	****	4.66	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	41	5	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1260	****	4.57	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	48	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1255	****	4.75	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	49	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1258	****	4.72	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	48	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 33	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 18
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 52 Non-major 34
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives 14	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 1		

Course-Section: MUSC 307 10
 Title Small Ensemble
 Instructor: King, Thomas D.
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1116
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1114/1509	4.64	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1086/1509	4.78	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1403/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.14	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1392/1463	4.35	4.49	4.09	4.08	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors		1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	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 307 11
 Title Small Ensemble
 Instructor: Franklin,Rachel
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1117
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.64	4.66	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.78	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1287	4.88	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	4.67	4.64	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.45	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	4.78	4.45	4.11	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	941/1506	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	853/1463	4.35	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	4.75	4.45	4.00	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	4.78	4.57	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	4.00	4.59	4.03	4.08	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 2	Graduate 0	Major 2	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 3	Non-major 1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 0				

Course-Section: MUSC 307 2
 Title Small Ensemble
 Instructor: Belzer, Matthew
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1118
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4									
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1509	4.64	4.66	4.31	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	133/1509	4.78	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	0	3	4.50	519/1287	4.88	4.76	4.30	4.33	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1459	4.67	4.64	4.22	4.26	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.45	4.09	4.12	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	531/1384	4.78	4.45	4.11	4.15	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	99/1463	4.35	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.32	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	274/1236	4.75	4.45	4.00	4.07	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1260	4.78	4.57	4.14	4.22	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.42	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 873	4.00	4.59	4.03	4.08	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 9	Non-major 5
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 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 307 3
 Title Small Ensemble
 Instructor: Belzer, Matthew
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1119
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	218/1509	4.64	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1509	4.78	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	4.88	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	979/1459	4.67	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.45	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	4.78	4.45	4.11	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	674/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	151/1463	4.35	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.43	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.73	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.29	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	4.75	4.45	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	4.78	4.57	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	4.00	4.59	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307 6
 Title Small Ensemble
 Instructor: Goldstein,Thoma
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1120
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1114/1509	4.64	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1509	4.78	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	118/1463	4.35	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.80
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.82	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.83	4.31	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307 8
 Title Small Ensemble
 Instructor: Belzer, Matthew
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1121
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.64	4.66	4.31	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.78	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	4.88	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1205/1506	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	209/1463	4.35	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.32	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	558/1260	4.78	4.57	4.14	4.22	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.42	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	866/ 873	4.00	4.59	4.03	4.08	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 308 1
 Title UMBC Wind Ensemble
 Instructor: Spece, Richard D
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1122
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	1	0	9	6	19	4.20	942/1509	4.20	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	3	7	25	4.63	401/1509	4.63	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	32	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1287	****	4.76	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	29	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1459	****	4.64	4.22	4.26	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	33	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1406	****	4.45	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	34	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1384	****	4.45	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	9	1	0	2	2	21	4.62	330/1489	4.62	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	1	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	0	0	0	12	12	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	30	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	28	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	211/1411	4.83	4.66	4.31	4.29	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	172/1405	4.91	4.66	4.32	4.32	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	7	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	****/1260	****	4.57	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	****/1255	****	4.75	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	****/1258	****	4.72	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	32	3	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.48	4.52	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	5.00	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.41	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.82	4.26	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	29	Required for Majors		16	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	3							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General		1	Under-grad	42	Non-major	24
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives		13	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		2				
				?	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 315 1
 Title Alexander Technique
 Instructor: Salkind,Wendy
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1123
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	192/1509	4.82	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	199/1287	4.82	4.76	4.30	4.33	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	106/1459	4.89	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	389/1406	4.45	4.45	4.09	4.12	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	278/1384	4.60	4.45	4.11	4.15	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	527/1489	4.45	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	151/1463	4.75	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	262/1438	4.88	4.66	4.46	4.43	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	190/1411	4.86	4.66	4.31	4.29	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	228/1405	4.86	4.66	4.32	4.32	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.45	4.00	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	172/1260	4.86	4.57	4.14	4.22	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	468/1258	4.71	4.72	4.38	4.42	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	130/ 873	4.71	4.59	4.03	4.08	4.71	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.86	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.67	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.63	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.38	4.73	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	5.00	4.06	3.94	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 1						

Course-Section: MUSC 318 1
 Title Digital Audio Processi
 Instructor: Wonneberger,Ala
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1124
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.45	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1384	****	4.45	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	823/1489	4.20	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.49	4.09	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1438	****	4.66	4.46	4.43	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.82	4.73	4.73	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1411	****	4.66	4.31	4.29	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1405	****	4.66	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	****	4.57	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	****	4.75	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1258	****	4.72	4.38	4.42	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors		5	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	11	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 321 1
 Title Music History I
 Instructor: Morin, Joseph C
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1125
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	8	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	482/1509	4.60	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	574/1509	4.48	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	1	2	5	17	4.52	500/1287	4.52	4.76	4.30	4.33	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	2	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	569/1459	4.43	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	1	1	0	2	4	17	4.50	332/1406	4.50	4.45	4.09	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	2	0	2	5	7	9	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.45	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	1	2	0	1	4	17	4.42	583/1489	4.42	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	15	10	4.40	1166/1506	4.40	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	690/1463	4.20	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	514/1438	4.71	4.66	4.46	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	794/1421	4.81	4.82	4.73	4.73	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	2	0	4	15	4.52	592/1411	4.52	4.66	4.31	4.29	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	0	5	14	4.43	733/1405	4.43	4.66	4.32	4.32	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	1	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	330/1236	4.44	4.45	4.00	4.07	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/1260	****	4.57	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/1255	****	4.75	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/1258	****	4.72	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	27	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	5.00	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	5.00	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	5.00	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.82	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.69	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.83	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.83	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: MUSC 321 1
 Title Music History I
 Instructor: Morin, Joseph C
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1125
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	5	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	33	Non-major	13
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	1	3	6	5	9	3.75	1304/1509	3.75	4.66	4.31	4.32	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	6	7	11	4.21	912/1509	4.21	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	18	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/1287	****	4.76	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	2	1	1	6	3	11	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	4	7	11	4.08	753/1406	4.08	4.45	4.09	4.12	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	9	12	4.33	531/1384	4.33	4.45	4.11	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	1	1	4	18	4.63	319/1489	4.63	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	15	9	4.38	1182/1506	4.38	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	2	14	4	4.10	799/1463	4.10	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	1	4	17	4.61	675/1438	4.61	4.66	4.46	4.43	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	1	0	0	21	4.70	979/1421	4.70	4.82	4.73	4.73	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	592/1411	4.52	4.66	4.31	4.29	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	2	5	13	4.27	881/1405	4.27	4.66	4.32	4.32	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	12	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	871/1236	3.73	4.45	4.00	4.07	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	187/1260	4.83	4.57	4.14	4.22	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	443/1255	4.67	4.75	4.33	4.37	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	212/1258	4.92	4.72	4.38	4.42	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	6	15	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	292/ 873	4.33	4.59	4.03	4.08	4.33
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.22	4.17	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	5.00	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 93	****	5.00	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.41	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.18	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.82	4.26	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	A	19	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	30	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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				

Course-Section: MUSC 360 1
 Title Sem:K-12 Choral Method
 Instructor: Caracciolo,Step
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1127
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	800/1509	4.33	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	859/1509	4.25	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	453/1287	4.57	4.76	4.30	4.33	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	902/1459	4.11	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	152/1406	4.78	4.45	4.09	4.12	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.45	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	1	1	3	3.22	1379/1489	3.22	4.50	4.17	4.14	3.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1127/1506	4.44	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	598/1463	4.29	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	675/1438	4.60	4.66	4.46	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	794/1421	4.80	4.82	4.73	4.73	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	496/1411	4.60	4.66	4.31	4.29	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	758/1405	4.40	4.66	4.32	4.32	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	352/1260	4.60	4.57	4.14	4.22	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	505/1255	4.60	4.75	4.33	4.37	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1258	4.80	4.72	4.38	4.42	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	152/ 873	4.67	4.59	4.03	4.08	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 93	****	5.00	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.41	4.34	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 4
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
					Other 0

Course-Section: MUSC 361 1
 Title Sem:K-12 Instru Method
 Instructor: Vanderbeek,Maxi
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1128
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	921/1509	4.21	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	1	8	4.14	972/1509	4.14	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	795/1287	4.23	4.76	4.30	4.33	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	11	4.50	332/1406	4.50	4.45	4.09	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	0	1	9	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.45	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	2	4	3.43	1335/1489	3.43	4.50	4.17	4.14	3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	807/1506	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	983/1463	3.90	4.49	4.09	4.08	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	1166/1438	4.11	4.66	4.46	4.43	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	846/1421	4.78	4.82	4.73	4.73	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	911/1411	4.22	4.66	4.31	4.29	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	994/1405	4.11	4.66	4.32	4.32	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.45	4.00	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	157/1260	4.88	4.57	4.14	4.22	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	274/1258	4.88	4.72	4.38	4.42	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	152/ 873	4.67	4.59	4.03	4.08	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0	Major 13	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 14	Non-major 1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	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 362 1
 Title Arts In Education
 Instructor: Yoshioka,Airi
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1129
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	303/1509	4.53	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	256/1509	4.18	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	4.80	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	454/1459	4.44	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	813/1406	4.31	4.45	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	619/1384	4.32	4.45	4.11	4.15	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	760/1489	4.00	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1070/1506	4.37	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	545/1463	4.37	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438	4.72	4.66	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	4.83	4.82	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	617/1411	4.42	4.66	4.31	4.29	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	4.67	4.66	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1236	4.42	4.45	4.00	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1260	4.92	4.57	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 873	4.92	4.59	4.03	4.08	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	5.00	4.16	4.07	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	5.00	4.22	4.17	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	5.00	4.48	4.52	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 177	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.30	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 165	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.11	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 89	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.86	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.67	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.63	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.38	4.73	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 93	5.00	5.00	4.06	3.94	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.39	4.61	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.34	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.62	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.47	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.32	4.40	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	4.82	4.26	5.00	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.69	4.14	5.00	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	4.83	4.31	5.00	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.83	4.05	5.00	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	5.00	4.27	5.00	5.00

Course-Section: MUSC 362 1
 Title Arts In Education
 Instructor: Yoshioka,Airi
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1129
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	1	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	0
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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 362 1
 Title Arts In Education
 Instructor: Yoshioka,Airi
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1130
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	833/1509	4.53	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1326/1509	4.18	4.69	4.26	4.25	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	426/1287	4.80	4.76	4.30	4.33	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	638/1459	4.44	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	261/1406	4.31	4.45	4.09	4.12	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	466/1384	4.32	4.45	4.11	4.15	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	1197/1489	4.00	4.50	4.17	4.14	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	3	4.23	1273/1506	4.37	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	467/1463	4.37	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	878/1438	4.72	4.66	4.46	4.43	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1014/1421	4.83	4.82	4.73	4.73	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	810/1411	4.42	4.66	4.31	4.29	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	828/1405	4.67	4.66	4.32	4.32	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	809/1236	4.42	4.45	4.00	4.07	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1260	4.92	4.57	4.14	4.22	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	87/ 873	4.92	4.59	4.03	4.08	4.83

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0	Major 13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 13	Non-major 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 380 1
 Title Intro To Conducting
 Instructor: Love,Jason L
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1131
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	17	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	127/1509	4.93	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	17	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	17	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	17	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	17	8	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/1406	****	4.45	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	18	4	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	132/1384	4.78	4.45	4.11	4.15	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	17	1	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	781/1489	4.23	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	17	0	0	0	0	13	1	4.07	1357/1506	4.07	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	286/1463	4.56	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1438	****	4.66	4.46	4.43	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1421	****	4.82	4.73	4.73	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1411	****	4.66	4.31	4.29	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1405	****	4.66	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1260	****	4.57	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1255	****	4.75	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1258	****	4.72	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	26	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 31 Non-major 20
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 390 1
 Title Adv.Perf.Stud:Westrn A
 Instructor: Franklin,Rachel
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1132
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.80	4.66	4.31	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.80	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	4.75	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.80	4.64	4.22	4.26	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	4.67	4.45	4.09	4.12	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.67	4.45	4.11	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.67	4.50	4.17	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.80	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	4.75	4.66	4.46	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.75	4.82	4.73	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	4.75	4.66	4.31	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	4.75	4.66	4.32	4.32	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.75	4.57	4.14	4.22	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	4.75	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	4.75	4.72	4.38	4.42	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	4.67	4.59	4.03	4.08	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 1	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 390 10
 Title Adv.Perf.Stud:Westrn A
 Instructor: Kannen, Maria La
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1133
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.80	4.66	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.80	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	4.75	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.80	4.64	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	4.67	4.45	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.67	4.45	4.11	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.67	4.50	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.80	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.75	4.49	4.09	4.08	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	1	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	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 390 13
 Title Adv.Perf.Stud:Westrn A
 Instructor: Dunlap,Matthew
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1134
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.80	4.66	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.80	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.80	4.64	4.22	4.26	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.80	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.75	4.49	4.09	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	4.75	4.66	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.75	4.82	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	4.75	4.66	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	4.75	4.66	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	4.67	4.45	4.00	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.75	4.57	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	4.75	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	4.75	4.72	4.38	4.42	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	1	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	1	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 390 33
 Title Adv.Perf.Stud:Westrn A
 Instructor: Ruas,Laura Mari
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1135
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1114/1509	4.80	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1086/1509	4.80	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1287	4.75	4.76	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	979/1459	4.80	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	813/1406	4.67	4.45	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	807/1384	4.67	4.45	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	986/1489	4.67	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.80	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	853/1463	4.75	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1203/1438	4.75	4.66	4.46	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1345/1421	4.75	4.82	4.73	4.73	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1051/1411	4.75	4.66	4.31	4.29	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1405	4.75	4.66	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	664/1236	4.67	4.45	4.00	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	746/1260	4.75	4.57	4.14	4.22	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	904/1255	4.75	4.75	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	932/1258	4.75	4.72	4.38	4.42	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	442/ 873	4.67	4.59	4.03	4.08	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	1	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 390 7
 Title Adv.Perf.Stud:Westrn A
 Instructor: Markovic-Prakas
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1136
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.80	4.66	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.80	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	4.75	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.80	4.64	4.22	4.26	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.80	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.75	4.49	4.09	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	4.75	4.66	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.75	4.82	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	4.75	4.66	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	4.75	4.66	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	4.67	4.45	4.00	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.75	4.57	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	4.75	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	4.75	4.72	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	4.67	4.59	4.03	4.08	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 1	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 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 400 4
 Title Special Projects
 Instructor: Wonneberger,Ala
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1137
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.69	4.26	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.32	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.45	4.09	4.11	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.45	4.11	4.23	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.50	4.17	4.18	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.49	4.09	4.18	5.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.35	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.45	4.00	4.03	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 1	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 417 1
 Title Spec Tpcs In Musc Tech
 Instructor: Wonneberger,Ala
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1138
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	244/1509	4.80	4.66	4.31	4.39	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1509	4.80	4.69	4.26	4.26	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	208/1287	4.80	4.76	4.30	4.38	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	146/1459	4.80	4.64	4.22	4.32	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	135/1406	4.80	4.45	4.09	4.11	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1384	4.75	4.45	4.11	4.23	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1489	4.80	4.50	4.17	4.18	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1463	****	4.49	4.09	4.18	****
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1438	****	4.66	4.46	4.50	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1421	****	4.82	4.73	4.76	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1411	****	4.66	4.31	4.35	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1405	****	4.66	4.32	4.34	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	****	4.57	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	****	4.75	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1258	****	4.72	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	3	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	9	Non-major	5
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 418 1
 Title Music Tech. Internship
 Instructor: Wonneberger,Ala
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1139
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.69	4.26	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.32	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.45	4.09	4.11	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.45	4.11	4.23	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.50	4.17	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.49	4.09	4.18	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	3	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	6	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 480 1
 Title Topic in Music, Art &
 Instructor: Dusman,Linda J
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1140
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1251/1509	3.86	4.66	4.31	4.39	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1283/1509	3.71	4.69	4.26	4.26	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1168/1287	3.50	4.76	4.30	4.38	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1212/1459	3.71	4.64	4.22	4.32	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	971/1406	3.86	4.45	4.09	4.11	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	1159/1384	3.57	4.45	4.11	4.23	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.50	4.17	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.49	4.09	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1393/1438	3.25	4.66	4.46	4.50	3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	881/1421	4.75	4.82	4.73	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1333/1411	3.25	4.66	4.31	4.35	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1321/1405	3.25	4.66	4.32	4.34	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	984/1236	3.50	4.45	4.00	4.03	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	505/1260	4.40	4.57	4.14	4.25	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	287/1255	4.80	4.75	4.33	4.46	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	932/1258	4.00	4.72	4.38	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	801/ 873	3.00	4.59	4.03	4.26	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 492 3
 Title Senior Project
 Instructor: Wonneberger,Ala
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1141
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	4.66	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.69	4.26	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.76	4.30	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.64	4.22	4.32	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.45	4.09	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.45	4.11	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.50	4.17	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1203/1438	4.00	4.66	4.46	4.50	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1345/1421	4.00	4.82	4.73	4.76	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.66	4.31	4.35	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.66	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.45	4.00	4.03	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 1	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 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 690 1
 Title Sem: Amer Chamber Musi
 Instructor: Yoshioka,Airi
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1142
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.49	4.09	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.33	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.57	4.14	4.21	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.43	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.50	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 1	Graduate 1	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 0	Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 693 1
 Title Solo Performance Study
 Instructor: Yoshioka,Airi
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1143
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.49	4.09	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.45	4.00	3.98	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.57	4.14	4.21	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.43	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.50	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	1	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	0	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						