

Course-Section: MUSC 101 0101
 Title: FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR
 Instructor: TANOSAKI, KAZUK
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1097
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	14	32	4.66	429/1576	4.66	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.66	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	21	25	4.51	594/1576	4.51	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.51	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	21	22	4.44	658/1342	4.44	4.75	4.32	4.19	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	5	0	1	1	19	18	4.38	707/1520	4.38	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	21	19	4.41	498/1465	4.41	4.45	4.12	4.02	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	3	0	0	1	19	19	4.46	448/1434	4.46	4.61	4.14	3.94	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	3	14	23	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	7	32	4.82	625/1574	4.82	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	21	26	4.55	355/1554	4.55	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	1142/1488	4.21	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	33	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	683/1493	4.86	4.86	4.73	4.65	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	34	0	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1276/1486	3.69	4.63	4.32	4.26	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	1222/1489	3.83	4.67	4.32	4.22	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	33	6	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	40	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	40	4	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.91	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	3.78	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	47	Non-major	47
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 111 0101
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB II
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1098
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	187/1576	4.85	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	173/1576	4.89	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1520	4.86	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	657/1547	4.60	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1324/1574	4.31	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	146/1554	4.87	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	355/1488	4.92	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	274/1489	4.92	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	3.91	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.47	4.17	3.96	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.09	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.09	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.65	4.05	3.91	4.50	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	3.78	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.98	4.03	3.64	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.84	4.60	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.84	4.67	4.68	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 111 0201
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB II
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1099
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	9	4.82	235/1576	4.85	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	152/1576	4.89	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	149/1520	4.86	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	3.94	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	217/1547	4.60	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1236/1574	4.31	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	116/1554	4.87	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1488	4.92	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	4.92	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	4.00	4.47	4.17	3.96	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	4.50	4.65	4.05	3.91	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	5.00	4.98	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.86	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 112 0601
 Title: MUSIC REPERTOIRE
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1100
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3								4	5
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	952/1576	4.25	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	939/1576	4.25	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	770/1342	4.33	4.75	4.32	4.19	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	859/1520	4.25	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.45	4.12	4.02	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.61	4.14	3.94	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1488	****	4.65	4.47	4.41	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1493	****	4.86	4.73	4.65	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1486	****	4.63	4.32	4.26	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1489	****	4.67	4.32	4.22	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	3.96	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.91	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	3.86	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 126 0101
 Title THEORY II:FORM&ANALYSI
 Instructor: GENDELMAN, MART
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1101
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	1035/1576	3.89	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	12	2	3.94	1197/1576	3.67	4.69	4.27	4.18	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	11	6	4.35	753/1342	4.28	4.75	4.32	4.19	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	768/1520	4.17	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	933/1465	3.57	4.45	4.12	4.02	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	852/1434	4.53	4.61	4.14	3.94	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	5	8	2	3.53	1338/1547	3.26	4.43	4.19	4.10	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1033/1574	4.78	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	5	7	1	3.57	1277/1554	3.59	4.52	4.10	4.01	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	1203/1488	3.75	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1337/1493	4.65	4.86	4.73	4.65	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1273/1486	3.45	4.63	4.32	4.26	3.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	997/1489	4.20	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	974/1277	3.68	4.60	4.03	3.91	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	802/1279	4.17	4.47	4.17	3.96	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	784/1270	4.67	4.69	4.35	4.09	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	928/1269	4.25	4.71	4.35	4.09	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.91	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 126 0201
 Title THEORY II:FORM&ANALYSI
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA I.
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1102
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1410/1576	3.89	4.62	4.30	4.11	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1438/1576	3.67	4.69	4.27	4.18	3.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	879/1342	4.28	4.75	4.32	4.19	4.20		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1041/1520	4.17	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	1347/1465	3.57	4.45	4.12	4.02	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.53	4.61	4.14	3.94	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	1459/1547	3.26	4.43	4.19	4.10	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1574	4.78	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1267/1554	3.59	4.52	4.10	4.01	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1406/1488	3.75	4.65	4.47	4.41	3.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	4.65	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	1392/1486	3.45	4.63	4.32	4.26	3.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	997/1489	4.20	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	889/1277	3.68	4.60	4.03	3.91	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	603/1279	4.17	4.47	4.17	3.96	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	4.67	4.69	4.35	4.09	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1269	4.25	4.71	4.35	4.09	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.91	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 171 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE VOICE CLA
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1103
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	500/1576	4.60	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	891/1576	4.30	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	2	0	1	3	4	3.70	1155/1342	3.70	4.75	4.32	4.19	3.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	453/1520	4.56	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	3	1	1	3	0	2	3.14	1360/1465	3.14	4.45	4.12	4.02	3.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	4	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1045/1434	3.83	4.61	4.14	3.94	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	1145/1547	3.90	4.43	4.19	4.10	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	712/1554	4.25	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	3.96	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.91	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 172C 0101
 Title DICTION
 Instructor: KING, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1104
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	1	4.25	952/1576	4.25	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	939/1576	4.25	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.45	4.12	4.02	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.61	4.14	3.94	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1347/1547	3.50	4.43	4.19	4.10	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1488	****	4.65	4.47	4.41	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1493	****	4.86	4.73	4.65	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1486	****	4.63	4.32	4.26	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1489	****	4.67	4.32	4.22	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	3.64	****	

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 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 5 Non-major 1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	4
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 175 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE VOCAL MET
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1105
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	939/1576	4.25	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1204/1434	3.50	4.61	4.14	3.94	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	755/1547	4.33	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	194/1554	4.75	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.60	4.03	3.91	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.47	4.17	3.96	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.69	4.35	4.09	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.09	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.65	4.05	3.91	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	3.78	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 178B 0101
 Title BEGINNING KEYBOARD SKI
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1106
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	8	4.20	1019/1576	4.35	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	222/1576	4.84	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1342	4.88	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	4.80	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1102/1465	3.75	4.45	4.12	4.02	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	339/1547	4.25	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1128/1574	4.61	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	871/1554	4.13	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	750/1488	4.60	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	1376/1493	4.20	4.86	4.73	4.65	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	821/1486	4.40	4.63	4.32	4.26	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	813/1489	4.40	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.09	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	4.80	4.84	4.60	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	4.60	4.84	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	4.50	4.83	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 382	4.71	4.96	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 178B 0201
 Title BEGINNING KEYBOARD SKI
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1107
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	637/1576	4.35	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	173/1576	4.84	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1342	4.88	4.75	4.32	4.19	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	395/1520	4.80	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	3.94	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1196/1547	4.25	4.43	4.19	4.10	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	758/1574	4.61	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	805/1554	4.13	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.17
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	3.91	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	26/ 40	4.80	4.84	4.60	4.44	4.80
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	19/ 24	4.80	4.90	4.83	4.71	4.80
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	28/ 35	4.60	4.84	4.67	4.68	4.60
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	21/ 28	4.50	4.83	4.78	4.65	4.50
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	1	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	180/ 382	4.71	4.96	4.08	3.86	4.43

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 10
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	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 179B 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE KEYBOARD
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1108
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	500/1576	4.61	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	222/1576	4.87	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	186/1547	4.72	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	665/1574	4.78	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	772/1554	3.97	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.20	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	177/ 382	4.80	4.96	4.08	3.86	4.60	

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 3		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
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 179B 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE KEYBOARD
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1109
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	1	14	4.61	485/1576	4.61	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	91/1576	4.87	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	10	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	5	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	10	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	13	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	3.94	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	1	1	1	14	4.65	363/1547	4.72	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	739/1574	4.78	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	9	1	3.73	1180/1554	3.97	4.52	4.10	4.01	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	589/1488	4.71	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	986/1493	4.71	4.86	4.73	4.65	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	596/1486	4.57	4.63	4.32	4.26	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	789/1489	4.43	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	4.84	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.90	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	4.84	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.83	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 382	4.80	4.96	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Course-Section: MUSC 179B 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE KEYBOARD
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1109
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0101
 Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1110
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	3	16	4.48	682/1576	4.48	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	350/1576	4.70	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	3	19	4.74	321/1342	4.74	4.75	4.32	4.19	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	0	1	3	17	4.59	406/1520	4.59	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	7	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.45	4.12	4.02	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	11	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	840/1434	4.09	4.61	4.14	3.94	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	3	6	12	4.32	774/1547	4.32	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	9	9	4.29	682/1554	4.29	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	750/1488	4.60	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.86	4.73	4.65	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	422/1486	4.70	4.63	4.32	4.26	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	513/1489	4.65	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	569/1277	4.21	4.60	4.03	3.91	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.91	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	3.78	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	30/ 40	4.44	4.84	4.60	4.44	4.44	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 24	****	4.90	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	31/ 35	4.14	4.84	4.67	4.68	4.14	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	4.83	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 0	General 12 Under-grad 25 Non-major 25
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	7	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 6
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	
				? 1	Other 0

Course-Section: MUSC 181 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE PIANO CLA
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1111
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	3	11	4.56	554/1576	4.56	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	215/1576	4.81	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	345/1342	4.71	4.75	4.32	4.19	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	631/1520	4.44	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1465	****	4.45	4.12	4.02	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	2	7	3.94	1113/1547	3.94	4.43	4.19	4.10	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	558/1554	4.38	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	442/1488	4.79	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	445/1493	4.93	4.86	4.73	4.65	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	499/1486	4.64	4.63	4.32	4.26	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	489/1277	4.30	4.60	4.03	3.91	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B 2	Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	Under-grad 17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Non-major 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	
				? 1	Other 4

Course-Section: MUSC 183 0101
 Title INTERM STRING CLASS
 Instructor: LADD, GITA
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1112
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1494/1576	3.33	4.62	4.30	4.11	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1523/1576	3.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1342	****	4.75	4.32	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1520/1520	1.50	4.68	4.25	4.09	1.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1242/1465	3.50	4.45	4.12	4.02	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	3.94	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1347/1547	3.50	4.43	4.19	4.10	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1227/1554	3.67	4.52	4.10	4.01	3.67

Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	3.86	****

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	3

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 189 0101
 Title GUITAR CLASS
 Instructor: FORSHEE, ZANE
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1113
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	457/1576	4.64	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	313/1576	4.73	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	179/1342	4.91	4.75	4.32	4.19	4.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	3	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	5	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.45	4.12	4.02	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	816/1547	4.27	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1003/1574	4.60	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	355/1554	4.56	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.63	4.32	4.26	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1114
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	279/1576	4.88	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	3.94	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1276/1547	4.17	4.43	4.19	4.10	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1079/1574	4.75	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1554	4.67	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.63	4.32	4.26	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1313/1489	3.50	4.67	4.32	4.22	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	3.91	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1064/1279	3.50	4.47	4.17	3.96	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.09	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.09	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.65	4.05	3.91	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	3.78	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190A 0201
 Title PIANO
 Instructor: HAWLEY, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1115
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	4.88	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.75	4.32	4.19	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1547	4.17	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	4.75	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	623/1554	4.67	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1488	4.50	4.65	4.47	4.41	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1486	4.50	4.63	4.32	4.26	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1489	3.50	4.67	4.32	4.22	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	3.50	4.47	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	5.00	4.65	4.05	3.91	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	32/ 40	4.33	4.84	4.60	4.44	4.33	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.90	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.84	4.67	4.68	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.86	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	1	1.00-1.99	B 0	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	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 190B 0201
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1116
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190B 0301
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: KING, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1117
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.60	4.03	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.47	4.17	3.96	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.69	4.35	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.71	4.35	4.09	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.84	4.60	4.44	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.84	4.67	4.68	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	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190C 0101
 Title VIOLIN
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1118
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.83	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	4.50	4.43	4.19	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	4.67	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00

Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.86	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190C 0201
 Title VIOLIN
 Instructor: TREMBLAY, CHRIS
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1119
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	415/1576	4.83	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1041/1547	4.50	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1262/1574	4.67	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.63	4.32	4.26	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	3.96	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.09	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.09	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	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 3 Non-major 3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 190D 0101
 Title VIOLA
 Instructor: LAMBROS, MARIA
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1120
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	1	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	3.94	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1557/1574	3.50	4.60	4.64	4.59	3.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190E 0101
 Title CELLO
 Instructor: LADD, GITA
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1121
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	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	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2 Under-grad 4 Non-major 4
84-150	1	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

Course-Section: MUSC 190I 0201
 Title FLUTE
 Instructor: KESNER, LORI
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1122
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1459/1547	3.00	4.43	4.19	4.10	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.86	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	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1123
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190Q 0201
 Title SAXOPHONE
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1124
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	3.91	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 190R 0101
 Title TUBA
 Instructor: SIEHNDEL, TRAVI
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1125
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	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 190S 0201
 Title PERCUSSION
 Instructor: DOVE, BARRY
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1126
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	3.91	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	3.96	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.09	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.09	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.65	4.05	3.91	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	3.78	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 191 0201
 Title RECITAL PREPARATION
 Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1127
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1299/1576	3.92	4.62	4.30	4.11	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	851/1576	4.42	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	4.75	4.75	4.32	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1520	4.67	4.68	4.25	4.09	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1465	4.67	4.45	4.12	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1434	4.67	4.61	4.14	3.94	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	339/1547	4.60	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1574	4.92	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	194/1554	4.81	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1488	****	4.65	4.47	4.41	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1493	****	4.86	4.73	4.65	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1486	****	4.63	4.32	4.26	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1489	****	4.67	4.32	4.22	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	603/1279	4.33	4.47	4.17	3.96	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.09	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	4.65	4.05	3.91	4.67

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 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 10 Non-major 6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 191 0301
 Title RECITAL PREPARATION
 Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1128
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	7	0	2	0	1	2	7	4.00	1148/1576	3.92	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	608/1576	4.42	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	4	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	298/1342	4.75	4.75	4.32	4.19	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	6	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	7	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.45	4.12	4.02	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	7	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.61	4.14	3.94	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	492/1547	4.60	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	586/1574	4.92	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	129/1554	4.81	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.88	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1488	****	4.65	4.47	4.41	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1493	****	4.86	4.73	4.65	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1486	****	4.63	4.32	4.26	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1489	****	4.67	4.32	4.22	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	3.91	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 0 Major 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 19 Non-major 8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	8

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 193A 0101
 Title PIANO
 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1129
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	3.94	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	4.60	4.03	3.91	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	3.96	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.09	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.09	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.65	4.05	3.91	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 193B 0201
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1130
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	4.63	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	4.83	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	4.75	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	4.75	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1277	4.50	4.60	4.03	3.91	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	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	1
84-150	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193B 0301
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: KING, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1131
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1386/1465	3.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1324/1574	4.63	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	4.83	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	870/1488	4.75	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	678/1486	4.75	4.63	4.32	4.26	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	4.50	4.60	4.03	3.91	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	3.96	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.86	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 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 4 Non-major 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	3

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 193C 0201
 Title VIOLIN
 Instructor: TREMBLAY, CHRIS
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1132
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00

Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.84	4.60	4.44	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193E 0101
 Title CELLO
 Instructor: LADD, GITA
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1133
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	

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 193F 0101
 Title GUITAR
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1134
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	3.94	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	3.91	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	3.78	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.98	4.03	3.64	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193G 0101
 Title CLASSICAL GUITAR
 Instructor: FORSHEE, ZANE
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1135
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.75	4.32	4.19	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1465	****	4.45	4.12	4.02	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	3.94	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1547	****	4.43	4.19	4.10	****	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193I 0101
 Title FLUTE
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1136
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	3.91	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.84	4.60	4.44	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.84	4.67	4.68	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0	Graduate	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
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 193K 0101
 Title CLARINET
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1137
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	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 193S 0101
 Title PERCUSSION
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1138
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	861/1576	4.67	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	3.94	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	4.50	4.43	4.19	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1262/1574	4.17	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.50	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1118/1489	4.50	4.67	4.32	4.22	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	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193S 0201
 Title PERCUSSION
 Instructor: DOVE, BARRY
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1139
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1/1576	4.67	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1041/1547	4.50	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1459/1574	4.17	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	4.50	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.50	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	3.91	5.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.98	4.03	3.64	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193W 0201
 Title UPRIGHT BASS
 Instructor: RUAS, LAURA
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1140
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.84	4.60	4.44	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.84	4.67	4.68	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.83	4.78	4.65	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.86	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	0
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	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 193Y 0101
 Title SAX IMPROV
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1141
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	3.94	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1142
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	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	Other	0
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 194E 0101
 Title CELLO
 Instructor: LADD, GITA
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1143
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	0	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1411/1493	4.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	3.96	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.09	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 194G 0101
 Title CLASSICAL GUITAR
 Instructor: FORSHEE, ZANE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1144
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 211 0101
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB IV
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1145
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	5	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.62	4.30	4.35	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	378/1576	4.68	4.69	4.27	4.32	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	275/1342	4.78	4.75	4.32	4.41	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.68	4.25	4.26	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	16	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	498/1465	4.42	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	9	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	498/1434	4.42	4.61	4.14	4.06	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	0	7	5	15	4.30	794/1547	4.30	4.43	4.19	4.22	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	1	12	14	4.48	1103/1574	4.48	4.60	4.64	4.62	4.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	379/1554	4.53	4.52	4.10	4.05	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	774/1488	4.58	4.65	4.47	4.44	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.86	4.73	4.75	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.63	4.32	4.29	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	602/1489	4.58	4.67	4.32	4.31	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	4	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.29	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.84	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.90	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.84	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.83	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	4.39	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 211 0101
 Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB IV
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1145
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 214 0101
 Title HIST JAZZ: ORIGINS-PRE
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 72

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1146
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	21	0	0	3	13	11	24	4.10	1094/1576	4.10	4.62	4.30	4.35	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	21	0	2	3	15	15	16	3.78	1299/1576	3.78	4.69	4.27	4.32	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	21	0	2	2	10	15	22	4.04	961/1342	4.04	4.75	4.32	4.41	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	21	35	1	4	3	5	3	3.31	****/1520	****	4.68	4.25	4.26	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	22	1	2	5	9	15	18	3.86	1028/1465	3.86	4.45	4.12	4.09	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	21	41	1	4	2	2	1	2.80	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.06	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	21	0	1	5	8	12	25	4.08	992/1547	4.08	4.43	4.19	4.22	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	22	0	0	0	1	40	9	4.16	1386/1574	4.16	4.60	4.64	4.62	4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	26	3	0	5	9	21	8	3.74	1173/1554	3.74	4.52	4.10	4.05	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	2	2	7	14	23	4.13	1192/1488	4.13	4.65	4.47	4.44	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	1	1	1	3	42	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.86	4.73	4.75	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	2	2	6	16	21	4.11	1069/1486	4.11	4.63	4.32	4.29	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	1	1	1	8	10	27	4.30	927/1489	4.30	4.67	4.32	4.31	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	9	2	3	5	5	25	4.20	585/1277	4.20	4.60	4.03	4.01	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	44	0	8	4	6	4	6	2.86	1220/1279	2.86	4.47	4.17	4.14	2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	2	3	8	5	11	3.69	1083/1270	3.69	4.69	4.35	4.30	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	2	1	4	4	18	4.21	846/1269	4.21	4.71	4.35	4.29	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	43	23	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.92	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	67	3	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	69	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	69	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.65	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	69	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	70	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	69	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.78	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	70	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	70	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	70	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	0	1	1	0	0	16	4.61	151/ 375	4.61	4.76	4.01	4.21	4.61
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	70	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	70	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	70	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	70	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	0	2	0	0	0	25	4.70	141/ 326	4.70	4.98	4.03	4.43	4.70
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	70	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	4.84	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	70	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	4.90	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	70	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.84	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	70	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	4.83	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	1	1	0	0	0	24	4.84	172/ 382	4.84	4.96	4.08	4.39	4.84

Course-Section: MUSC 214 0101
 Title HIST JAZZ: ORIGINS-PRE
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 72

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1146
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 20	Required for Majors	25	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 2	B 19				
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 6	General	11	Under-grad 72	Non-major 70
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 9	D 3				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0				
			I 0	Other	7		
			? 0				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	68	0	0	0	5	10	54	4.71	347/1576	4.71	4.62	4.30	4.35	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	68	0	0	2	6	15	46	4.52	581/1576	4.52	4.69	4.27	4.32	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	68	0	1	1	5	15	47	4.54	552/1342	4.54	4.75	4.32	4.41	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	68	48	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	****/1520	****	4.68	4.25	4.26	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	68	46	2	4	6	5	6	3.39	****/1465	****	4.45	4.12	4.09	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	68	61	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.06	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	70	1	0	0	7	12	47	4.61	411/1547	4.61	4.43	4.19	4.22	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	69	0	0	2	28	34	4	3.59	1551/1574	3.59	4.60	4.64	4.62	3.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	75	1	0	0	11	34	16	4.08	881/1554	4.08	4.52	4.10	4.05	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	72	0	0	0	1	12	52	4.78	442/1488	4.78	4.65	4.47	4.44	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	72	0	0	0	0	4	61	4.94	390/1493	4.94	4.86	4.73	4.75	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	71	0	0	0	1	18	47	4.70	422/1486	4.70	4.63	4.32	4.29	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	0	11	55	4.83	274/1489	4.83	4.67	4.32	4.31	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	70	2	0	0	4	10	51	4.72	176/1277	4.72	4.60	4.03	4.01	4.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	112	0	12	1	1	1	10	2.84	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	114	0	13	2	4	0	4	2.13	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	113	0	9	0	6	0	9	3.00	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.29	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	111	23	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	134	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	135	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	127	1	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	136	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	136	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	136	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	121	1	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	136	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.84	4.60	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	106	1	0	0	1	0	29	4.93	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99 1	A 25	Required for Majors	27
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 19		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 8	C 13	General	20
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	7
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 219 0101
 Title INTRO DIGITAL AUDIO WK
 Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1148
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	471/1576	4.63	4.62	4.30	4.35	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	910/1576	4.29	4.69	4.27	4.32	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	209/1342	4.86	4.75	4.32	4.41	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	2	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	921/1520	4.20	4.68	4.25	4.26	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1218/1465	3.57	4.45	4.12	4.09	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.06	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	939/1547	4.14	4.43	4.19	4.22	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	567/1574	4.86	4.60	4.64	4.62	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.52	4.10	4.05	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.63	4.32	4.29	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	4.01	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.29	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 226 0101
 Title THEORY IV:MUSIC WRITIN
 Instructor: MACAULAY, JANIC
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1149
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	527/1576	4.58	4.62	4.30	4.35	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	476/1576	4.61	4.69	4.27	4.32	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	19	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.75	4.32	4.41	4.67		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	562/1520	4.47	4.68	4.25	4.26	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	668/1465	4.24	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	345/1434	4.57	4.61	4.14	4.06	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	7	12	4.30	784/1547	4.30	4.43	4.19	4.22	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	795/1574	4.74	4.60	4.64	4.62	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	772/1554	4.20	4.52	4.10	4.05	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	442/1488	4.79	4.65	4.47	4.44	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	445/1493	4.93	4.86	4.73	4.75	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.63	4.32	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	434/1489	4.71	4.67	4.32	4.31	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	215/1277	4.67	4.60	4.03	4.01	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1129/1279	3.33	4.47	4.17	4.14	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1024/1270	3.83	4.69	4.35	4.30	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.71	4.35	4.29	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.92	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	5
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	3						

Course-Section: MUSC 230 0101
 Title MUSICS OF THE WORLD
 Instructor: BECK, GINA C
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1150
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	16	0	1	2	5	4	11	3.96	1194/1576	3.96	4.62	4.30	4.35	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	16	0	0	3	6	4	10	3.91	1227/1576	3.91	4.69	4.27	4.32	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	16	0	2	2	6	4	9	3.70	1157/1342	3.70	4.75	4.32	4.41	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	17	20	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1520	****	4.68	4.25	4.26	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	16	10	2	0	3	4	4	3.62	1201/1465	3.62	4.45	4.12	4.09	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	16	21	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.06	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	16	0	0	0	6	4	13	4.30	784/1547	4.30	4.43	4.19	4.22	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	16	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	625/1574	4.83	4.60	4.64	4.62	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	2	1	7	10	2	3.41	1350/1554	3.41	4.52	4.10	4.05	3.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	1	1	2	5	12	4.24	1126/1488	4.24	4.65	4.47	4.44	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	1	1	2	18	4.68	1029/1493	4.68	4.86	4.73	4.75	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	4	1	4	3	9	3.57	1313/1486	3.57	4.63	4.32	4.29	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	3	3	13	4.24	969/1489	4.24	4.67	4.32	4.31	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	176/1277	4.73	4.60	4.03	4.01	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.29	****
4. Were special techniques successful	34	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.92	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	4.21	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.98	4.03	4.43	5.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	39	Non-major	31
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 301 0101
 Title CHAMBERS PLAYERS
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1151
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	4	4.80	243/1576	4.87	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	222/1576	4.87	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1520	****	4.68	4.25	4.25	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1386/1465	3.00	4.45	4.12	4.09	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1547	4.67	4.43	4.19	4.21	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1003/1574	4.57	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	4.72	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.58

Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	4.23	****

Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 301 0101
 Title CHAMBERS PLAYERS
 Instructor: TREMBLAY, CHRIS (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1152
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	4	4.80	243/1576	4.87	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	222/1576	4.87	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1520	****	4.68	4.25	4.25	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1386/1465	3.00	4.45	4.12	4.09	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1547	4.67	4.43	4.19	4.21	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1003/1574	4.57	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1554	4.72	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.58
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	4.23	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 301 0101
 Title CHAMBERS PLAYERS
 Instructor: SPECE, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1153
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1/1576	4.87	4.62	4.30	4.30	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	4.87	4.69	4.27	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.57	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	4.72	4.52	4.10	4.09	5.00	
Lecture															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.70	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	4.11	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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 303 0101
 Title MD CAMERATA--CHAMBER C
 Instructor: WANENCHAK, L
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1154
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	5	0	1	2	6	7	10	3.88	1257/1576	3.88	4.62	4.30	4.30	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	1	2	9	13	4.23	958/1576	4.23	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	19	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1342	****	4.75	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	5	0	2	1	8	9	4.20	921/1520	4.20	4.68	4.25	4.25	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	23	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1465	****	4.45	4.12	4.09	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	21	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1	0	5	6	4	10	3.76	1235/1547	3.76	4.43	4.19	4.21	3.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	586/1574	4.84	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	8	11	2	3.59	1270/1554	3.59	4.52	4.10	4.09	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	1171/1488	4.17	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	557/1493	4.91	4.86	4.73	4.70	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	1010/1486	4.18	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.67	4.32	4.34	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	4	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	28	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	4.09	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	31	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 304 0101
 Title UMBC JUBILEE SINGERS
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1155
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	25	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	243/1576	4.80	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	25	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	152/1576	4.90	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	25	4	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1342	****	4.75	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	26	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1520	****	4.68	4.25	4.25	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	26	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1465	****	4.45	4.12	4.09	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	26	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	26	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	26	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	160/1554	4.80	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1488	****	4.65	4.47	4.47	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1493	****	4.86	4.73	4.70	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1486	****	4.63	4.32	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1489	****	4.67	4.32	4.34	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.41	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	4.12	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	4.23	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 35
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 305 0101
 Title UMBC COMMUNITY SYMPHON
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA
 Enrollment: 53
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1156
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	8	0	0	0	0	5	35	4.88	187/1576	4.88	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	0	1	39	4.97	46/1576	4.98	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.97	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	27	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	26	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	110/1520	4.93	4.68	4.25	4.25	4.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	31	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	****/1465	****	4.45	4.12	4.09	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	30	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	11	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	49/1547	4.97	4.43	4.19	4.21	4.97	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	10	30	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	40	4.95	58/1554	4.95	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	35	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	34	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	35	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	155/1489	4.92	4.67	4.32	4.34	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	36	6	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	45	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	45	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	44	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	4.09	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.98	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	34	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	48	Non-major	25
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	22	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MUSC 307B 0101
 Title JAZZ BIG BAND
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1157
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	527/1576	4.58	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	201/1576	4.83	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.75	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.25	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	339/1547	4.67	4.43	4.19	4.21	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	712/1554	4.25	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1488	****	4.65	4.47	4.47	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1493	****	4.86	4.73	4.70	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1486	****	4.63	4.32	4.32	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1489	****	4.67	4.32	4.34	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	4.11	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	4 Under-grad 12 Non-major 5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 307C 0101
 Title JAZZ WORKSHOP
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1158
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.30	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.25	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.21	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.09	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	4.20	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.98	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	4.24	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	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
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 307F 0101
 Title PERCUSSION
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1159
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	4	4.57	541/1576	4.57	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	515/1576	4.57	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1342	****	4.75	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.68	4.25	4.25	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1465	****	4.45	4.12	4.09	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	238/1547	4.75	4.43	4.19	4.21	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1025/1574	4.57	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	160/1554	4.80	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.86	4.73	4.70	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.67	4.32	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	603/1279	4.33	4.47	4.17	4.20	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.71	4.35	4.41	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	709/ 878	3.50	4.65	4.05	4.09	3.50	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.98	4.03	4.23	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307G 0101
 Title COLLEGIUM
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1160
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.30	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.25	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.21	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.09	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1210/1493	4.50	4.86	4.73	4.70	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.67	4.32	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.60	4.03	4.11	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.65	4.05	4.09	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307H 0101
 Title SAXOPHONE
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1161
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1445/1576	3.50	4.62	4.30	4.30	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	4.11	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	4.12	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 307K 0101
 Title VOCAL ARTS ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: KING, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1162
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1241/1576	3.90	4.62	4.30	4.30	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1342	****	4.75	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.68	4.25	4.25	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1465	****	4.45	4.12	4.09	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1239/1547	3.75	4.43	4.19	4.21	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1081/1554	3.88	4.52	4.10	4.09	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1488	****	4.65	4.47	4.47	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1493	****	4.86	4.73	4.70	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1486	****	4.63	4.32	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1489	****	4.67	4.32	4.34	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	4.11	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	4.12	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.98	4.03	4.23	5.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 307L 0101
 Title COLLABORATIVE PIANO
 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1163
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	1042/1576	4.17	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	0	4	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	1212/1520	3.83	4.68	4.25	4.25	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1242/1465	3.50	4.45	4.12	4.09	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	682/1434	4.25	4.61	4.14	4.15	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1239/1547	3.75	4.43	4.19	4.21	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1303/1554	3.50	4.52	4.10	4.09	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1210/1493	4.50	4.86	4.73	4.70	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1253/1486	3.75	4.63	4.32	4.32	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1313/1489	3.50	4.67	4.32	4.34	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.60	4.03	4.11	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1146/1279	3.25	4.47	4.17	4.20	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.69	4.35	4.42	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1036/1269	3.75	4.71	4.35	4.41	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	671/ 878	3.67	4.65	4.05	4.09	3.67	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.84	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.90	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.84	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.83	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 308 0101
 Title UMBC WIND ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: VILLANUEVA, JAR
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1164
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	23	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	****/1576	****	4.62	4.30	4.30	****
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	23	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1576	****	4.69	4.27	4.28	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	23	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/1574	****	4.60	4.64	4.61	****
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1554	****	4.52	4.10	4.09	****
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1488	****	4.65	4.47	4.47	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1493	****	4.86	4.73	4.70	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1486	****	4.63	4.32	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1489	****	4.67	4.32	4.34	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	4.09	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	4.12	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	4.23	****

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	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 309 0101
 Title UMBC NEW MUSIC ENSEMBL
 Instructor: SMITH, STUART S
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1165
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	0	8	4.45	712/1576	4.45	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	920/1576	4.27	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1520	4.83	4.68	4.25	4.25	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	238/1547	4.75	4.43	4.19	4.21	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	682/1554	4.29	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1488	****	4.65	4.47	4.47	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1493	****	4.86	4.73	4.70	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1486	****	4.63	4.32	4.32	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1489	****	4.67	4.32	4.34	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	4.09	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	4.24	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	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 2		

Course-Section: MUSC 319 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS IN MUSIC TE
 Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1166
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	5	4.63	471/1576	4.63	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	298/1342	4.75	4.75	4.32	4.30	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.68	4.25	4.25	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	231/1465	4.71	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	226/1434	4.71	4.61	4.14	4.15	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	238/1547	4.75	4.43	4.19	4.21	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	160/1554	4.80	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.86	4.73	4.70	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.67	4.32	4.34	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	159/1277	4.75	4.60	4.03	4.11	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	4.09	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	4.24	****	

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 1		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	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
					6
					3
					0
					6

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 322 0101
 Title: MUSIC HISTORY II
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1167
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	3	20	4.72	347/1576	4.72	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	197/1342	4.88	4.75	4.32	4.30	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	418/1520	4.58	4.68	4.25	4.25	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	1	4	17	4.57	328/1465	4.57	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	296/1434	4.64	4.61	4.14	4.15	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	3	18	4.58	434/1547	4.58	4.43	4.19	4.21	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	17	6	4.26	1317/1574	4.26	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	1	9	7	4.22	742/1554	4.22	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	834/1488	4.54	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	888/1493	4.77	4.86	4.73	4.70	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	735/1486	4.46	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	742/1489	4.46	4.67	4.32	4.34	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	608/1277	4.17	4.60	4.03	4.11	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	4.09	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	4
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 323 0101
 Title CAREER DEV FOR MUSICI
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1168
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	787/1576	4.40	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	568/1576	4.53	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	735/1342	4.38	4.75	4.32	4.30	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.68	4.25	4.25	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	347/1465	4.53	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	226/1434	4.71	4.61	4.14	4.15	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	445/1547	4.57	4.43	4.19	4.21	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	702/1574	4.79	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	822/1488	4.55	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	966/1493	4.73	4.86	4.73	4.70	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	749/1486	4.45	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	649/1489	4.55	4.67	4.32	4.34	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	132/1277	4.80	4.60	4.03	4.11	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.47	4.17	4.20	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	784/1270	4.33	4.69	4.35	4.42	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	353/1269	4.83	4.71	4.35	4.41	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.65	4.05	4.09	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 16 Non-major 6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 2		

Course-Section: MUSC 385 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE CONDUCTIN
 Instructor: MCCOY, MARK
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1169
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	5	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	256/1576	4.78	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.75	4.32	4.30	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	453/1520	4.56	4.68	4.25	4.25	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	2	0	1	5	4.13	778/1465	4.13	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	345/1434	4.57	4.61	4.14	4.15	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.43	4.19	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	805/1554	4.17	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	561/1486	4.60	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	579/1489	4.60	4.67	4.32	4.34	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	4.09	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.98	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	4.24	****	

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	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 390B 0201
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1170
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.33	4.62	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.33	4.69	4.27	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	4.50	4.60	4.64	4.61	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 390B 0301
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: KING, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1171
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1148/1576	4.33	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1576	4.33	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.68	4.25	4.25	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.61	4.14	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.43	4.19	4.21	4.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1411/1493	4.00	4.86	4.73	4.70	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.67	4.32	4.34	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	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
84-150	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 390B 0401
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: MARKOVICPRAKASH
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1172
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1148/1576	4.33	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1576	4.33	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.43	4.19	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.50	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390D 0101
 Title VIOLA
 Instructor: LAMBROS, MARIA
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1173
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	4.11	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	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
84-150	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 390S 0101
 Title PERCUSSION
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1174
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.09	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390X 0101
 Title SENIOR PROJECT
 Instructor: LAGANA, TOM
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1175
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	0	4.00	1148/1576	4.67	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.67	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390X 0101
 Title SENIOR PROJECT
 Instructor: RICHARDS, E.M.
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1176
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1/1576	4.67	4.62	4.30	4.30	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.25	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.09	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.21	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	4.67	4.60	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.09	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	4.11	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.98	4.03	4.23	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	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 390X 0101
 Title SENIOR PROJECT
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1177
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.67	4.62	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.28	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	4.67	4.60	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	4.11	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.41	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390X 0101
 Title SENIOR PROJECT
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1178
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 400 0101
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, TOM
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1179
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1547	4.50	4.43	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	4.67	4.60	4.64	4.69	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.55	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.38	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.65	4.05	4.33	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	4.76	4.01	3.90	3.00

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 2	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 4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	2	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 400 0601
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS
 Instructor: WANENCHAK, L
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1180
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	4.50	4.45	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.50	4.61	4.14	4.30	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	4.67	4.60	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.24	5.00	

Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.88	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 400 0801
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA I.
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1181
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.38	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1465	4.50	4.45	4.12	4.22	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	878/1434	4.50	4.61	4.14	4.30	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1547	4.50	4.43	4.19	4.24	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.67	4.60	4.64	4.69	4.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.38	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 401 0101
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS: COMP
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA I.
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1182
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.35	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.22	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.52	4.10	4.24	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.55	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.84	4.60	5.00	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.84	4.67	5.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 2 Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	2

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 417 0101
 Title SPEC TPCS IN MUSC TECH
 Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1183
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	6	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.38	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	4.33	****	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	Non-major
			P 0		3
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	
					1

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 418 0101
 Title MUSIC TECH. INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1184
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.38	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.22	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	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 480 0101
 Title TOPICS IN MUSC/ART/SOC
 Instructor: BECK, GINA C
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1185
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	1325/1576	3.80	4.62	4.30	4.46	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1076/1576	4.10	4.69	4.27	4.35	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	240/1342	4.80	4.75	4.32	4.46	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	683/1520	4.40	4.68	4.25	4.38	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	5	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	708/1465	4.20	4.45	4.12	4.22	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1063/1434	3.80	4.61	4.14	4.30	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1159/1547	3.89	4.43	4.19	4.24	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	665/1574	4.80	4.60	4.64	4.69	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1367/1554	3.33	4.52	4.10	4.24	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	1048/1488	4.33	4.65	4.47	4.55	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	1167/1493	4.56	4.86	4.73	4.80	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1286/1486	3.67	4.63	4.32	4.41	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	1057/1489	4.11	4.67	4.32	4.38	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	506/1277	4.29	4.60	4.03	4.04	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1064/1279	3.50	4.47	4.17	4.31	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1135/1270	3.50	4.69	4.35	4.53	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1036/1269	3.75	4.71	4.35	4.55	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.52	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	152/ 375	4.50	4.76	4.01	3.90	4.50
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.98	4.03	3.97	5.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	3.88	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 15 Non-major 9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 492 0101
 Title SENIOR PROJECT
 Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1186
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.38	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	238/1547	4.75	4.43	4.19	4.24	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.65	4.05	4.33	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.84	4.60	5.00	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	4.90	4.83	5.00	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.84	4.67	5.00	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.83	4.78	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.88	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	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	4
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		
			? 0		
					### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant