

Course-Section: MUSC 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO MUSIC
 Instructor: COX, FRANKLIN
 Enrollment: 163
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1016
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	7	13	10	16	3.65	1307/1481	3.65	4.76	4.29	4.14	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	5	8	13	20	3.92	1106/1481	3.92	4.70	4.23	4.18	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	3	9	10	23	3.98	919/1249	3.98	4.70	4.27	4.14	3.98	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	7	3	5	12	6	14	3.58	1251/1424	3.58	4.62	4.21	4.06	3.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	5	11	10	15	3.54	1059/1396	3.54	4.42	3.98	3.89	3.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	6	6	6	13	10	5	3.05	1262/1342	3.05	4.29	4.07	3.88	3.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	3	9	9	21	3.87	1078/1459	3.87	4.45	4.16	4.17	3.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	2	30	14	4.26	1208/1480	4.26	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	1	3	11	15	4	3.53	1216/1450	3.53	4.64	4.09	3.97	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	2	2	8	12	19	4.02	1146/1409	4.02	4.43	4.42	4.36	4.02	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	2	3	37	4.77	804/1407	4.77	4.74	4.69	4.57	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	3	2	5	15	18	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.65	4.26	4.23	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	2	7	9	21	3.95	1053/1400	3.95	4.59	4.27	4.19	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	2	2	4	9	22	4.21	480/1179	4.21	4.59	3.96	3.85	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	4	3	2	1	6	3.13	1125/1262	3.13	4.47	4.05	3.77	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	3	4	2	2	6	3.24	1146/1259	3.24	4.59	4.29	4.06	3.24	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	3	4	2	3	4	3.06	1165/1256	3.06	4.50	4.30	4.08	3.06	
4. Were special techniques successful	34	10	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	****/ 788	****	4.55	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99 0	A 22	Required for Majors	28
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 2	B 19	Graduate	0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5	C 2	General	4
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 12	D 0	Under-grad	50
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	4
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	6
			? 1		

Course-Section: MUSC 101 0101
 Title: FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR
 Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1017
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	8	12	4.19	918/1481	4.13	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	17	4.54	481/1481	4.48	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	393/1249	4.67	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.62		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	3	1	8	1	3	3.00	1361/1424	3.56	4.62	4.21	4.06	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	3	15	4.39	387/1396	4.28	4.42	3.98	3.89	4.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	5	3	4	2	4	2.83	1313/1342	2.83	4.29	4.07	3.88	2.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	264/1459	4.70	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1480	4.98	4.52	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	9	11	5	3.84	1022/1450	3.92	4.64	4.09	3.97	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	483/1409	4.65	4.43	4.42	4.36	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	4	20	4.72	899/1407	4.82	4.74	4.69	4.57	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	567/1399	4.56	4.65	4.26	4.23	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	4	15	4.36	754/1400	4.31	4.59	4.27	4.19	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	18	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	793/1179	3.73	4.59	3.96	3.85	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	418/1262	4.02	4.47	4.05	3.77	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1002/1259	4.04	4.59	4.29	4.06	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	837/1256	4.07	4.50	4.30	4.08	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 788	****	4.55	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 249	****	5.00	4.11	3.95	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	4.25	4.00	3.44	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	4.89	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C 2	General 8	Under-grad 26	Non-major 12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	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 3		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 101 0201
 Title: FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR
 Instructor: HAWLEY, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 73
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1018
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	8	4	15	4.07	1031/1481	4.13	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	7	18	4.41	646/1481	4.48	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	4	24	4.72	270/1249	4.67	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	896/1424	3.56	4.62	4.21	4.06	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	1	1	6	13	4.17	574/1396	4.28	4.42	3.98	3.89	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1342	2.83	4.29	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	23	4.72	217/1459	4.70	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	281/1480	4.98	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	7	13	7	4.00	836/1450	3.92	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	670/1409	4.65	4.43	4.42	4.36	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	400/1407	4.82	4.74	4.69	4.57	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	431/1399	4.56	4.65	4.26	4.23	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	4	5	16	4.26	867/1400	4.31	4.59	4.27	4.19	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	2	0	4	2	6	3.71	820/1179	3.73	4.59	3.96	3.85	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	2	3	4	10	3.61	958/1262	4.02	4.47	4.05	3.77	3.61	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	3	2	4	13	4.23	803/1259	4.04	4.59	4.29	4.06	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	2	6	3	10	4.00	901/1256	4.07	4.50	4.30	4.08	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	15	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	****/ 788	****	4.55	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 22	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General 8	Under-grad 30 Non-major 6
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 111 0101
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB II
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1019
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1481	4.91	4.76	4.29	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1481	4.80	4.70	4.23	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1249	4.95	4.70	4.27	4.14	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1424	4.83	4.62	4.21	4.06	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	136/1396	4.57	4.42	3.98	3.89	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	474/1342	4.33	4.29	4.07	3.88	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	242/1459	4.41	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1079/1480	4.32	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	99/1450	4.73	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	383/1409	4.81	4.43	4.42	4.36	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	785/1407	4.81	4.74	4.69	4.57	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	376/1399	4.75	4.65	4.26	4.23	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	166/1400	4.86	4.59	4.27	4.19	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	134/1179	4.54	4.59	3.96	3.85	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.00	4.20	3.93	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	5.00	4.40	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 111 0201
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB II
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1020
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	225/1481	4.91	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	399/1481	4.80	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	142/1249	4.95	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	287/1424	4.83	4.62	4.21	4.06	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	380/1396	4.57	4.42	3.98	3.89	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1342	4.33	4.29	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	899/1459	4.41	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1267/1480	4.32	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	296/1450	4.73	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1409	4.81	4.43	4.42	4.36	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	659/1407	4.81	4.74	4.69	4.57	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1399	4.75	4.65	4.26	4.23	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	218/1400	4.86	4.59	4.27	4.19	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	384/1179	4.54	4.59	3.96	3.85	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	570/1262	4.25	4.47	4.05	3.77	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	304/1259	4.80	4.59	4.29	4.06	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1042/1256	3.75	4.50	4.30	4.08	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 788	****	4.55	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 112 0301
 Title: MUSIC REPERTOIRE
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1021
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.06	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.42	3.98	3.89	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.29	4.07	3.88	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.52	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	3.97	5.00	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	3.77	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.08	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.55	4.00	3.80	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 126 0101
 Title THEORY II:FORM&ANALYSI
 Instructor: DUSMAN, LINDA J
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1022
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	196/1481	4.85	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	399/1481	4.60	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	346/1249	4.65	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	287/1424	4.67	4.62	4.21	4.06	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	297/1396	4.50	4.42	3.98	3.89	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	222/1342	4.63	4.29	4.07	3.88	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	719/1459	4.32	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	715/1480	4.89	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	281/1450	4.57	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	633/1409	4.61	4.43	4.42	4.36	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	545/1407	4.89	4.74	4.69	4.57	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.65	4.26	4.23	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.59	4.27	4.19	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	111/1179	4.80	4.59	3.96	3.85	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	138/1262	4.88	4.47	4.05	3.77	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.08	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	83/ 788	4.86	4.55	4.00	3.80	4.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 1	A 11	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 20 Non-major 4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 170 0101
 Title BEGINNING VOICE CLASS
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1023
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	883/1481	4.29	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	854/1481	4.24	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1249	3.71	4.70	4.27	4.14	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	1	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	959/1424	4.13	4.62	4.21	4.06	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	6	0	3.33	1167/1396	3.32	4.42	3.98	3.89	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	1	2	1	4	0	3.00	1269/1342	2.96	4.29	4.07	3.88	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	2	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1236/1459	3.67	4.45	4.16	4.17	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	2	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	4.92	4.52	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	997/1450	4.16	4.64	4.09	3.97	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1110/1409	4.19	4.43	4.42	4.36	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1407	4.88	4.74	4.69	4.57	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	1002/1399	4.22	4.65	4.26	4.23	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	969/1400	4.25	4.59	4.27	4.19	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1179	4.00	4.59	3.96	3.85	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	829/1262	4.21	4.47	4.05	3.77	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	257/1259	4.65	4.59	4.29	4.06	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1256	4.62	4.50	4.30	4.08	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	318/ 788	4.17	4.55	4.00	3.80	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 1	A 4	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 7	Under-grad 16 Non-major 8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	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 170 0201
 Title BEGINNING VOICE CLASS
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1024
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	729/1481	4.29	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	11	4.25	822/1481	4.24	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1066/1249	3.71	4.70	4.27	4.14	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	728/1424	4.13	4.62	4.21	4.06	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	0	5	4	2	3.31	1181/1396	3.32	4.42	3.98	3.89	3.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	2	5	3	1	2.92	1296/1342	2.96	4.29	4.07	3.88	2.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	0	6	5	5	3.76	1148/1459	3.67	4.45	4.16	4.17	3.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	784/1480	4.92	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	431/1450	4.16	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	1031/1409	4.19	4.43	4.42	4.36	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	823/1407	4.88	4.74	4.69	4.57	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	648/1399	4.22	4.65	4.26	4.23	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	741/1400	4.25	4.59	4.27	4.19	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	590/1179	4.00	4.59	3.96	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	320/1262	4.21	4.47	4.05	3.77	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	643/1259	4.65	4.59	4.29	4.06	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	457/1256	4.62	4.50	4.30	4.08	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	347/ 788	4.17	4.55	4.00	3.80	4.14	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.89	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.92	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	4.96	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 15	Required for Majors 1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 4
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	
				? 1	Other 1

Course-Section: MUSC 171 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE VOICE CLA
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1025
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	173/1481	4.89	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	278/1249	4.71	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	157/1424	4.86	4.62	4.21	4.06	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	877/1396	3.80	4.42	3.98	3.89	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.29	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	0	3	3.67	1201/1459	3.67	4.45	4.16	4.17	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	127/1450	4.83	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.43	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.59	4.27	4.19	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1179	****	4.59	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1262	4.67	4.47	4.05	3.77	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.59	4.29	4.06	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	457/1256	4.67	4.50	4.30	4.08	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.55	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 173 0101
 Title INTRO TO CHORAL SINGIN
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1026
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1225/1481	3.80	4.76	4.29	4.14	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	959/1481	4.10	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	573/1249	4.44	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	885/1424	4.13	4.62	4.21	4.06	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1083/1396	3.50	4.42	3.98	3.89	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1241/1342	3.14	4.29	4.07	3.88	3.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1228/1459	3.60	4.45	4.16	4.17	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	3.00	1469/1480	3.00	4.52	4.68	4.64	3.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1238/1409	3.80	4.43	4.42	4.36	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.65	4.26	4.23	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1204/1400	3.60	4.59	4.27	4.19	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	894/1179	3.50	4.59	3.96	3.85	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1262	****	4.47	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1259	****	4.59	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1256	****	4.50	4.30	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	7	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	1	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 178B 0101
 Title: BEG. KEYBOARD
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1027
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	292/1481	4.73	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	228/1481	4.88	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	432/1249	4.79	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	263/1424	4.85	4.62	4.21	4.06	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	257/1396	4.79	4.42	3.98	3.89	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	542/1342	4.63	4.29	4.07	3.88	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	367/1459	4.63	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1107/1480	4.42	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	741/1450	4.07	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.14	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	968/1409	4.67	4.43	4.42	4.36	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1107/1407	4.75	4.74	4.69	4.57	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	753/1399	4.67	4.65	4.26	4.23	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1110/1400	4.42	4.59	4.27	4.19	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	760/1179	3.80	4.59	3.96	3.85	3.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 178B 0201
 Title: BEG. KEYBOARD
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1028
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	340/1481	4.73	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1481	4.88	4.70	4.23	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1249	4.79	4.70	4.27	4.14	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1424	4.85	4.62	4.21	4.06	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1396	4.79	4.42	3.98	3.89	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	4.63	4.29	4.07	3.88	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	276/1459	4.63	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1100/1480	4.42	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	836/1450	4.07	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1409	4.67	4.43	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	4.75	4.74	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1399	4.67	4.65	4.26	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1400	4.42	4.59	4.27	4.19	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1179	3.80	4.59	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1262	****	4.47	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1259	****	4.59	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	****	4.50	4.30	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.55	4.00	3.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	39/ 55	4.50	4.89	4.55	4.48	4.50	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.63	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	30/ 34	4.50	4.96	4.83	4.67	4.50	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	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 7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	6

Course-Section: MUSC 179B 0101
 Title INTER. KEYBOARD
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1029
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1481	4.76	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	183/1481	4.57	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.14	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1424	4.75	4.62	4.21	4.06	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1396	****	4.42	3.98	3.89	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.29	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	161/1459	4.48	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1434/1480	3.90	4.52	4.68	4.64	3.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	334/1450	4.25	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1409	3.00	4.43	4.42	4.36	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1407	2.00	4.74	4.69	4.57	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1399	****	4.65	4.26	4.23	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1400	****	4.59	4.27	4.19	****	
Discussion															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1259	1.00	4.59	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	3.00	4.50	4.30	4.08	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.00	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	5.00	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	5.00	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.20	4.20	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	39/ 55	4.50	4.89	4.55	4.48	4.50	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	43/ 51	4.00	4.92	4.65	4.63	4.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.96	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 179B 0201
 Title INTER. KEYBOARD
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1030
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	340/1481	4.76	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	736/1481	4.57	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.14	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1424	4.75	4.62	4.21	4.06	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1396	****	4.42	3.98	3.89	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.29	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	854/1459	4.48	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1349/1480	3.90	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	836/1450	4.25	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1356/1409	3.00	4.43	4.42	4.36	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1403/1407	2.00	4.74	4.69	4.57	2.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1399	****	4.65	4.26	4.23	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1400	****	4.59	4.27	4.19	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1179	****	4.59	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1260/1262	1.00	4.47	4.05	3.77	1.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1257/1259	1.00	4.59	4.29	4.06	1.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1167/1256	3.00	4.50	4.30	4.08	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	****	4.55	4.00	3.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	4.50	4.89	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	4.00	4.92	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.96	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0101
 Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1031
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	2	2	8	4.00	1069/1481	4.15	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	399/1481	4.74	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	334/1249	4.72	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	3	1	8	4.15	852/1424	4.35	4.62	4.21	4.06	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	801/1396	3.95	4.42	3.98	3.89	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	1269/1342	3.00	4.29	4.07	3.88	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	2	8	3.93	1021/1459	4.15	4.45	4.16	4.17	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	2	4.13	1302/1480	4.18	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	945/1450	4.12	4.64	4.09	3.97	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	813/1409	4.57	4.43	4.42	4.36	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	861/1407	4.73	4.74	4.69	4.57	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	534/1399	4.63	4.65	4.26	4.23	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	766/1400	4.48	4.59	4.27	4.19	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	557/1179	4.28	4.59	3.96	3.85	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	610/1262	3.52	4.47	4.05	3.77	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	821/1259	3.93	4.59	4.29	4.06	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1025/1256	3.32	4.50	4.30	4.08	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 788	****	4.55	4.00	3.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	41/ 55	4.25	4.89	4.55	4.48	4.25	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.92	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 34	****	4.96	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	6
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0201
 Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1032
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	792/1481	4.15	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	128/1481	4.74	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	236/1249	4.72	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	395/1424	4.35	4.62	4.21	4.06	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	707/1396	3.95	4.42	3.98	3.89	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1342	3.00	4.29	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	671/1459	4.15	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	4	4.24	1230/1480	4.18	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	578/1450	4.12	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	559/1409	4.57	4.43	4.42	4.36	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	861/1407	4.73	4.74	4.69	4.57	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	289/1399	4.63	4.65	4.26	4.23	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	492/1400	4.48	4.59	4.27	4.19	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	299/1179	4.28	4.59	3.96	3.85	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	1186/1262	3.52	4.47	4.05	3.77	2.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1067/1259	3.93	4.59	4.29	4.06	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	3	0	0	2	2.83	1200/1256	3.32	4.50	4.30	4.08	2.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 788	****	4.55	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.00	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 249	****	5.00	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	5.00	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.00	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	4.25	4.00	3.44	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	4.25	4.89	4.55	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 181 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE PIANO CLA
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1033
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	967/1481	4.14	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	0	11	4.43	632/1481	4.43	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	406/1424	4.54	4.62	4.21	4.06	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	136/1396	4.75	4.42	3.98	3.89	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	1234/1342	3.17	4.29	4.07	3.88	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	2	3	3	2	3.08	1371/1459	3.08	4.45	4.16	4.17	3.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	2	4.14	1295/1480	4.14	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	672/1450	4.21	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	670/1409	4.58	4.43	4.42	4.36	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	400/1407	4.92	4.74	4.69	4.57	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.65	4.26	4.23	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	937/1400	4.17	4.59	4.27	4.19	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	590/1179	4.00	4.59	3.96	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.47	4.05	3.77	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	680/1259	4.40	4.59	4.29	4.06	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	680/1256	4.40	4.50	4.30	4.08	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	291/ 788	4.25	4.55	4.00	3.80	4.25	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	5.00	4.11	3.95	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.20	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.25	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.89	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.92	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.96	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 189 0101
 Title GUITAR CLASS
 Instructor: KING, TROY
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1034
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	155/1481	4.85	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.70	4.27	4.14	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1424	****	4.62	4.21	4.06	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	102/1396	4.83	4.42	3.98	3.89	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	914/1459	4.09	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	1288/1480	4.15	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.15	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	196/1450	4.70	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.43	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	129/1399	4.90	4.65	4.26	4.23	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	385/1400	4.70	4.59	4.27	4.19	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.59	3.96	3.85	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.47	4.05	3.77	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	809/1256	4.20	4.50	4.30	4.08	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190A 0101
 Title PIANO
 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1035
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	328/1481	4.73	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	361/1481	4.64	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1424	4.80	4.62	4.21	4.06	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	827/1459	4.20	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.52	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1450	4.50	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	37/ 55	4.60	4.89	4.55	4.48	4.60	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	39/ 51	4.67	4.92	4.65	4.63	4.67	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	4.96	4.83	4.67	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	8	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190A 0101
 Title PIANO
 Instructor: HAWLEY, TOM (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1036
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	328/1481	4.73	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	361/1481	4.64	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1424	4.80	4.62	4.21	4.06	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	827/1459	4.20	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.52	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1409	****	4.43	4.42	4.36	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1407	****	4.74	4.69	4.57	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1399	****	4.65	4.26	4.23	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1400	****	4.59	4.27	4.19	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1179	****	4.59	3.96	3.85	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	37/ 55	4.60	4.89	4.55	4.48	4.60	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	39/ 51	4.67	4.92	4.65	4.63	4.67	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	4.96	4.83	4.67	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	8	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1037
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1361/1424	3.00	4.62	4.21	4.06	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1292/1396	3.00	4.42	3.98	3.89	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.29	4.07	3.88	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1318/1459	3.33	4.45	4.16	4.17	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	836/1450	4.50	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1356/1409	4.00	4.43	4.42	4.36	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.59	4.27	4.19	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	590/1179	4.00	4.59	3.96	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	3.77	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.08	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.89	4.55	4.48	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.63	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	1	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	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1038
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1361/1424	3.00	4.62	4.21	4.06	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1292/1396	3.00	4.42	3.98	3.89	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.29	4.07	3.88	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1318/1459	3.33	4.45	4.16	4.17	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	3.77	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.08	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.89	4.55	4.48	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.63	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	1	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	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190C 0101
 Title VIOLIN
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1039
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.14	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.06	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.42	3.98	3.89	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.45	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.52	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	3.97	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.43	4.42	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.57	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.23	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.59	4.27	4.19	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.59	3.96	3.85	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	3.77	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.89	4.55	4.48	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.63	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190F 0101
 Title ELECTRIC GUITAR
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1040
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	162/1481	4.83	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.06	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.42	3.98	3.89	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.29	4.07	3.88	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	695/1459	4.33	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	259/1450	4.60	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.43	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.59	4.27	4.19	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1262	****	4.47	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1259	****	4.59	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	****	4.50	4.30	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.55	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190I 0101
 Title FLUTE
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1041
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.14	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.06	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1292/1396	3.00	4.42	3.98	3.89	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1269/1342	3.00	4.29	4.07	3.88	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.50

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	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	2				
				?	1						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1042
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.14	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.52	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	3.97	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1043
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.14	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.52	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190S 0101
 Title PERCUSSION
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1044
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.14	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.06	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.42	3.98	3.89	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.29	4.07	3.88	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.45	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1215/1480	4.25	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	3.97	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.43	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.59	4.27	4.19	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.89	4.55	4.48	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.42	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.63	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	4.96	4.83	4.67	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.82	4.58	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190S 0101
 Title PERCUSSION
 Instructor: DOVE, BARRY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1045
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	4	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.14	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.06	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.42	3.98	3.89	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.29	4.07	3.88	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.45	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1215/1480	4.25	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	3.97	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.43	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.59	4.27	4.19	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.59	3.96	3.85	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.89	4.55	4.48	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.42	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.63	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	4.96	4.83	4.67	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.82	4.58	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	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	4	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 191 0101
 Title RECITAL PREPARATION
 Instructor: DUSMAN, LINDA J
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1046
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	9	12	4.19	928/1481	4.59	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	10	7	8	3.81	1179/1481	4.40	4.70	4.23	4.18	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	846/1249	4.11	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	16	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	773/1424	4.22	4.62	4.21	4.06	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	19	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/1396	****	4.42	3.98	3.89	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	19	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/1342	****	4.29	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	4	1	0	1	6	12	4.40	611/1459	4.70	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	0	23	4.92	631/1480	4.96	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	417/1450	4.72	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	1236/1409	3.82	4.43	4.42	4.36	3.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	705/1407	4.82	4.74	4.69	4.57	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	969/1399	4.09	4.65	4.26	4.23	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	551/1400	4.55	4.59	4.27	4.19	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	6	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	419/1179	4.29	4.59	3.96	3.85	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	310/1262	4.57	4.47	4.05	3.77	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	325/1259	4.79	4.59	4.29	4.06	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	428/1256	4.69	4.50	4.30	4.08	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	159/ 788	4.57	4.55	4.00	3.80	4.57	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.00	4.35	4.14	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.25	4.00	3.44	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 19	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	23				
				? 0						

Course-Section: MUSC 191 0201
 Title RECITAL PREPARATION
 Instructor: DUSMAN, LINDA J
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1047
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	4.59	4.76	4.29	4.14	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	4.40	4.70	4.23	4.18	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	4.70	4.45	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	4.96	4.52	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	4.72	4.64	4.09	3.97	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	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	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	2				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1048
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.14	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.14	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.06	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.42	3.98	3.89	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.29	4.07	3.88	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.45	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.52	4.68	4.64	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	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 193B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1049
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	228/1481	4.75	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.14	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.06	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.45	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1215/1480	4.25	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	836/1450	4.50	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1408/1409	2.33	4.43	4.42	4.36	2.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1405/1407	3.00	4.74	4.69	4.57	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1399/1400	3.00	4.59	4.27	4.19	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	3.77	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.08	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.55	4.00	3.80	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.89	4.55	4.48	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.42	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.63	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	4.96	4.83	4.67	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.82	4.58	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1050
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	228/1481	4.75	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.14	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.06	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.45	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1215/1480	4.25	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	4.50	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	2.33	4.43	4.42	4.36	2.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	3.00	4.74	4.69	4.57	3.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	3.00	4.59	4.27	4.19	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.59	3.96	3.85	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	3.77	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.08	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.55	4.00	3.80	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.89	4.55	4.48	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.42	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.63	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	4.96	4.83	4.67	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.82	4.58	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1051
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	228/1481	4.75	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.14	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.06	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.45	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1215/1480	4.25	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1408/1409	2.33	4.43	4.42	4.36	2.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	3.77	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.08	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.55	4.00	3.80	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.89	4.55	4.48	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.42	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.63	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	4.96	4.83	4.67	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.82	4.58	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1052
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.14	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.06	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.42	3.98	3.89	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.29	4.07	3.88	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.52	4.68	4.64	5.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.43	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.57	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1053
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.18	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	3.97	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.43	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.59	4.27	4.19	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	3.77	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	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	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193F 0101
 Title GUITAR
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1054
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	162/1481	4.83	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.14	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.06	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.42	3.98	3.89	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	611/1459	4.40	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	164/1450	4.75	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1270/1409	3.67	4.43	4.42	4.36	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1221/1407	4.33	4.74	4.69	4.57	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	753/1399	4.33	4.65	4.26	4.23	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	791/1400	4.33	4.59	4.27	4.19	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1179	****	4.59	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	931/1262	3.67	4.47	4.05	3.77	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1067/1259	3.67	4.59	4.29	4.06	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1069/1256	3.67	4.50	4.30	4.08	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	4.55	4.00	3.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.89	4.55	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1055
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.76	4.29	4.14	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.70	4.27	4.14	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.62	4.21	4.06	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	707/1396	4.00	4.42	3.98	3.89	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.29	4.07	3.88	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	3.97	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.43	4.42	4.36	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1107/1407	4.50	4.74	4.69	4.57	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.65	4.26	4.23	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.59	4.27	4.19	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.59	3.96	3.85	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.47	4.05	3.77	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.59	4.29	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.50	4.30	4.08	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.55	4.00	3.80	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 193V 0101
 Title ELECTRIC BASS
 Instructor: KEMP, WILLIAM M
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1056
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.70	4.23	4.18	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.06	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1438/1459	2.00	4.45	4.16	4.17	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.52	4.68	4.64	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	3.97	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.43	4.42	4.36	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.59	4.27	4.19	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	590/1179	4.00	4.59	3.96	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	3.77	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.08	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193W 0101
 Title UPRIGHT BASS
 Instructor: BALDWIN, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1057
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.06	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.42	3.98	3.89	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1469/1480	3.00	4.52	4.68	4.64	3.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.64	4.09	3.97	4.00	
Lecture															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1397/1407	3.00	4.74	4.69	4.57	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	4.59	4.27	4.19	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 211 0101
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB IV
 Instructor: COX, FRANKLIN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1058
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	233/1481	4.80	4.76	4.29	4.40	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	286/1481	4.70	4.70	4.23	4.29	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	298/1249	4.70	4.70	4.27	4.36	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	287/1424	4.67	4.62	4.21	4.28	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1396	****	4.42	3.98	3.94	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.29	4.07	4.05	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	550/1459	4.44	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	981/1480	4.63	4.52	4.68	4.68	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	296/1450	4.56	4.64	4.09	4.15	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	334/1409	4.80	4.43	4.42	4.47	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1145/1399	3.80	4.65	4.26	4.29	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	492/1400	4.60	4.59	4.27	4.34	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1179	****	4.59	3.96	4.05	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1262	****	4.47	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1259	****	4.59	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1256	****	4.50	4.30	4.28	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 788	****	4.55	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.00	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	5.00	4.11	4.32	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.20	4.58	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 214 0101
 Title HIST JAZZ: ORIGINS-PRE
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1059
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	10	25	4.36	729/1481	4.36	4.76	4.29	4.40	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	8	13	19	4.17	909/1481	4.17	4.70	4.23	4.29	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	11	24	4.40	624/1249	4.40	4.70	4.27	4.36	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	31	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.62	4.21	4.28	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	5	12	21	4.30	459/1396	4.30	4.42	3.98	3.94	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	33	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	****/1342	****	4.29	4.07	4.05	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	8	29	4.52	436/1459	4.52	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	15	25	4.63	981/1480	4.63	4.52	4.68	4.68	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	8	15	10	4.06	803/1450	4.06	4.64	4.09	4.15	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	14	20	4.39	902/1409	4.39	4.43	4.42	4.47	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	4	34	4.89	522/1407	4.89	4.74	4.69	4.78	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	5	13	19	4.32	773/1399	4.32	4.65	4.26	4.29	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	2	2	2	8	22	4.28	852/1400	4.28	4.59	4.27	4.34	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	0	2	4	3	24	4.48	275/1179	4.48	4.59	3.96	4.05	4.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	4	4	6	5	3.63	944/1262	3.63	4.47	4.05	4.11	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	391/1259	4.72	4.59	4.29	4.34	4.72
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	486/1256	4.63	4.50	4.30	4.28	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	23	16	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 788	****	4.55	4.00	3.98	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.00	4.20	4.51	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	5.00	4.11	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	5.00	4.40	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.20	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.04	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors								
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	26	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	0		
28-55	15	1.00-1.99	2	B	10								
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	7	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	42	Non-major	11		
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	8	D	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	1								
				P	0								
				I	0				Other	8			
				?	1								

Course-Section: MUSC 217 0101
 Title ROCK & RELATED MUSIC
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 129
 Questionnaires: 77

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1060
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	7	66	4.90	159/1481	4.90	4.76	4.29	4.40	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	2	6	25	40	4.41	646/1481	4.41	4.70	4.23	4.29	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	2	0	4	19	48	4.52	479/1249	4.52	4.70	4.27	4.36	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	58	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	****/1424	****	4.62	4.21	4.28	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	41	3	2	7	6	11	3.69	972/1396	3.69	4.42	3.98	3.94	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	67	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/1342	****	4.29	4.07	4.05	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	2	8	61	4.75	196/1459	4.75	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	72	4.99	141/1480	4.99	4.52	4.68	4.68	4.99	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	0	0	4	21	33	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.64	4.09	4.15	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	68	4.92	169/1409	4.92	4.43	4.42	4.47	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	71	4.97	150/1407	4.97	4.74	4.69	4.78	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	14	58	4.78	234/1399	4.78	4.65	4.26	4.29	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	69	4.93	102/1400	4.93	4.59	4.27	4.34	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	0	7	63	4.90	88/1179	4.90	4.59	3.96	4.05	4.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	41	0	11	2	6	4	13	3.17	1108/1262	3.17	4.47	4.05	4.11	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	41	0	15	1	8	6	6	2.64	1222/1259	2.64	4.59	4.29	4.34	2.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	41	0	12	1	5	4	14	3.19	1152/1256	3.19	4.50	4.30	4.28	3.19	
4. Were special techniques successful	41	31	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 788	****	4.55	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	73	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.00	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	73	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 249	****	5.00	4.11	4.32	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	75	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.00	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	75	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	75	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	75	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.25	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	75	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	75	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	75	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	75	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.89	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	75	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	75	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.92	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	75	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.96	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	75	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 217 0101
 Title ROCK & RELATED MUSIC
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 129
 Questionnaires: 77

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1060
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	0	A	29	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B	22						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	20	Under-grad	76	Non-major	40
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	15	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 219 0101
 Title INTRO DIGITAL AUDIO WK
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1061
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	513/1481	4.55	4.76	4.29	4.40	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	589/1481	4.45	4.70	4.23	4.29	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	369/1249	4.64	4.70	4.27	4.36	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	497/1424	4.45	4.62	4.21	4.28	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	801/1396	3.90	4.42	3.98	3.94	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	384/1342	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.05	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	535/1459	4.45	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	1326/1480	4.09	4.52	4.68	4.68	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	417/1450	4.44	4.64	4.09	4.15	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	716/1409	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.47	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	880/1407	4.73	4.74	4.69	4.78	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	810/1399	4.27	4.65	4.26	4.29	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	754/1400	4.36	4.59	4.27	4.34	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	147/1179	4.73	4.59	3.96	4.05	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	556/1262	4.27	4.47	4.05	4.11	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	634/1259	4.45	4.59	4.29	4.34	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	549/1256	4.55	4.50	4.30	4.28	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.55	4.00	3.98	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 1	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 13 Non-major 3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	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 7	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 220 0101
 Title INTRO TO PERCUSSION EN
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1062
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.76	4.29	4.40	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.29	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.28	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.42	3.98	3.94	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.29	4.07	4.05	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1256/1459	3.50	4.45	4.16	4.17	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.52	4.68	4.68	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.43	4.42	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.65	4.26	4.29	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	791/1400	4.33	4.59	4.27	4.34	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	259/1179	4.50	4.59	3.96	4.05	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1254/1256	1.00	4.50	4.30	4.28	1.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.55	4.00	3.98	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	155/ 246	4.00	4.00	4.20	4.51	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 249	5.00	5.00	4.11	4.32	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 242	5.00	5.00	4.40	4.63	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	5.00	4.20	4.58	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	5.00	4.04	4.28	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	5.00	4.49	5.00	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	48/ 69	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.72	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	5.00	3.92	3.55	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 59	5.00	5.00	4.30	4.67	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	28/ 51	4.00	4.25	4.00	4.07	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.89	4.55	4.44	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 3	Non-major 1
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 226 0101
 Title THEORY IV:MUSIC WRITIN
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1063
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	159/1481	4.90	4.76	4.29	4.40	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	399/1481	4.60	4.70	4.23	4.29	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	203/1249	4.80	4.70	4.27	4.36	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	136/1424	4.90	4.62	4.21	4.28	4.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	623/1396	4.13	4.42	3.98	3.94	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.29	4.07	4.05	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	402/1459	4.56	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	928/1480	4.70	4.52	4.68	4.68	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	139/1450	4.80	4.64	4.09	4.15	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	334/1409	4.80	4.43	4.42	4.47	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.74	4.69	4.78	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	459/1399	4.60	4.65	4.26	4.29	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	250/1400	4.80	4.59	4.27	4.34	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	208/1179	4.60	4.59	3.96	4.05	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1262	****	4.47	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1259	****	4.59	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1256	****	4.50	4.30	4.28	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.55	4.00	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 230 0101
 Title MUSICS OF THE WORLD
 Instructor: HUANG, YI-PING
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1064
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	2	5	16	4.11	996/1481	4.11	4.76	4.29	4.40	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	6	16	4.22	854/1481	4.22	4.70	4.23	4.29	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	3	16	4.11	846/1249	4.11	4.70	4.27	4.36	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	3	5	15	4.24	762/1424	4.24	4.62	4.21	4.28	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	7	7	7	3.60	1025/1396	3.60	4.42	3.98	3.94	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	1	3	7	8	3.86	920/1342	3.86	4.29	4.07	4.05	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	3	6	14	4.24	792/1459	4.24	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	871/1480	4.76	4.52	4.68	4.68	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	0	4	9	9	3.96	904/1450	3.96	4.64	4.09	4.15	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	4	17	4.48	787/1409	4.48	4.43	4.42	4.47	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	3	0	2	20	4.56	1061/1407	4.56	4.74	4.69	4.78	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	2	4	16	4.24	846/1399	4.24	4.65	4.26	4.29	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	1	5	14	4.08	991/1400	4.08	4.59	4.27	4.34	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	1	3	18	4.50	259/1179	4.50	4.59	3.96	4.05	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	677/1262	4.09	4.47	4.05	4.11	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	391/1259	4.73	4.59	4.29	4.34	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	394/1256	4.73	4.50	4.30	4.28	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	3	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	117/ 788	4.71	4.55	4.00	3.98	4.71	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 7	Under-grad 27 Non-major 2
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 7	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 301 0101
 Title CHAMBERS PLAYERS
 Instructor: RICHARD, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1065
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	196/1481	4.86	4.76	4.29	4.29	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	149/1481	4.86	4.70	4.23	4.23	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1396	****	4.42	3.98	4.00	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.45	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	912/1480	4.71	4.52	4.68	4.65	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	119/1450	4.86	4.64	4.09	4.10	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1356/1409	3.00	4.43	4.42	4.43	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1325/1399	3.00	4.65	4.26	4.27	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.59	4.27	4.28	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1179	****	4.59	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.34	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 303 0101
 Title MD CAMERATA--CHAMBER C
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1066
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	316/1481	4.73	4.76	4.29	4.29	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	399/1481	4.60	4.70	4.23	4.23	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	810/1249	4.17	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.42	3.98	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	****	4.29	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	7	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	775/1459	4.25	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1029/1480	4.54	4.52	4.68	4.65	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	79/1450	4.92	4.64	4.09	4.10	4.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	682/1409	4.57	4.43	4.42	4.43	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.59	4.27	4.28	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1179	****	4.59	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1262	****	4.47	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1259	****	4.59	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1256	****	4.50	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.55	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 304 0101
 Title UMBC JUBILEE SINGERS
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1067
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	29	4.82	218/1481	4.82	4.76	4.29	4.29	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	103/1481	4.91	4.70	4.23	4.23	4.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	25	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	****/1249	****	4.70	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	21	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	21	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	82/1396	4.91	4.42	3.98	4.00	4.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	27	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1342	****	4.29	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	196/1459	4.75	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	18	15	4.45	1079/1480	4.45	4.52	4.68	4.65	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	119/1450	4.85	4.64	4.09	4.10	4.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	231/1409	4.88	4.43	4.42	4.43	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.59	4.27	4.28	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	5	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	****/1179	****	4.59	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	391/1262	4.45	4.47	4.05	4.14	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	211/1259	4.91	4.59	4.29	4.34	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	549/1256	4.55	4.50	4.30	4.34	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	4	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.55	4.00	4.07	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.25	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.89	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.92	4.65	4.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	29	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	17	Under-grad	34	Non-major	9
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1068
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1481	4.80	4.76	4.29	4.29	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	399/1481	4.60	4.70	4.23	4.23	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1249	****	4.70	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1424	****	4.62	4.21	4.27	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1396	****	4.42	3.98	4.00	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1342	****	4.29	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	276/1459	4.67	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	880/1480	4.75	4.52	4.68	4.65	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	473/1450	4.40	4.64	4.09	4.10	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.43	4.42	4.43	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.65	4.26	4.27	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	791/1400	4.33	4.59	4.27	4.28	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.59	3.96	4.02	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1262	4.80	4.47	4.05	4.14	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	304/1259	4.80	4.59	4.29	4.34	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.55	4.00	4.07	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307D 0101
 Title FLUTE
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1069
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	678/1481	4.40	4.76	4.29	4.29	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.23	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	217/1424	4.75	4.62	4.21	4.27	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1396	****	4.42	3.98	4.00	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.29	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.45	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	997/1480	4.60	4.52	4.68	4.65	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	164/1450	4.75	4.64	4.09	4.10	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1409	****	4.43	4.42	4.43	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1407	****	4.74	4.69	4.67	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1399	****	4.65	4.26	4.27	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1400	****	4.59	4.27	4.28	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1262	****	4.47	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1259	****	4.59	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	****	4.50	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.55	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307F 0101
 Title PERCUSSION
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1070
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.29	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.23	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.45	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.52	4.68	4.65	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	4.10	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307G 0101
 Title COLLEGIUM
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1071
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	340/1481	4.71	4.76	4.29	4.29	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	149/1481	4.86	4.70	4.23	4.23	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.70	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.42	3.98	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.29	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1459	****	4.45	4.16	4.17	****	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	797/1480	4.83	4.52	4.68	4.65	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	4.10	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.43	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.59	4.27	4.28	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	177/1179	4.67	4.59	3.96	4.02	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1262	4.67	4.47	4.05	4.14	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.59	4.29	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	457/1256	4.67	4.50	4.30	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	176/ 788	4.50	4.55	4.00	4.07	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307K 0101
 Title VOCAL ARTS ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID A
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1072
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.23	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.45	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.52	4.68	4.65	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	4.10	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.43	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.59	4.27	4.28	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.59	3.96	4.02	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.55	4.00	4.07	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.89	4.55	4.88	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.67	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.88	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	4.96	4.83	4.67	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.82	4.67	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307L 0101
 Title COLLABORATIVE PIANO
 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1073
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.76	4.29	4.29	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.70	4.23	4.23	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.62	4.21	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1396	4.50	4.42	3.98	4.00	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.29	4.07	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.52	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	4.10	5.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.43	4.42	4.43	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1107/1407	4.50	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.59	4.27	4.28	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	259/1179	4.50	4.59	3.96	4.02	4.50	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.47	4.05	4.14	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.59	4.29	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.50	4.30	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	176/ 788	4.50	4.55	4.00	4.07	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 309 0101
 Title UMBC NEW MUSIC ENSEMBL
 Instructor: SMITH, STUART S
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1074
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.76	4.29	4.29	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.23	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1158/1480	4.33	4.52	4.68	4.65	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	4.10	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 311 0101
 Title FREE COMPOSITION
 Instructor: SMITH, STUART S
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1075
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.70	4.23	4.23	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	297/1396	4.50	4.42	3.98	4.00	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.29	4.07	4.12	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.52	4.68	4.65	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	4.10	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.43	4.42	4.43	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.65	4.26	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.59	4.27	4.28	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.59	3.96	4.02	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	4.55	4.00	4.07	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 313 0101
 Title ADVANCED GAMELAN
 Instructor: BECK, GINA C
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1076
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.70	4.23	4.23	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.70	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1424	****	4.62	4.21	4.27	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	143/1459	4.83	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.52	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	281/1450	4.57	4.64	4.09	4.10	4.57	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1409	****	4.43	4.42	4.43	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1407	****	4.74	4.69	4.67	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1399	****	4.65	4.26	4.27	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1400	****	4.59	4.27	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 317 0101
 Title SESSION ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: KEMP, WILLIAM M
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1077
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.76	4.29	4.29	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	228/1481	4.75	4.70	4.23	4.23	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.45	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.52	4.68	4.65	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	4.10	5.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1409	****	4.43	4.42	4.43	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1407	****	4.74	4.69	4.67	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1399	****	4.65	4.26	4.27	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1400	****	4.59	4.27	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 319 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS IN MUSIC TE
 Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1078
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.76	4.29	4.29	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	374/1481	4.63	4.70	4.23	4.23	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	102/1396	4.83	4.42	3.98	4.00	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.29	4.07	4.12	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	775/1459	4.25	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.52	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	111/1450	4.88	4.64	4.09	4.10	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1098/1409	4.14	4.43	4.42	4.43	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	491/1399	4.57	4.65	4.26	4.27	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1400	4.86	4.59	4.27	4.28	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.59	3.96	4.02	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.55	4.00	4.07	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.00	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	5.00	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	5.00	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.04	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.89	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.92	4.65	4.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 322 0101
 Title: MUSIC HISTORY II
 Instructor: COX, FRANKLIN
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1079
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	749/1481	4.33	4.76	4.29	4.29	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.70	4.23	4.23	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	287/1424	4.67	4.62	4.21	4.27	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	435/1396	4.33	4.42	3.98	4.00	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.29	4.07	4.12	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	276/1459	4.67	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.52	4.68	4.65	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	473/1450	4.40	4.64	4.09	4.10	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.43	4.42	4.43	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.65	4.26	4.27	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.59	4.27	4.28	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.59	3.96	4.02	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.47	4.05	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.59	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	773/1256	4.25	4.50	4.30	4.34	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.55	4.00	4.07	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1080
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	228/1481	4.75	4.70	4.23	4.23	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	193/1396	4.67	4.42	3.98	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	135/1342	4.75	4.29	4.07	4.12	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	695/1459	4.33	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.52	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	4.10	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.43	4.42	4.43	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	267/1399	4.75	4.65	4.26	4.27	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.59	4.27	4.28	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	134/1179	4.75	4.59	3.96	4.02	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.55	4.00	4.07	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 59	5.00	5.00	4.30	4.48	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	11/ 51	4.50	4.25	4.00	4.13	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.33	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.26	3.90	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 385 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE CONDUCTIN
 Instructor: CAMERON, WAYNE
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1081
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.23	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.42	3.98	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.29	4.07	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	276/1459	4.67	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.52	4.68	4.65	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	4.10	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.43	4.42	4.43	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.59	4.27	4.28	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.59	3.96	4.02	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.47	4.05	4.14	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.55	4.00	4.07	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390A 0101
 Title PIANO
 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1082
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.70	4.23	4.23	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.62	4.21	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1292/1396	3.00	4.42	3.98	4.00	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.29	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.52	4.68	4.65	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.43	4.42	4.43	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1296/1407	4.00	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.65	4.26	4.27	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	4.59	4.27	4.28	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	590/1179	4.00	4.59	3.96	4.02	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.47	4.05	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.59	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	901/1256	4.00	4.50	4.30	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.55	4.00	4.07	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1083
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.23	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.42	3.98	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.29	4.07	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.45	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.52	4.68	4.65	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	4.10	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.43	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.59	4.27	4.28	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.59	3.96	4.02	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.89	4.55	4.88	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.88	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1084
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.29	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.27	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.42	3.98	4.00	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.29	4.07	4.12	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.45	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.52	4.68	4.65	4.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.89	4.55	4.88	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.88	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390F 0101
 Title ELECTRIC GUITAR
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1085
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.23	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.42	3.98	4.00	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.52	4.68	4.65	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	4.10	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.43	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.59	4.27	4.28	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.59	3.96	4.02	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.34	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390I 0101
 Title FLUTE
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1086
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.23	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1380/1459	3.00	4.45	4.16	4.17	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.52	4.68	4.65	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.43	4.42	4.43	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.59	4.27	4.28	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.34	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.89	4.55	4.88	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.88	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390X 0101
 Title SENIOR PROJECT
 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1087
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.23	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.42	3.98	4.00	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.52	4.68	4.65	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	4.10	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.43	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.59	4.27	4.28	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.59	3.96	4.02	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.55	4.00	4.07	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.89	4.55	4.88	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.88	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 390X 0101
 Title SENIOR PROJECT
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1088
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.23	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.42	3.98	4.00	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.45	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.52	4.68	4.65	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.55	4.00	4.07	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.89	4.55	4.88	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.88	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 400 0101
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1089
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1000/1481	4.50	4.70	4.23	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	893/1249	4.50	4.70	4.27	4.44	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	959/1424	4.50	4.62	4.21	4.35	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1269/1342	4.00	4.29	4.07	4.21	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.45	4.16	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.52	4.68	4.74	5.00	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.33	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.60	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 400 0101
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS
 Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1090
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1000/1481	4.50	4.70	4.23	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	893/1249	4.50	4.70	4.27	4.44	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	959/1424	4.50	4.62	4.21	4.35	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1269/1342	4.00	4.29	4.07	4.21	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.45	4.16	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.52	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	4.28	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.43	4.42	4.51	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.65	4.26	4.36	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.59	4.27	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.59	3.96	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.33	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.60	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 400 0201
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS
 Instructor: JAKCOSN, JANICE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1091
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	4.50	4.70	4.23	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	4.50	4.70	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	4.50	4.62	4.21	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.42	3.98	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	4.00	4.29	4.07	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.45	4.16	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.52	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	4.28	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.89	4.55	4.86	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.75	5.00	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.71	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	4.96	4.83	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.82	5.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 400 0201
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1092
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	4.50	4.70	4.23	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	4.50	4.70	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	4.50	4.62	4.21	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.42	3.98	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	4.00	4.29	4.07	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.45	4.16	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.52	4.68	4.74	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.89	4.55	4.86	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.75	5.00	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.71	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	4.96	4.83	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.82	5.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 418 0101
 Title: MUSIC TECH. INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1093
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.32	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.45	4.16	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.52	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	4.28	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.43	4.42	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.36	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.59	4.27	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.59	3.96	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.33	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.60	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.89	4.55	4.86	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	4.92	4.65	4.71	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	4.96	4.83	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.82	5.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 428 0101
 Title ELECTRONIC MUSIC
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA I.
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1094
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	196/1481	4.86	4.76	4.29	4.45	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	790/1481	4.29	4.70	4.23	4.32	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	405/1249	4.60	4.70	4.27	4.44	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	364/1424	4.57	4.62	4.21	4.35	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	707/1396	4.00	4.42	3.98	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	257/1342	4.57	4.29	4.07	4.21	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	749/1459	4.29	4.45	4.16	4.25	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1193/1480	4.29	4.52	4.68	4.74	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	692/1450	4.20	4.64	4.09	4.28	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	865/1409	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.51	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	659/1399	4.43	4.65	4.26	4.36	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	521/1400	4.57	4.59	4.27	4.38	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.59	3.96	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	418/1262	4.43	4.47	4.05	4.33	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	257/1259	4.86	4.59	4.29	4.57	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	256/1256	4.86	4.50	4.30	4.60	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	335/ 788	4.17	4.55	4.00	4.26	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 480 0101
 Title TOPICS IN MUSC/ART/SOC
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1095
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	159/1481	4.90	4.76	4.29	4.45	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	183/1481	4.80	4.70	4.23	4.32	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	203/1249	4.80	4.70	4.27	4.44	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.62	4.21	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	193/1396	4.67	4.42	3.98	4.09	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	474/1342	4.33	4.29	4.07	4.21	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	827/1459	4.20	4.45	4.16	4.25	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1086/1480	4.44	4.52	4.68	4.74	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	504/1450	4.38	4.64	4.09	4.28	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.43	4.42	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	129/1399	4.90	4.65	4.26	4.36	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	146/1400	4.90	4.59	4.27	4.38	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.59	3.96	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	264/1262	4.67	4.47	4.05	4.33	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	402/1259	4.71	4.59	4.29	4.57	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	406/1256	4.71	4.50	4.30	4.60	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.55	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 3
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 1	Other	8
			? 2		

Course-Section: MUSC 492 0101
 Title SENIOR PROJECT
 Instructor: SMITH, STUART
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1096
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.70	4.23	4.32	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.45	4.16	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.52	4.68	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	4.28	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.43	4.42	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.59	4.27	4.38	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.33	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.57	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.60	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	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 694 8010
 Title SOLO PERFORMANCE STUDY
 Instructor: TANOSOKI, KAZUK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1097
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.70	4.23	4.11	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1361/1424	3.00	4.62	4.21	4.16	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.45	4.16	4.01	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.52	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.64	4.09	3.96	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 2 Non-major 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 694 8010
 Title SOLO PERFORMANCE STUDY
 Instructor: RICHARD, MICHAEL (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1098
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.70	4.23	4.11	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1361/1424	3.00	4.62	4.21	4.16	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.45	4.16	4.01	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.52	4.68	4.74	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	2	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						