

Course-Section: MUSC 101 01
 Title Fundamentals Music Thr
 Instructor: Richards,Kazuko
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 982
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	287/1447	4.42	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	228/1447	4.61	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	496/1241	4.62	4.84	4.33	4.25	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	437/1402	4.45	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	529/1358	4.11	4.53	4.11	4.03	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1316	4.67	4.62	4.14	3.99	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	971/1427	4.27	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1447	4.99	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	141/1434	4.38	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	626/1387	4.51	4.74	4.46	4.46	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	919/1387	4.82	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	879/1386	4.33	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	520/1380	4.57	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	82/1193	4.30	4.68	4.02	3.99	4.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	710/1172	3.84	4.72	4.15	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	490/1182	4.14	4.83	4.35	4.18	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	798/1170	4.19	4.78	4.38	4.17	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 9	Non-major 9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	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 101 02
 Title Fundamentals Music Thr
 Instructor: Hawley JR,Thoma
 Enrollment: 89
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 983
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	11	13	22	4.06	1027/1447	4.42	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	16	28	4.45	619/1447	4.61	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	9	36	4.69	357/1241	4.62	4.84	4.33	4.25	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	32	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	665/1402	4.45	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	3	0	7	12	12	3.88	931/1358	4.11	4.53	4.11	4.03	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	38	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	****/1316	4.67	4.62	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	6	7	33	4.53	422/1427	4.27	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	48	4.98	146/1447	4.99	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	3	0	0	10	18	9	3.97	889/1434	4.38	4.64	4.10	4.10	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	4	13	29	4.39	921/1387	4.51	4.74	4.46	4.46	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	45	4.92	475/1387	4.82	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	6	14	28	4.41	748/1386	4.33	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	13	30	4.52	637/1380	4.57	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	3	2	8	9	12	3.74	855/1193	4.30	4.68	4.02	3.99	3.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	2	1	6	6	7	3.68	914/1172	3.84	4.72	4.15	3.95	3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	6	4	3	9	3.68	1032/1182	4.14	4.83	4.35	4.18	3.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	1	4	7	10	4.18	804/1170	4.19	4.78	4.38	4.17	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	28	11	2	1	4	0	3	3.10	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 43	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	B 2						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	33	Under-grad	49	Non-major	49
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	5				
			? 3						

Course-Section: MUSC 111 01
 Title Musicianship Lab II
 Instructor: Pollauf, Jacquelin
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 984
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	723/1447	4.53	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	196/1447	4.90	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1241	4.96	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	186/1402	4.89	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	239/1316	4.83	4.62	4.14	3.99	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	513/1427	4.55	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	4	7	3	3.80	1414/1447	3.53	4.63	4.69	4.68	3.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	408/1434	4.45	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	4.94	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	707/1387	4.73	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1386	4.94	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	463/1380	4.77	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1193	4.80	4.68	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1172	4.80	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1182	4.83	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1170	4.50	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	3.67	4.85	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 111 02
 Title Musicianship Lab II
 Instructor: Pollauf, Jacquiel
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 985
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	408/1447	4.53	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1447	4.90	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	127/1241	4.96	4.84	4.33	4.25	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1402	4.89	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1316	4.83	4.62	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	310/1427	4.55	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	9	3	0	3.25	1437/1447	3.53	4.63	4.69	4.68	3.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	397/1434	4.45	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	245/1387	4.94	4.74	4.46	4.46	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1030/1387	4.73	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	171/1386	4.94	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	193/1380	4.77	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	100/1193	4.80	4.68	4.02	3.99	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	323/1172	4.80	4.72	4.15	3.95	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	430/1182	4.83	4.83	4.35	4.18	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	864/1170	4.50	4.78	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	612/ 800	3.67	4.85	4.06	3.95	3.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 112 02
 Title Music Repertoire
 Instructor: Yoshioka,Airi
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 986
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1079/1447	4.50	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: MUSC 126 01
 Title Theory II:Form&Analysi
 Instructor: Dusman,Linda J
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 987
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	3	12	4.26	859/1447	4.41	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	728/1447	4.46	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	313/1241	4.75	4.84	4.33	4.25	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	402/1402	4.57	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	1	12	4.21	644/1358	4.23	4.53	4.11	4.03	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	434/1316	4.48	4.62	4.14	3.99	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	6	3	6	3.42	1284/1427	3.65	4.53	4.19	4.24	3.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	5	4.26	1246/1447	4.19	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	733/1434	4.08	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	414/1387	4.55	4.74	4.46	4.46	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	422/1387	4.91	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	663/1386	4.48	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	534/1380	4.64	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	332/1193	4.28	4.68	4.02	3.99	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	339/1172	4.57	4.72	4.15	3.95	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	440/1170	4.71	4.78	4.38	4.17	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0	Major 17
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 19	Non-major 2
84-150	1	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 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: MUSC 126 02
 Title Theory II:Form&Analysi
 Instructor: Rubin,Anna I
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 988
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	529/1447	4.41	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	479/1447	4.46	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	261/1241	4.75	4.84	4.33	4.25	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	437/1402	4.57	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	608/1358	4.23	4.53	4.11	4.03	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	392/1316	4.48	4.62	4.14	3.99	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1090/1427	3.65	4.53	4.19	4.24	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1326/1447	4.19	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	849/1434	4.08	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	970/1387	4.55	4.74	4.46	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	579/1387	4.91	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	607/1386	4.48	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	463/1380	4.64	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	602/1193	4.28	4.68	4.02	3.99	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	4.57	4.72	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	4.71	4.78	4.38	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 163 01
 Title Diction: German
 Instructor: King, Thomas D.
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 989
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1411/1447	3.00	4.75	4.31	4.18	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1291/1358	3.00	4.53	4.11	4.03	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1427/1427	1.00	4.53	4.19	4.24	1.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1443/1447	3.00	4.63	4.69	4.68	3.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1349/1434	3.00	4.64	4.10	4.10	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1350/1387	3.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1320/1387	4.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: MUSC 170 01
 Title: Beginning Voice Class
 Instructor: Jackson, Janice
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 990
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	211/1447	4.85	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	187/1447	4.82	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	611/1241	4.44	4.84	4.33	4.25	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	347/1402	4.64	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	1057/1358	3.70	4.53	4.11	4.03	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	3	3	1	3	3.40	1172/1316	3.40	4.62	4.14	3.99	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1077/1427	3.90	4.53	4.19	4.24	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	397/1434	4.45	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 171 01
 Title Intermediate Voice Cla
 Instructor: Jackson,Janice
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 991
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	474/1447	4.60	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	677/1447	4.40	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	4	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.84	4.33	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	281/1402	4.70	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.53	4.11	4.03	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	2	0	1	4	2	3.44	1156/1316	3.44	4.62	4.14	3.99	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	541/1427	4.44	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	158/1434	4.75	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1387	4.86	4.74	4.46	4.46	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1386	4.86	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	392/1380	4.71	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	323/1172	4.60	4.72	4.15	3.95	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	327/1170	4.80	4.78	4.38	4.17	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	250/ 800	4.40	4.85	4.06	3.95	4.40

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 175 01
 Title Intermediate Vocal Met
 Instructor: Jackson,Janice
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 992
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	532/1447	4.50	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	680/1427	4.33	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	158/1434	4.75	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	798/1387	4.50	4.74	4.46	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: MUSC 178 01
 Title: Begin Keyboard Skills
 Instructor: Beith, Nancy S
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 993
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	640/1447	4.56	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1447	4.94	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1241	4.90	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1402	4.71	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1358	****	4.53	4.11	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1427	4.94	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1447	4.72	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	315/1434	4.34	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	4.17	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1380	4.33	4.80	4.32	4.31	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	4.72	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	****	4.83	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	3.95	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.92	4.72	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 178 02
 Title: Begin Keyboard Skills
 Instructor: Beith, Nancy S
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 994
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	408/1447	4.56	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	128/1447	4.94	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	231/1241	4.90	4.84	4.33	4.25	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	591/1402	4.71	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1358	****	4.53	4.11	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	99/1427	4.94	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	1124/1447	4.72	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	754/1434	4.34	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1325/1387	4.17	4.74	4.46	4.46	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	815/1380	4.33	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1172	****	4.72	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1182	****	4.83	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors		8	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	1							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 179 01
 Title Interm Keyboard Skills
 Instructor: Beith,Nancy S
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 995
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	254/1447	4.52	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	494/1402	4.65	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1316	4.67	4.62	4.14	3.99	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1427	4.85	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.92	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	454/1434	4.30	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.92	4.72	4.50	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.38	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.65	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.49	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 15	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.31	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	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	3
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	0				
			? 0						

Course-Section: MUSC 179 02
 Title Interm Keyboard Skills
 Instructor: Beith,Nancy S
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 996
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	889/1447	4.52	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	165/1402	4.65	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1316	4.67	4.62	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	256/1427	4.85	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	646/1447	4.92	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	701/1434	4.30	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	3.95	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	5.00	4.92	4.72	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 180 01
 Title: Beginning Piano Class
 Instructor: Beith, Nancy S
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 997
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	292/1447	4.71	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	186/1241	4.86	4.84	4.33	4.25	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	931/1358	3.89	4.53	4.11	4.03	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	6	3	3.57	1237/1427	3.57	4.53	4.19	4.24	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	983/1434	3.91	4.64	4.10	4.10	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	414/1387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	422/1387	4.92	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	431/1386	4.67	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	143/1380	4.92	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	256/1193	4.56	4.68	4.02	3.99	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1172	****	4.72	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1182	****	4.83	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 181 01
 Title Intermediate Piano Cla
 Instructor: Beith,Nancy S
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 998
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	170/1447	4.83	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	451/1241	4.60	4.84	4.33	4.25	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	9	4.42	603/1402	4.42	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.53	4.11	4.03	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1134/1316	3.50	4.62	4.14	3.99	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	0	2	6	3.91	1077/1427	3.91	4.53	4.19	4.24	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	436/1447	4.92	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	540/1434	4.33	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1015/1387	4.29	4.74	4.46	4.46	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	656/1387	4.86	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	855/1386	4.29	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	0	4	3.86	1128/1380	3.86	4.80	4.32	4.31	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	999/1193	3.40	4.68	4.02	3.99	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1172	****	4.72	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1182	****	4.83	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 184 01
 Title Beginning Woodwind Cla
 Instructor: Belzer,Matthew
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 999
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	540/1434	4.33	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 185 01
 Title Interm Woodwind Class
 Instructor: Belzer, Matthew
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1000
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	452/1447	4.63	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	137/1447	4.88	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	217/1402	4.75	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	430/1358	4.43	4.53	4.11	4.03	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	373/1427	4.57	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	190/1434	4.71	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.71

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	3.99	****

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	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 189 01
 Title Guitar Class
 Instructor: Dunlap,Matthew
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1001
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	452/1447	4.63	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	137/1447	4.88	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	237/1358	4.67	4.53	4.11	4.03	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	166/1316	4.75	4.62	4.14	3.99	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	200/1427	4.75	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	190/1434	4.71	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.71

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1387	****	4.74	4.46	4.46	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1387	****	4.92	4.73	4.71	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1386	****	4.77	4.32	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1380	****	4.80	4.32	4.31	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	3.99	****

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	4.72	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	****	4.83	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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 190 01
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Franklin,Rachel
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1002
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	4.92	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.92	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.75	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	958/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	4.87	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	4.88	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	4.88	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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	9	5.00	1/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	128/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	380/1241	4.92	4.84	4.33	4.25	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1402	4.92	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1358	4.06	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1316	3.83	4.62	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	842/1427	4.75	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	803/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	141/1434	4.87	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1386	4.88	4.77	4.32	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	4.88	4.80	4.32	4.31	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 31	4.67	4.92	4.72	4.50	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.38	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.65	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 20	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 15	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.31	****

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	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190 04
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Caracciolo,Step
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1004
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.92	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.75	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.87	4.64	4.10	4.10	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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 1	Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 190 05
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Jackson,Janice
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1005
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	4.92	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.92	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1427	4.75	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1202/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	4.87	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1386	4.88	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	4.88	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190 06
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: King,Thomas D.
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1006
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	341/1434	4.87	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.88	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	4.88	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190 08
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Yoshioka,Airi
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1007
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1291/1358	4.06	4.53	4.11	4.03	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.87	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.88	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	4.88	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190 09
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Tremblay,Christ
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1008
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	309/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.92	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1427	4.75	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1434	4.87	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.88	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	4.88	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	28/ 31	4.67	4.92	4.72	4.50	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.65	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.49	5.00

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	0
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	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190 11
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Ladd,Gita
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1009
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	507/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	292/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	4.92	4.84	4.33	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1402	4.92	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1358	4.06	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	154/1427	4.75	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1139/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1434	4.87	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	566/1387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	253/1386	4.88	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	273/1380	4.88	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	4.67	4.92	4.72	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 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 7	Non-major 7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 190 13
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Dunlap,Matthew
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1010
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1058/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1053/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	799/1358	4.06	4.53	4.11	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	812/1316	3.83	4.62	4.14	3.99	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.88	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	4.88	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	4.67	4.92	4.72	4.50	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.38	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.65	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 15	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.31	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	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	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190 15
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Kesner,Lori A.
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1011
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	254/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1402	4.92	4.74	4.24	4.15	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1358	4.06	4.53	4.11	4.03	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	200/1427	4.75	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	754/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	117/1434	4.87	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	4.88	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	4.88	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	****

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	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 5	Non-major 4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 190 28
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Dove,Barry B
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1012
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	4.92	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.92	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	529/1358	4.06	4.53	4.11	4.03	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1427	4.75	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1252/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	341/1434	4.87	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.88	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	4.88	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190 37
 Title Perf.Studies:Western A
 Instructor: Richards,Kazuko
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1013
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	685/1402	4.92	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1291/1358	4.06	4.53	4.11	4.03	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1050/1316	3.83	4.62	4.14	3.99	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	971/1427	4.75	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	4.87	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1350/1387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1320/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1386	4.88	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1030/1380	4.88	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193 01
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Franklin,Rachel
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1014
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	4.88	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	836/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.89	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	5.00
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.65	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193 04
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Caracciolo,Step
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1015
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	4.88	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.89	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193 06
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: King,Thomas D.
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1016
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	408/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	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	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	2
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 193 07
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Markovic-Prakas
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1017
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	971/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	1 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
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 193 08
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Yoshioka,Airi
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1018
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1358	4.88	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	4.89	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193 11
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Ladd,Gita
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1019
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	532/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	4.88	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	341/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.50

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.89	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 2	Non-major 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	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 193 12
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Lagana,Thomas V
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1020
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.89	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193 13
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Dunlap,Matthew
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1021
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1358	4.88	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1252/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	158/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.75

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	4.89	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	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 4	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 4	Non-major 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1022
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	532/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	976/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00

Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1386	4.89	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1023
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.92	4.72	4.50	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.65	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193 17
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Richards, Edwin
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1024
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1025
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1058/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1400/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1359/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	799/1358	4.88	4.53	4.11	4.03	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1359/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	849/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1026
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	4.88	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	459/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	4.89	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.92	4.72	4.50	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.38	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.65	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.49	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 15	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.31	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193 30
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Pollauf, Jacquel
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1027
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193 33
 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo
 Instructor: Ruas,Laura Mari
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1028
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	4.88	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.89	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: MUSC 194 02
 Title Perf Studies: Musc Maj
 Instructor: Hawley JR,Thoma
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1029
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.58	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.58	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.83	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.92	4.72	4.50	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.65	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.49	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 194 04
 Title Perf Studies: Musc Maj
 Instructor: Caracciolo,Step
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1030
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.58	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.58	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.83	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: MUSC 194 06
 Title Perf Studies: Musc Maj
 Instructor: King, Thomas D.
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1031
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.58	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.58	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.83	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.50	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	4.50	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1032
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	459/1427	4.58	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1447	4.58	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.83	4.64	4.10	4.10	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	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 194 13
 Title Perf Studies: Musc Maj
 Instructor: Dunlap,Matthew
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1033
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	976/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1359/1427	4.58	4.53	4.19	4.24	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.58	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	849/1434	4.83	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1176/1387	4.50	4.74	4.46	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	710/1172	4.50	4.72	4.15	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.92	4.72	4.50	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.38	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.65	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.49	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 194 28
 Title Perf Studies: Musc Maj
 Instructor: Dove, Barry B
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1034
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.58	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.58	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.83	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 211 01
 Title Musicianship Lab IV
 Instructor: Pollauf, Jacquel
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1035
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	452/1447	4.63	4.75	4.31	4.31	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	249/1447	4.75	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	168/1241	4.88	4.84	4.33	4.35	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	136/1402	4.85	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	237/1358	4.67	4.53	4.11	4.12	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1316	4.67	4.62	4.14	4.08	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	301/1427	4.64	4.53	4.19	4.14	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	1	4.06	1343/1447	4.06	4.63	4.69	4.70	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	478/1434	4.38	4.64	4.10	3.97	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	784/1387	4.80	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	316/1386	4.75	4.77	4.32	4.24	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	339/1380	4.75	4.80	4.32	4.30	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.32	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	0	0	5	17	19	4.34	781/1447	4.34	4.75	4.31	4.31	4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	2	4	10	24	4.40	677/1447	4.40	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	5	9	27	4.54	514/1241	4.54	4.84	4.33	4.35	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	27	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	873/1402	4.14	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	4	6	11	18	3.95	858/1358	3.95	4.53	4.11	4.12	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	36	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	1	3	5	32	4.66	292/1427	4.66	4.53	4.19	4.14	4.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	1	0	2	38	4.88	565/1447	4.88	4.63	4.69	4.70	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	1	1	6	20	6	3.85	1017/1434	3.85	4.64	4.10	3.97	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	6	10	23	4.44	870/1387	4.44	4.74	4.46	4.42	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	2	2	35	4.85	681/1387	4.85	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	6	8	24	4.41	733/1386	4.41	4.77	4.32	4.24	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	4	4	30	4.59	571/1380	4.59	4.80	4.32	4.30	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	1	2	2	8	23	4.39	388/1193	4.39	4.68	4.02	4.04	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	36	0	2	1	2	0	8	3.85	835/1172	3.85	4.72	4.15	4.12	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	1002/1182	3.79	4.83	4.35	4.30	3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	672/1170	4.38	4.78	4.38	4.32	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	36	6	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.92	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: MUSC 214 01
 Title Hist Jazz: Origins-Pre
 Instructor: Goldstein,Thoma
 Enrollment: 86
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1036
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	2	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	20	Under-grad	49	Non-major	44
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

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	9	0	0	0	1	10	69	4.85	201/1447	4.85	4.75	4.31	4.31	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	0	3	12	65	4.78	228/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	1	2	8	70	4.81	222/1241	4.81	4.84	4.33	4.35	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	54	0	0	2	3	22	4.74	228/1402	4.74	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	50	4	0	8	1	17	3.90	917/1358	3.90	4.53	4.11	4.12	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	67	0	1	2	0	12	4.53	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	1	7	73	4.85	120/1427	4.85	4.53	4.19	4.14	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	1	2	44	35	4.38	1175/1447	4.38	4.63	4.69	4.70	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	0	0	5	33	29	4.36	516/1434	4.36	4.64	4.10	3.97	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	4	72	4.92	160/1387	4.92	4.74	4.46	4.42	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	1	4	72	4.92	422/1387	4.92	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	4	72	4.92	109/1386	4.92	4.77	4.32	4.24	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	3	73	4.92	127/1380	4.92	4.80	4.32	4.30	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	0	1	0	3	71	4.92	52/1193	4.92	4.68	4.02	4.04	4.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	60	0	5	1	2	3	18	3.97	746/1172	3.97	4.72	4.15	4.12	3.97
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	62	0	8	4	4	0	11	3.07	1136/1182	3.07	4.83	4.35	4.30	3.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	62	0	6	4	2	2	13	3.44	1088/1170	3.44	4.78	4.38	4.32	3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	59	21	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	87	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	87	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	87	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	88	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	87	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	87	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	87	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	87	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	87	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	87	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	87	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	87	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	87	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	87	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	87	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	87	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	4.92	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	87	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	87	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	87	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	87	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: MUSC 217 01
 Title Rock & Related Music
 Instructor: Morin, Joseph C
 Enrollment: 191
 Questionnaires: 89

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1037
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2	A	37	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	29	Under-grad	89	Non-major	88
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	20	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 222 1
 Title Jazz Arranging
 Instructor: Belzer, Matthew
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1038
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.31	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.23	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.35	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.12	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	4.08	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.53	4.19	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	958/1447	4.67	4.63	4.69	4.70	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.64	4.10	3.97	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.24	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	652/1193	4.00	4.68	4.02	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	4.12	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.32	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	4.01	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 224 1
 Title Instrumentation
 Instructor: Dusman,Linda J
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1039
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	452/1447	4.63	4.75	4.31	4.31	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	974/1447	4.13	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	844/1241	4.17	4.84	4.33	4.35	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	358/1402	4.63	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	173/1358	4.75	4.53	4.11	4.12	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	971/1427	4.00	4.53	4.19	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	600/1434	4.29	4.64	4.10	3.97	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1387	****	4.74	4.46	4.42	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1387	****	4.92	4.73	4.71	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1386	****	4.77	4.32	4.24	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1380	****	4.80	4.32	4.30	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	4.72	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	****	4.83	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors		6	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	4
84-150	0	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		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 226 01
 Title Theory IV:Music Writin
 Instructor: Macaulay,Janice
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1040
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	133/1447	4.92	4.75	4.31	4.31	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	1057/1358	3.70	4.53	4.11	4.12	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	582/1427	4.42	4.53	4.19	4.14	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	1202/1447	4.33	4.63	4.69	4.70	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	442/1434	4.42	4.64	4.10	3.97	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	510/1386	4.60	4.77	4.32	4.24	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	4.72	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1182	****	4.83	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 230 01
 Title Musics Of The World
 Instructor: Beck,Gina C
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1041
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	9	13	4.38	752/1447	4.38	4.75	4.31	4.31	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	7	13	4.25	853/1447	4.25	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	2	19	4.58	469/1241	4.58	4.84	4.33	4.35	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	1	1	2	1	10	4.20	827/1402	4.20	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	1	2	3	13	4.30	563/1358	4.30	4.53	4.11	4.12	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	14	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	342/1316	4.56	4.62	4.14	4.08	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	256/1427	4.70	4.53	4.19	4.14	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	243/1447	4.96	4.63	4.69	4.70	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.64	4.10	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	521/1387	4.70	4.74	4.46	4.42	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	528/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	0	2	17	4.70	392/1386	4.70	4.77	4.32	4.24	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	3	17	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.80	4.32	4.30	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	82/1193	4.85	4.68	4.02	4.04	4.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	****/1172	****	4.72	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1182	****	4.83	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.32	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 1	Major 5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 10	Under-grad 24	Non-major 20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 301 01
 Title Chambers Players
 Instructor: Yoshioka,Airi (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1042
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	309/1447	4.75	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	170/1447	4.83	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	380/1402	4.60	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	283/1427	4.67	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1079/1447	4.50	4.63	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1434	4.60	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1387	****	4.74	4.46	4.44	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1387	****	4.92	4.73	4.71	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1386	****	4.77	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	****	4.80	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	4.12	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 301 01
 Title Chambers Players
 Instructor: Ladd,Gita (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1043
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	309/1447	4.75	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	170/1447	4.83	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	380/1402	4.60	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	283/1427	4.67	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1079/1447	4.50	4.63	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	701/1434	4.60	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1387	****	4.74	4.46	4.44	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1387	****	4.92	4.73	4.71	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1386	****	4.77	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1380	****	4.80	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	4.12	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 301 01
 Title Chambers Players
 Instructor: Kannen, Maria La (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1044
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	309/1447	4.75	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	170/1447	4.83	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	380/1402	4.60	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	283/1427	4.67	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1079/1447	4.50	4.63	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	4.60	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.60

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1387	****	4.74	4.46	4.44	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1387	****	4.92	4.73	4.71	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1386	****	4.77	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1380	****	4.80	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	4.05	****

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	4.12	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	Under-grad 12	Non-major 7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 303 01
 Title UMBC Camerata--Chamber
 Instructor: Caracciolo,Step
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1045
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	5	28	4.71	353/1447	4.71	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	27	4.74	260/1447	4.74	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	33	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	****	4.84	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	21	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	542/1402	4.46	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	30	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1358	****	4.53	4.11	4.10	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	32	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	3	0	0	4	8	19	4.48	486/1427	4.48	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	262/1434	4.63	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	276/1387	4.86	4.74	4.46	4.44	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	1	0	0	0	13	4.71	919/1387	4.71	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	529/1386	4.58	4.77	4.32	4.30	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	2	0	10	4.38	775/1380	4.38	4.80	4.32	4.32	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/1172	****	4.72	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1182	****	4.83	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	1	2	0	0	2	3.00	****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	31	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 27	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0 Major 13
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 36 Non-major 23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives 13	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 304 01
 Title UMBC Jubilee Singers
 Instructor: Jackson,Janice
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1046
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	0	20	4.42	695/1447	4.42	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	238/1447	4.77	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.84	4.33	4.33	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	314/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	17	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	21	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	5	0	1	4	1	13	4.37	644/1427	4.37	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	15	9	4.38	1175/1447	4.38	4.63	4.69	4.65	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	0	5	15	4.57	296/1434	4.57	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	741/1387	4.55	4.74	4.46	4.44	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	353/1386	4.73	4.77	4.32	4.30	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	159/1380	4.91	4.80	4.32	4.32	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	559/1172	4.29	4.72	4.15	4.24	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	723/1182	4.29	4.83	4.35	4.42	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	19	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 305 01
 Title UMBC Community Symphon
 Instructor: Richards, Edwin
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1047
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	0	6	38	4.78	287/1447	4.78	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	7	37	4.84	162/1447	4.84	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	33	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	****/1241	****	4.84	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	27	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	150/1402	4.82	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	38	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1358	****	4.53	4.11	4.10	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	40	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	12	0	0	3	4	24	4.68	274/1427	4.68	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	3	41	4.93	339/1447	4.93	4.63	4.69	4.65	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	42	4.95	44/1434	4.95	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	35	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	35	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	36	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	****/1386	****	4.77	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	****/1380	****	4.80	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	36	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1172	****	4.72	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1182	****	4.83	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	43	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 31	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 23
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 47 Non-major 24
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 18	F 0	Electives 14	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 1		

Course-Section: MUSC 307 06
 Title Small Ensemble
 Instructor: Goldstein,Thoma
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1048
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	4.51	4.75	4.31	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	4.84	4.78	4.27	4.23	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	4.50	4.84	4.33	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1402	4.83	4.74	4.24	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.10	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1427	4.61	4.53	4.19	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	4.90	4.63	4.69	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	158/1434	4.52	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	4.75	4.80	4.32	4.32	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	4.05	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1172	4.75	4.72	4.15	4.24	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	4.25	4.78	4.38	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 800	4.75	4.85	4.06	4.12	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.17	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.21	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	2.87	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.38	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307 07
 Title Small Ensemble
 Instructor: Morin, Joseph C
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1049
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	723/1447	4.51	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	196/1447	4.84	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.84	4.33	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	314/1402	4.83	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.10	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	680/1427	4.61	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1447	4.90	4.63	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	454/1434	4.52	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	659/1380	4.75	4.80	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	4.05	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	377/1172	4.75	4.72	4.15	4.24	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1070/1170	4.25	4.78	4.38	4.49	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	195/ 800	4.75	4.85	4.06	4.12	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 5	Non-major 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 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: MUSC 307 10
 Title Small Ensemble
 Instructor: King, Thomas D.
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1050
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	971/1447	4.51	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	292/1447	4.84	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	4.50	4.84	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1402	4.83	4.74	4.24	4.24	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.10	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	459/1427	4.61	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	901/1447	4.90	4.63	4.69	4.65	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	454/1434	4.52	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.40

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.44	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	4.75	4.80	4.32	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 308 01
 Title UMBC Wind Ensemble
 Instructor: Spece, Richard D
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1051
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	7	12	11	4.06	1027/1447	4.06	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	22	4.65	376/1447	4.65	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	26	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1241	****	4.84	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	23	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	217/1402	4.75	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	27	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1358	****	4.53	4.11	4.10	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	28	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	140/1427	4.83	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	13	4.42	1147/1447	4.42	4.63	4.69	4.65	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	9	19	4.68	222/1434	4.68	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	217/1386	4.83	4.77	4.32	4.30	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	238/1380	4.83	4.80	4.32	4.32	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	7	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1172	****	4.72	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1182	****	4.83	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	28	Required for Majors		11	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	0							
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General		1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	18
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	8	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives		14	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		1				
				?	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 319 01
 Title Adv Topics In Music Te
 Instructor: Wonneberger,Ala
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1052
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	222/1447	4.83	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	532/1447	4.50	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1241	4.83	4.84	4.33	4.33	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	314/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1125/1358	3.60	4.53	4.11	4.10	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	866/1427	4.17	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	673/1447	4.83	4.63	4.69	4.65	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	341/1434	4.50	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1282/1387	3.67	4.74	4.46	4.44	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.77	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.80	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1022/1193	3.33	4.68	4.02	4.05	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	377/1172	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.24	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 320 01
 Title UMBC Jazz Ensemble
 Instructor: Belzer, Matthew
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1053
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	222/1447	4.83	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1358	****	4.53	4.11	4.10	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	99/1427	4.89	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	436/1447	4.92	4.63	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	315/1434	4.55	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	4.05	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	4.12	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 13	Non-major 4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 322 01
 Title Music History II
 Instructor: Morin, Joseph C
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1054
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	3	25	4.63	452/1447	4.63	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	25	4.63	401/1447	4.63	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	26	4.66	392/1241	4.66	4.84	4.33	4.33	4.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	2	3	2	21	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	4	4	20	4.32	540/1358	4.32	4.53	4.11	4.10	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	3	1	22	4.23	644/1316	4.23	4.62	4.14	4.13	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	1	3	24	4.44	554/1427	4.44	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	18	4.58	1030/1447	4.58	4.63	4.69	4.65	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	5	1	14	4.45	408/1434	4.45	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	2	1	19	4.65	581/1387	4.65	4.74	4.46	4.44	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	1	1	1	19	4.57	1090/1387	4.57	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	2	2	2	17	4.48	649/1386	4.48	4.77	4.32	4.30	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	2	1	16	4.27	868/1380	4.27	4.80	4.32	4.32	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	1	0	2	3	16	4.50	288/1193	4.50	4.68	4.02	4.05	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	496/1172	4.36	4.72	4.15	4.24	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	2	0	0	9	4.45	595/1182	4.45	4.83	4.35	4.42	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	616/1170	4.45	4.78	4.38	4.49	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	21	2	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	351/ 800	4.22	4.85	4.06	4.12	4.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.92	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: MUSC 322 01
 Title Music History II
 Instructor: Morin, Joseph C
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1054
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MUSC 324 01
 Title Small Ensemble Jazz Gr
 Instructor: Belzer,Matthew
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1055
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.53	4.19	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.64	4.10	4.09	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	4
84-150	1	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 324 02
 Title Small Ensemble Jazz Gr
 Instructor: Lagana, Thomas V
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1056
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.23	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.33	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.10	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	4.13	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.53	4.19	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.65	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	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 385 01
 Title Intermediate Conductin
 Instructor: Caracciolo,Step
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1057
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.84	4.33	4.33	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	237/1358	4.67	4.53	4.11	4.10	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	154/1427	4.80	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.63	4.69	4.65	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	93/1434	4.89	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.89

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	4.05	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1058
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1058/1447	4.50	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1053/1447	4.50	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	849/1434	4.50	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.32	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.49	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390 17
 Title Adv.Perf.Stud:Westrn A
 Instructor: Richards,Edwin
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1059
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.50	4.75	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.50	4.78	4.27	4.23	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.50	4.64	4.10	4.09	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	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
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 391 01
 Title Adv Perf Studies - Wes
 Instructor: Ruas,Laura
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1060
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.23	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.64	4.10	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.32	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.92	4.72	5.00	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	5.00	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	5.00	4.60	5.00	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 15	5.00	5.00	4.61	5.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: MUSC 391 01
 Title Adv Perf Studies - Wes
 Instructor: Franklin,Rachel
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1061
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor Mean	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	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.23	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.33	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.10	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	4.13	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.53	4.19	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.65	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 392 01
 Title Adv.Perf.Stud:Westrn A
 Instructor: Yoshioka,Airi
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1062
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.23	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.64	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	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 400 03
 Title Special Projects
 Instructor: Morin, Joseph C
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1063
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.31	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.64	4.10	4.17	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 400 04
 Title Special Projects
 Instructor: Hawley JR,Thoma
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1064
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	4.27	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.64	4.10	4.17	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.51	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.92	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.60	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 1	Non-major 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 401 03
 Title Special Projects: Comp
 Instructor: Dusman,Linda J
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1065
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.31	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.34	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	529/1358	4.33	4.53	4.11	4.15	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1202/1447	4.33	4.63	4.69	4.72	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	230/1434	4.67	4.64	4.10	4.17	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.34	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.34	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	4.25	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.49	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.51	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.92	4.72	4.80	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.60	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 427 01
 Title Electronic Music
 Instructor: Rubin, Anna I
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1066
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1007/1447	4.10	4.75	4.31	4.43	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	1	3	3.50	1323/1447	3.50	4.78	4.27	4.31	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	872/1241	4.11	4.84	4.33	4.41	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1153/1402	3.78	4.74	4.24	4.34	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1084/1358	3.67	4.53	4.11	4.15	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	1	2	3	3.30	1212/1316	3.30	4.62	4.14	4.27	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	1356/1427	3.11	4.53	4.19	4.20	3.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.63	4.69	4.72	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	1269/1434	3.43	4.64	4.10	4.17	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1235/1387	3.88	4.74	4.46	4.48	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	604/1387	4.88	4.92	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	1	3	1	3.00	1328/1386	3.00	4.77	4.32	4.34	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1276/1380	3.38	4.80	4.32	4.34	3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	593/1193	4.13	4.68	4.02	4.00	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1090/1172	3.00	4.72	4.15	4.25	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	430/1182	4.67	4.83	4.35	4.49	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	710/1170	4.33	4.78	4.38	4.51	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.74	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.72	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	4.92	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 480 01
 Title Topic in Music, Art &
 Instructor: Dusman,Linda J
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1067
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	408/1447	4.67	4.75	4.31	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	766/1447	4.33	4.78	4.27	4.31	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	4.84	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.74	4.24	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	529/1358	4.33	4.53	4.11	4.15	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1316	4.67	4.62	4.14	4.27	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1123/1427	3.83	4.53	4.19	4.20	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	958/1447	4.67	4.63	4.69	4.72	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.64	4.10	4.17	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	566/1387	4.67	4.74	4.46	4.48	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	431/1386	4.67	4.77	4.32	4.34	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.80	4.32	4.34	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	288/1193	4.50	4.68	4.02	4.00	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	4.72	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	****	4.83	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 4	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 6	Non-major 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 0				

Course-Section: MUSC 492 02
 Title Senior Project
 Instructor: Morin, Joseph C
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1068
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.31	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	4.27	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.50	4.63	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.64	4.10	4.17	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: MUSC 492 03
 Title Senior Project
 Instructor: Rubin, Anna I
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1069
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.31	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.34	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.50	4.63	4.69	4.72	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.64	4.10	4.17	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.92	4.72	4.80	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.60	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	5.00	4.60	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 15	5.00	5.00	4.61	5.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
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						