

Course-Section: MUSC 100 0101  
 Title INTRO TO MUSIC  
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH  
 Enrollment: 184  
 Questionnaires: 83

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1050  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	1	1	13	26	36	4.23	914/1504	4.23	4.67	4.27	4.13	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	2	8	27	40	4.36	707/1503	4.36	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	2	2	6	22	45	4.38	671/1290	4.38	4.80	4.28	4.19	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	48	3	3	2	7	13	3.86	1136/1453	3.86	4.66	4.21	4.11	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	14	7	5	18	20	13	3.43	1162/1421	3.43	4.52	4.00	3.91	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	62	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	****/1365	****	4.56	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	1	2	7	13	52	4.51	455/1485	4.51	4.51	4.16	4.13	4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	3	73	4.96	263/1504	4.96	4.66	4.69	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	2	9	40	18	4.07	810/1483	4.07	4.54	4.06	3.97	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	2	20	53	4.68	556/1425	4.68	4.63	4.41	4.36	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	5	71	4.91	502/1426	4.91	4.92	4.69	4.56	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	10	16	50	4.53	552/1418	4.53	4.56	4.25	4.20	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	1	0	4	14	56	4.65	459/1416	4.65	4.65	4.26	4.21	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	1	2	9	19	41	4.35	420/1199	4.35	4.50	3.97	3.82	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	53	0	12	3	6	2	7	2.63	1228/1312	2.63	4.36	4.00	3.69	2.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	55	0	10	3	9	1	5	2.57	1241/1303	2.57	4.60	4.24	3.93	2.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	53	0	5	5	7	4	9	3.23	1169/1299	3.23	4.46	4.25	3.94	3.23
4. Were special techniques successful	53	28	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	80	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	5.00	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	80	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 244	****	4.00	4.09	4.07	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	82	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.64	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	82	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	82	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	82	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	82	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	1.00	4.23	4.11	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	82	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.71	4.49	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	82	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	4.60	4.51	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	1	A 35	Required for Majors 57
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	B 26	Graduate 1
					Major 0

56-83	4	2.00-2.99	13	C	9	General	12	Under-grad	82	Non-major	46
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	17	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 101 0101  
 Title FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR  
 Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE  
 Enrollment: 62  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1051  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	2	3	14	4.50	549/1504	4.28	4.67	4.27	4.13	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	106/1503	4.72	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	131/1290	4.80	4.80	4.28	4.19	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1181/1453	3.94	4.66	4.21	4.11	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	212/1421	4.25	4.52	4.00	3.91	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	3	1	2	4	2	3.08	1287/1365	3.08	4.56	4.08	3.96	3.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	124/1485	4.63	4.51	4.16	4.13	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.66	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	6	11	3	3.85	1041/1483	3.88	4.54	4.06	3.97	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	107/1425	4.65	4.63	4.41	4.36	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	301/1426	4.89	4.92	4.69	4.56	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	158/1418	4.70	4.56	4.25	4.20	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	282/1416	4.69	4.65	4.26	4.21	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	471/1199	4.14	4.50	3.97	3.82	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	2	2	2	1	3.00	1149/1312	3.31	4.36	4.00	3.69	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	6	0	1	3.00	1195/1303	3.26	4.60	4.24	3.93	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	3	2	1	1	1	2.38	1257/1299	3.12	4.46	4.25	3.94	2.38
4. Were special techniques successful	11	7	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	20	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 101 0201  
 Title FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR  
 Instructor: HAWLEY, THOMAS  
 Enrollment: 78  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1052  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1	1	5	18	12	4.05	1070/1504	4.28	4.67	4.27	4.13	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	12	23	4.54	449/1503	4.72	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	29	4.70	300/1290	4.80	4.80	4.28	4.19	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	26	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	947/1453	3.94	4.66	4.21	4.11	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	3	8	7	12	3.84	919/1421	4.25	4.52	4.00	3.91	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	30	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	****/1365	3.08	4.56	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	5	7	23	4.42	577/1485	4.63	4.51	4.16	4.13	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	26	4.70	953/1504	4.85	4.66	4.69	4.66	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	3	1	0	5	20	5	3.90	989/1483	3.88	4.54	4.06	3.97	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	13	19	4.35	951/1425	4.65	4.63	4.41	4.36	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	32	4.84	667/1426	4.89	4.92	4.69	4.56	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	11	24	4.54	526/1418	4.70	4.56	4.25	4.20	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	7	24	4.59	544/1416	4.69	4.65	4.26	4.21	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	1	0	5	7	8	4.00	636/1199	4.14	4.50	3.97	3.82	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	3	5	2	9	3.62	971/1312	3.31	4.36	4.00	3.69	3.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	4	1	4	4	8	3.52	1116/1303	3.26	4.60	4.24	3.93	3.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	2	6	6	7	3.86	1017/1299	3.12	4.46	4.25	3.94	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	16	15	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	33	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	3						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	7	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	37	Non-major	7
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 111 0101  
 Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB II  
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1053  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	119/1503	4.94	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	145/1290	4.94	4.80	4.28	4.19	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1453	4.93	4.66	4.21	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	4.88	4.52	4.00	3.91	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1365	4.70	4.56	4.08	3.96	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	455/1485	4.42	4.51	4.16	4.13	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1193/1504	4.52	4.66	4.69	4.66	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	3.97	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1418	****	4.56	4.25	4.20	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1416	****	4.65	4.26	4.21	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1199	****	4.50	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1312	****	4.36	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1303	****	4.60	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1299	****	4.46	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 111 0102  
 Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB II  
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1054  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1503	4.94	4.68	4.20	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1290	4.94	4.80	4.28	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	129/1453	4.93	4.66	4.21	4.11	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	158/1421	4.88	4.52	4.00	3.91	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	420/1365	4.70	4.56	4.08	3.96	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	670/1485	4.42	4.51	4.16	4.13	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	983/1504	4.52	4.66	4.69	4.66	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	3.97	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.36	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.56	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1418	****	4.56	4.25	4.20	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1416	****	4.65	4.26	4.21	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1199	****	4.50	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1312	****	4.36	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1303	****	4.60	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1299	****	4.46	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	3.80	****

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

Course-Section: MUSC 112 0101  
 Title MUSIC REPERTOIRE  
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1055  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1092/1504	4.50	4.67	4.27	4.13	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	4.75	4.66	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	3.97	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 112 0301  
 Title MUSIC REPERTOIRE  
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1056  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	4.50	4.67	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1087/1504	4.75	4.66	4.69	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	3.97	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: MUSC 126 0101  
 Title THEORY II:FORM&ANALYSI  
 Instructor: DUSMAN, LINDA J  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1057  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	5	12	4.47	594/1504	4.47	4.67	4.27	4.13	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	14	4.47	541/1503	4.47	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	270/1290	4.74	4.80	4.28	4.19	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.66	4.21	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	5	7	3.89	871/1421	3.89	4.52	4.00	3.91	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	407/1365	4.41	4.56	4.08	3.96	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	4	10	4.16	878/1485	4.16	4.51	4.16	4.13	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	8	4.42	1155/1504	4.42	4.66	4.69	4.66	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	195/1483	4.69	4.54	4.06	3.97	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	315/1425	4.81	4.63	4.41	4.36	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	736/1418	4.38	4.56	4.25	4.20	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	498/1416	4.63	4.65	4.26	4.21	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.50	3.97	3.82	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	310/1312	4.58	4.36	4.00	3.69	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	268/1303	4.83	4.60	4.24	3.93	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	273/1299	4.83	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	4.00	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	3.00	4.40	4.24	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.00	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	1.00	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.60	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.92	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.71	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.73	4.60	4.48	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned      Cum. GPA      Expected Grades      Reasons      Type      Majors

Grade	Count	Score Range	Count	Category	Count	Description	Count	Level	Count	Level	Count
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 170 0101  
 Title BEGINNING VOICE CLASS  
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1058  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	2	3	9	4.50	549/1504	4.42	4.67	4.27	4.13	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	495/1503	4.61	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1290	4.50	4.80	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	363/1453	4.61	4.66	4.21	4.11	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	4	1	5	2	3.42	1168/1421	3.44	4.52	4.00	3.91	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1201/1365	3.45	4.56	4.08	3.96	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	4	2	2	5	3.62	1242/1485	3.84	4.51	4.16	4.13	3.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	306/1483	4.49	4.54	4.06	3.97	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	700/1425	4.41	4.63	4.41	4.36	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1426	4.88	4.92	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	317/1418	4.61	4.56	4.25	4.20	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	593/1416	4.67	4.65	4.26	4.21	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	636/1199	4.00	4.50	3.97	3.82	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1312	****	4.36	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1303	****	4.60	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1299	****	4.46	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 170 0201  
 Title BEGINNING VOICE CLASS  
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1059  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	2	8	8	4.33	788/1504	4.42	4.67	4.27	4.13	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	248/1503	4.61	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.80	4.28	4.19	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	290/1453	4.61	4.66	4.21	4.11	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	0	9	2	3.47	1137/1421	3.44	4.52	4.00	3.91	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1153/1365	3.45	4.56	4.08	3.96	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	964/1485	3.84	4.51	4.16	4.13	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	409/1483	4.49	4.54	4.06	3.97	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1036/1425	4.41	4.63	4.41	4.36	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	825/1426	4.88	4.92	4.69	4.56	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	578/1418	4.61	4.56	4.25	4.20	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	255/1416	4.67	4.65	4.26	4.21	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1199	4.00	4.50	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1312	****	4.36	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1303	****	4.60	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1299	****	4.46	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	13	Under-grad	18	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 173 0101  
 Title INTRO TO CHORAL SINGIN  
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1060  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1010/1504	4.14	4.67	4.27	4.13	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	414/1503	4.57	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.80	4.28	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.66	4.21	4.11	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	548/1421	4.25	4.52	4.00	3.91	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1104/1365	3.60	4.56	4.08	3.96	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.51	4.16	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1255/1504	4.29	4.66	4.69	4.66	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.54	4.06	3.97	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1036/1425	4.25	4.63	4.41	4.36	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	848/1418	4.25	4.56	4.25	4.20	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	446/1416	4.67	4.65	4.26	4.21	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	860/1199	3.67	4.50	3.97	3.82	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	164/1312	4.80	4.36	4.00	3.69	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	299/1303	4.80	4.60	4.24	3.93	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	504/1299	4.60	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.24	4.01	3.80	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	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Title

Baltimore County

JUN 14, 2005

Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S

Spring 2005

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	416/1504	4.66	4.67	4.27	4.13	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1052/1503	4.43	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.80	4.28	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1453	4.58	4.66	4.21	4.11	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1246/1485	3.88	4.51	4.16	4.13	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1314/1504	4.10	4.66	4.69	4.66	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	338/1483	4.17	4.54	4.06	3.97	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1425	****	4.63	4.41	4.36	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1319/1426	4.00	4.92	4.69	4.56	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1418	****	4.56	4.25	4.20	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1416	****	4.65	4.26	4.21	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1199	****	4.50	3.97	3.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	26/ 40	4.67	4.92	4.53	4.52	4.67
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	23/ 35	4.67	4.71	4.49	4.65	4.67
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	28/ 36	4.33	4.73	4.60	4.48	4.33
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	16/ 20	4.50	4.94	4.24	4.92	4.50
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 16	5.00	4.60	4.51	5.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 178B 0201  
 Title  
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1062  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	2	5	4.71	306/1504	4.66	4.67	4.27	4.13	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	138/1503	4.43	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.80	4.28	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	440/1453	4.58	4.66	4.21	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.00	3.91	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1365	****	4.56	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	866/1485	3.88	4.51	4.16	4.13	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1411/1504	4.10	4.66	4.69	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1061/1483	4.17	4.54	4.06	3.97	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1312	****	4.36	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1303	****	4.60	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1299	****	4.46	4.25	3.94	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	4.67	4.92	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	4.67	4.71	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	4.33	4.73	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	4.50	4.94	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	5.00	4.60	4.51	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 179B 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1063  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	962/1504	4.27	4.67	4.27	4.13	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1503	4.92	4.68	4.20	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1290	4.76	4.80	4.28	4.19	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1453	4.62	4.66	4.21	4.11	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	4.50	4.52	4.00	3.91	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1365	****	4.56	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1485	4.83	4.51	4.16	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1030/1504	4.47	4.66	4.69	4.66	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	700/1483	4.38	4.54	4.06	3.97	4.20

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: MUSC 179B 0201  
 Title  
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1064  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	788/1504	4.27	4.67	4.27	4.13	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	151/1503	4.92	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	290/1290	4.76	4.80	4.28	4.19	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	363/1453	4.62	4.66	4.21	4.11	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	320/1421	4.50	4.52	4.00	3.91	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1365	****	4.56	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	290/1485	4.83	4.51	4.16	4.13	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	1221/1504	4.47	4.66	4.69	4.66	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	298/1483	4.38	4.54	4.06	3.97	4.56
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.56	4.25	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	255/1416	4.80	4.65	4.26	4.21	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1199	****	4.50	3.97	3.82	****
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.36	4.00	3.69	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.60	4.24	3.93	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	3.94	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	3.80	****
-----														
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.92	4.53	4.52	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.73	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	4.94	4.24	4.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	1	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	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0101  
 Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS  
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1065  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	725/1504	4.44	4.67	4.27	4.13	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	12	4.39	678/1503	4.70	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	15	4.61	400/1290	4.85	4.80	4.28	4.19	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	440/1453	4.77	4.66	4.21	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	1	4	7	4.00	745/1421	4.14	4.52	4.00	3.91	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1153/1365	4.37	4.56	4.08	3.96	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	1	11	4.24	784/1485	4.36	4.51	4.16	4.13	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	928/1504	4.86	4.66	4.69	4.66	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	11	3	4.13	762/1483	4.22	4.54	4.06	3.97	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	712/1425	4.66	4.63	4.41	4.36	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	940/1426	4.80	4.92	4.69	4.56	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	669/1418	4.63	4.56	4.25	4.20	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	776/1416	4.55	4.65	4.26	4.21	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	159/1199	4.48	4.50	3.97	3.82	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	4	2	3	3.36	1062/1312	4.00	4.36	4.00	3.69	3.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	764/1303	4.27	4.60	4.24	3.93	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	996/1299	4.03	4.46	4.25	3.94	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	648/ 758	3.25	4.24	4.01	3.80	3.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	5.00	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	4.00	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	3.00	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	3.00	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	3.00	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	1.00	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	3.00	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.92	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	35	****	4.71	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	4.73	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	4.94	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	4.60	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0101  
 Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS  
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1065  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	18	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0201  
 Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS  
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1066  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3								4	5
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	851/1504	4.44	4.67	4.27	4.13	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	190/1503	4.70	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	105/1290	4.85	4.80	4.28	4.19	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	152/1453	4.77	4.66	4.21	4.11	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	524/1421	4.14	4.52	4.00	3.91	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	223/1365	4.37	4.56	4.08	3.96	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	190/1485	4.36	4.51	4.16	4.13	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	4.86	4.66	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	810/1483	4.22	4.54	4.06	3.97	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	700/1425	4.66	4.63	4.41	4.36	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	773/1426	4.80	4.92	4.69	4.56	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	342/1418	4.63	4.56	4.25	4.20	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	727/1416	4.55	4.65	4.26	4.21	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	320/1199	4.48	4.50	3.97	3.82	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	592/1312	4.00	4.36	4.00	3.69	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	563/1303	4.27	4.60	4.24	3.93	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	922/1299	4.03	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	3.25	4.24	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0301  
 Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS  
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1067  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	376/1504	4.44	4.67	4.27	4.13	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	85/1503	4.70	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1290	4.85	4.80	4.28	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1453	4.77	4.66	4.21	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	660/1421	4.14	4.52	4.00	3.91	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1365	4.37	4.56	4.08	3.96	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	953/1485	4.36	4.51	4.16	4.13	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	743/1504	4.86	4.66	4.69	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	409/1483	4.22	4.54	4.06	3.97	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	270/1425	4.66	4.63	4.41	4.36	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	401/1426	4.80	4.92	4.69	4.56	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	247/1418	4.63	4.56	4.25	4.20	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	209/1416	4.55	4.65	4.26	4.21	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	455/1199	4.48	4.50	3.97	3.82	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	465/1312	4.00	4.36	4.00	3.69	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	910/1303	4.27	4.60	4.24	3.93	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	834/1299	4.03	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 758	3.25	4.24	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	14	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 181 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE PIANO CLA  
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1068  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.67	4.27	4.13	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	631/1453	4.38	4.66	4.21	4.11	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	890/1485	4.14	4.51	4.16	4.13	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	602/1483	4.29	4.54	4.06	3.97	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	665/1425	4.60	4.63	4.41	4.36	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1418	4.80	4.56	4.25	4.20	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1145/1416	3.80	4.65	4.26	4.21	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.50	3.97	3.82	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1247/1312	2.50	4.36	4.00	3.69	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.60	4.24	3.93	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1272/1299	2.00	4.46	4.25	3.94	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 183 0101  
 Title INTERM STRING CLASS  
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1069  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean						Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.80	4.28	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.00	3.91	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.56	4.08	3.96	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.51	4.16	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.66	4.69	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.54	4.06	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.56	4.25	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.21	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.50	3.97	3.82	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.36	4.00	3.69	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.60	4.24	3.93	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	3.94	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.92	4.53	4.52	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.71	4.49	4.65	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.73	4.60	4.48	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	4.94	4.24	4.92	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 16	5.00	4.60	4.51	5.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: MUSC 187 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE BRASS CLA  
 Instructor: CAMERON, WAYNE  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1070  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	3.97	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	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 189 0101  
 Title GUITAR CLASS  
 Instructor: KING, TROY  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1071  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	183/1504	4.83	4.67	4.27	4.13	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.80	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.66	4.21	4.11	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	212/1421	4.67	4.52	4.00	3.91	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1365	****	4.56	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1387/1485	3.00	4.51	4.16	4.13	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1337/1504	4.17	4.66	4.69	4.66	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	700/1483	4.20	4.54	4.06	3.97	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.63	4.41	4.36	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.56	4.25	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	324/1416	4.75	4.65	4.26	4.21	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	429/1199	4.33	4.50	3.97	3.82	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.36	4.00	3.69	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.60	4.24	3.93	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	922/1299	4.00	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	3.80	****

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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	6	Non-major	3
84-150	3	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	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 190A 0101  
 Title PIANO  
 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1072  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.51	4.16	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.66	4.69	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	3.97	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1367/1425	3.00	4.63	4.41	4.36	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.56	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.36	4.00	3.69	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.60	4.24	3.93	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	3.94	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.24	4.01	3.80	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 40	4.50	4.92	4.53	4.52	4.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.71	4.49	4.65	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	29/ 36	4.00	4.73	4.60	4.48	4.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	4.94	4.24	4.92	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1073  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.16	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.11	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	983/1504	4.67	4.66	4.69	4.66	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	3.97	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	3	Non-major	2
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 190G 0101  
 Title CLASSICAL GUITAR  
 Instructor: KING, TROY  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1074  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.67	4.27	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	3.97	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190I 0101  
 Title FLUTE  
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1075  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.54	4.06	3.97	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.92	4.53	4.52	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.71	4.49	4.65	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.73	4.60	4.48	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
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 190K 0101  
 Title CLARINET  
 Instructor: SPITTEL, RICHA  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1076  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.80	4.28	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.51	4.16	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	3.97	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.56	4.25	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.21	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190M 0101  
 Title BASSOON  
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1077  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.16	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.11	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1087/1504	4.50	4.66	4.69	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1233/1483	3.50	4.54	4.06	3.97	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
84-150	2	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 190N 0101  
 Title TRUMPET  
 Instructor: CAMERON, WAYNE  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1078  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	3.97	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	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190V 0101  
 Title ELECTRIC BASS  
 Instructor: KEMP, WILLIAM M  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1079  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.80	4.28	4.19	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.51	4.16	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	3.97	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	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 191 0101  
 Title RECITAL PREPARATION  
 Instructor: DUSMAN, LINDA J  
 Enrollment: 57  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1080  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	962/1504	4.60	4.67	4.27	4.13	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	380/1503	4.30	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.80	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	349/1485	4.60	4.51	4.16	4.13	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	891/1504	4.88	4.66	4.69	4.66	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.54	4.06	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1278/1425	4.33	4.63	4.41	4.36	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1013/1418	4.50	4.56	4.25	4.20	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.21	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	5.00	4.50	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.36	4.00	3.69	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.60	4.24	3.93	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	3.94	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	3.80	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.64	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 191 0201  
 Title RECITAL PREPARATION  
 Instructor: DUSMAN, LINDA J  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1081  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	0	1	5.00	1/1504	4.60	4.67	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1052/1503	4.30	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	4.88	4.66	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.54	4.06	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	4.33	4.63	4.41	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	4.50	4.56	4.25	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.21	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.50	3.97	3.82	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.36	4.00	3.69	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.60	4.24	3.93	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	3.94	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1082  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.80	4.28	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.00	3.91	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.56	4.08	3.96	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.51	4.16	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	3.97	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.56	4.25	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.21	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.36	4.00	3.69	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.60	4.24	3.93	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	3.94	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193I 0101  
 Title FLUTE  
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1083  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.66	4.69	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.54	4.06	3.97	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193Q 0101  
 Title SAXOPHONE  
 Instructor: NEVIUS, SHEILA  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1084  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.80	4.28	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.00	3.91	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.56	4.08	3.96	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.51	4.16	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.66	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.92	4.53	4.52	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.71	4.49	4.65	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.73	4.60	4.48	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	4.94	4.24	4.92	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 16	5.00	4.60	4.51	5.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 193V 0101  
 Title ELECTRIC BASS  
 Instructor: KEMP, WILLIAM M  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1085  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	3.97	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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



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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1086  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.66	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.56	4.25	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.21	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.50	3.97	3.82	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.36	4.00	3.69	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.60	4.24	3.93	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	3.94	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.92	4.53	4.52	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.71	4.49	4.65	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.73	4.60	4.48	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	4.94	4.24	4.92	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193Y 0101  
 Title SAX IMPROV  
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1087  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.80	4.28	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.00	3.91	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.56	4.08	3.96	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.51	4.16	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	3.97	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	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 211 0101  
 Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB IV  
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1088  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1	11	4.53	509/1504	4.53	4.67	4.27	4.26	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.68	4.20	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	173/1290	4.85	4.80	4.28	4.27	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	240/1453	4.69	4.66	4.21	4.20	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.00	3.90	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	223/1365	4.60	4.56	4.08	4.00	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	648/1485	4.36	4.51	4.16	4.15	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	1207/1504	4.36	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.54	4.06	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	179/1425	4.90	4.63	4.41	4.40	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	738/1426	4.80	4.92	4.69	4.71	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	450/1418	4.60	4.56	4.25	4.22	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	525/1416	4.60	4.65	4.26	4.24	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.50	3.97	3.95	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	592/1312	4.25	4.36	4.00	3.98	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	227/1303	4.88	4.60	4.24	4.23	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	883/1299	4.13	4.46	4.25	4.21	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	273/ 758	4.33	4.24	4.01	3.89	4.33
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.00	4.35	4.30	****

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	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 214 0101  
 Title HIST JAZZ: ORIGINS-PRE  
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM  
 Enrollment: 73  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1089  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	2	2	6	8	21	4.13	1029/1504	4.13	4.67	4.27	4.26	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	3	8	10	17	4.08	1008/1503	4.08	4.68	4.20	4.18	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	1	6	9	22	4.28	758/1290	4.28	4.80	4.28	4.27	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	27	2	0	3	3	4	3.58	1258/1453	3.58	4.66	4.21	4.20	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	3	7	13	13	3.70	991/1421	3.70	4.52	4.00	3.90	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	32	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	****/1365	****	4.56	4.08	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	3	11	23	4.41	577/1485	4.41	4.51	4.16	4.15	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	31	9	4.22	1294/1504	4.23	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	4	11	12	6	3.61	1197/1483	3.61	4.54	4.06	4.02	3.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	10	19	10	3.95	1194/1425	3.95	4.63	4.41	4.40	3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	1	36	4.82	690/1426	4.82	4.92	4.69	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	4	7	9	19	4.10	981/1418	4.10	4.56	4.25	4.22	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	4	14	19	4.28	845/1416	4.28	4.65	4.26	4.24	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	2	2	6	6	19	4.09	607/1199	4.09	4.50	3.97	3.95	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	4	3	4	5	5	3.19	1110/1312	3.19	4.36	4.00	3.98	3.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	2	2	5	4	8	3.67	1076/1303	3.67	4.60	4.24	4.23	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	1	5	4	10	4.00	922/1299	4.00	4.46	4.25	4.21	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	20	17	0	2	0	3	0	3.20	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 233	****	5.00	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 244	****	4.00	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	3.00	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 70	****	3.00	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 67	****	3.00	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 56	****	1.00	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	3.00	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.92	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/	35	****	4.71	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/	36	****	4.73	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/	20	****	4.94	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/	16	****	4.60	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: MUSC 214 0101  
 Title HIST JAZZ: ORIGINS-PRE  
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM  
 Enrollment: 73  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1089  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	11	Under-grad	42	Non-major	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 217 0101  
 Title ROCK & RELATED MUSIC  
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH  
 Enrollment: 142  
 Questionnaires: 66

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1090  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1	0	0	1	3	11	50	4.69	327/1504	4.69	4.67	4.27	4.26	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	7	17	36	4.28	827/1503	4.28	4.68	4.20	4.18	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	5	2	10	46	4.43	601/1290	4.43	4.80	4.28	4.27	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	57	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	****/1453	****	4.66	4.21	4.20	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	57	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	****/1421	****	4.52	4.00	3.90	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	61	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1365	****	4.56	4.08	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	4	4	54	4.70	251/1485	4.70	4.51	4.16	4.15	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	61	4.95	329/1504	4.95	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	0	2	6	27	19	4.17	731/1483	4.17	4.54	4.06	4.02	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	57	4.85	270/1425	4.85	4.63	4.41	4.40	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	62	4.94	351/1426	4.94	4.92	4.69	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	10	50	4.70	331/1418	4.70	4.56	4.25	4.22	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	5	55	4.80	268/1416	4.80	4.65	4.26	4.24	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	1	4	11	44	4.63	195/1199	4.63	4.50	3.97	3.95	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	41	0	6	4	4	4	7	3.08	1134/1312	3.08	4.36	4.00	3.98	3.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	41	0	6	2	6	5	6	3.12	1188/1303	3.12	4.60	4.24	4.23	3.12
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	41	0	4	4	3	6	8	3.40	1140/1299	3.40	4.46	4.25	4.21	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	41	21	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	65	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	4.00	4.09	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	65	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	65	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	1.00	4.23	4.24	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.92	4.53	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.71	4.49	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99 0	A 25	Required for Majors	28
28-55	10	1.00-1.99 1	B 21		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 8	C 10	General	28
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 14	D 1		Under-grad 66
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 16	F 1	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 4		

Course-Section: MUSC 219 0101  
 Title STUDIO RECORDING  
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1091  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	509/1504	4.54	4.67	4.27	4.26	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	795/1503	4.31	4.68	4.20	4.18	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	800/1290	4.23	4.80	4.28	4.27	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	501/1453	4.46	4.66	4.21	4.20	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.52	4.00	3.90	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	581/1365	4.25	4.56	4.08	4.00	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.51	4.16	4.15	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	1221/1504	4.33	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	397/1483	4.45	4.54	4.06	4.02	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	1050/1425	4.23	4.63	4.41	4.40	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1036/1426	4.62	4.92	4.69	4.71	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	939/1418	4.15	4.56	4.25	4.22	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	8	4.23	887/1416	4.23	4.65	4.26	4.24	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	207/1199	4.62	4.50	3.97	3.95	4.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1312	****	4.36	4.00	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1303	****	4.60	4.24	4.23	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1299	****	4.46	4.25	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: MUSC 220 0101  
 Title INTRO TO PERCUSSION EN  
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1092  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1	0	4	4.17	991/1504	4.17	4.67	4.27	4.26	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	1168/1503	3.83	4.68	4.20	4.18	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.80	4.28	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.20	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1017/1421	3.67	4.52	4.00	3.90	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	420/1365	4.40	4.56	4.08	4.00	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	670/1485	4.33	4.51	4.16	4.15	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1093/1483	3.80	4.54	4.06	4.02	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1257/1425	3.75	4.63	4.41	4.40	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	825/1426	4.75	4.92	4.69	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1163/1418	3.75	4.56	4.25	4.22	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.65	4.26	4.24	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	****	4.50	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	902/1312	3.75	4.36	4.00	3.98	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1166/1299	3.25	4.46	4.25	4.21	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.24	4.01	3.89	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	5.00	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.00	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	3.00	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.00	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	3.00	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	1.00	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.00	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.92	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	4.71	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	4.73	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	4.94	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	4.60	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: MUSC 220 0101  
 Title INTRO TO PERCUSSION EN  
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1092  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	6	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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 0101  
 Title THEORY IV:MUSIC WRITIN  
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1093  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	10	4.91	131/1504	4.91	4.67	4.27	4.26	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	106/1503	4.91	4.68	4.20	4.18	4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	131/1290	4.91	4.80	4.28	4.27	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	152/1453	4.82	4.66	4.21	4.20	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	212/1421	4.67	4.52	4.00	3.90	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	114/1365	4.80	4.56	4.08	4.00	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.51	4.16	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1064/1504	4.55	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	115/1483	4.82	4.54	4.06	4.02	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.56	4.25	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.50	3.97	3.95	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	297/1312	4.60	4.36	4.00	3.98	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.21	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	3.89	****

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	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 230 0101  
 Title MUSICS OF THE WORLD  
 Instructor: HUANG, YI-PING  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1094  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	725/1504	4.39	4.67	4.27	4.26	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	587/1503	4.44	4.68	4.20	4.18	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	839/1290	4.19	4.80	4.28	4.27	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	578/1453	4.41	4.66	4.21	4.20	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	614/1421	4.18	4.52	4.00	3.90	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	6	1	7	4.07	742/1365	4.07	4.56	4.08	4.00	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	339/1485	4.61	4.51	4.16	4.15	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	624/1483	4.27	4.54	4.06	4.02	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	209/1425	4.88	4.63	4.41	4.40	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	247/1418	4.76	4.56	4.25	4.22	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	544/1416	4.59	4.65	4.26	4.24	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	154/1199	4.71	4.50	3.97	3.95	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	330/1312	4.56	4.36	4.00	3.98	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	535/1303	4.56	4.60	4.24	4.23	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.21	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	132/ 758	4.67	4.24	4.01	3.89	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 301 0101  
 Title CHAMBERS PLAYERS  
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1095  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	239/1504	4.77	4.67	4.27	4.27	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	106/1503	4.90	4.68	4.20	4.22	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	440/1290	4.57	4.80	4.28	4.31	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	215/1453	4.73	4.66	4.21	4.23	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	320/1421	4.50	4.52	4.00	4.01	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1365	****	4.56	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	8	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	170/1485	4.79	4.51	4.16	4.17	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	1006/1504	4.64	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	167/1483	4.81	4.54	4.06	4.08	4.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1425	****	4.63	4.41	4.43	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1426	****	4.92	4.69	4.71	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1418	****	4.56	4.25	4.26	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1416	****	4.65	4.26	4.27	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1199	****	4.50	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	530/1312	4.33	4.36	4.00	4.09	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.92	4.53	4.74	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.73	4.60	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 19	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 6	Under-grad 22 Non-major 6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 301 0101  
 Title CHAMBERS PLAYERS  
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1096  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	239/1504	4.77	4.67	4.27	4.27	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	106/1503	4.90	4.68	4.20	4.22	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	440/1290	4.57	4.80	4.28	4.31	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	215/1453	4.73	4.66	4.21	4.23	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	320/1421	4.50	4.52	4.00	4.01	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1365	****	4.56	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	8	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	170/1485	4.79	4.51	4.16	4.17	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	1006/1504	4.64	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1483	4.81	4.54	4.06	4.08	4.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	530/1312	4.33	4.36	4.00	4.09	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.92	4.53	4.74	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.73	4.60	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 19	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	

Course-Section: MUSC 303 0101  
 Title MD CAMERATA--CHAMBER C  
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1097  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	3	16	4.62	406/1504	4.62	4.67	4.27	4.27	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	258/1503	4.71	4.68	4.20	4.22	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.80	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.00	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1365	****	4.56	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	14	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.51	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	12	7	4.30	1242/1504	4.30	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	250/1483	4.62	4.54	4.06	4.08	4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	853/1425	4.44	4.63	4.41	4.43	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	964/1418	4.13	4.56	4.25	4.26	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	871/1416	4.25	4.65	4.26	4.27	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1199	****	4.50	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1312	****	4.36	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1303	****	4.60	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1299	****	4.46	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	21	Non-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						



Course-Section: MUSC 304 0101  
 Title UMBC JUBILEE SINGERS  
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1098  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	7	11	4.08	1061/1504	4.08	4.67	4.27	4.27	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	15	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.68	4.20	4.22	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	20	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1290	****	4.80	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.66	4.21	4.23	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	22	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1421	****	4.52	4.00	4.01	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1365	****	4.56	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	1	1	2	6	13	4.26	750/1485	4.26	4.51	4.16	4.17	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	16	9	4.31	1242/1504	4.31	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	298/1483	4.56	4.54	4.06	4.08	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	1002/1425	4.30	4.63	4.41	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	342/1418	4.70	4.56	4.25	4.26	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	2	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.65	4.26	4.27	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	****	4.50	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	221/1312	4.71	4.36	4.00	4.09	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	19	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	4.00	4.09	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	1.00	4.23	4.13	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.92	4.53	4.74	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	17	Under-grad	26	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 307B 0101  
 Title JAZZ BIG BAND  
 Instructor: VILLANEUVA, JAR  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1099  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	2	5	4.20	962/1504	4.20	4.67	4.27	4.27	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	795/1503	4.30	4.68	4.20	4.22	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	711/1290	4.33	4.80	4.28	4.31	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1453	****	4.66	4.21	4.23	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.52	4.00	4.01	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	200/1485	4.75	4.51	4.16	4.17	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	1242/1504	4.30	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	298/1483	4.56	4.54	4.06	4.08	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.56	4.25	4.26	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1167/1416	3.75	4.65	4.26	4.27	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1199	****	4.50	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1312	****	4.36	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1303	****	4.60	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1299	****	4.46	4.25	4.30	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	10	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 307D 0101  
 Title FLUTE  
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1100  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	788/1504	4.33	4.67	4.27	4.27	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	357/1503	4.63	4.68	4.20	4.22	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1453	****	4.66	4.21	4.23	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1330/1485	3.33	4.51	4.16	4.17	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	983/1504	4.67	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	493/1483	4.38	4.54	4.06	4.08	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	420/1425	4.75	4.63	4.41	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.56	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	324/1416	4.75	4.65	4.26	4.27	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1199	****	4.50	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1312	****	4.36	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1303	****	4.60	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1299	****	4.46	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	2	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	1	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 307E 0101  
 Title AFRICAN/WORLD DRUMMING  
 Instructor: DOVE, BARRY  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1101  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	10	4.91	131/1504	4.91	4.67	4.27	4.27	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	346/1503	4.64	4.68	4.20	4.22	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1290	****	4.80	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1168/1453	3.80	4.66	4.21	4.23	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	7	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1387/1485	3.00	4.51	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1200/1504	4.36	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.54	4.06	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	665/1425	4.60	4.63	4.41	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	342/1418	4.70	4.56	4.25	4.26	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	407/1416	4.70	4.65	4.26	4.27	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.50	3.97	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	0	1	5	3.56	993/1312	3.56	4.36	4.00	4.09	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	535/1303	4.56	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	132/ 758	4.67	4.24	4.01	4.00	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
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	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 307F 0101  
 Title PERCUSSION  
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1102  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	357/1504	4.67	4.67	4.27	4.27	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	151/1503	4.83	4.68	4.20	4.22	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.80	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.52	4.00	4.01	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1365	****	4.56	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1485	4.80	4.51	4.16	4.17	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	983/1504	4.67	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	108/1483	4.83	4.54	4.06	4.08	4.83
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1425	****	4.63	4.41	4.43	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1426	****	4.92	4.69	4.71	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1418	****	4.56	4.25	4.26	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1416	****	4.65	4.26	4.27	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	****	4.50	3.97	4.02	****
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1312	****	4.36	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1303	****	4.60	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1299	****	4.46	4.25	4.30	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	3

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 307G 0101  
 Title COLLEGIUM  
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1103  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	7	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	138/1503	4.86	4.68	4.20	4.22	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	344/1290	4.67	4.80	4.28	4.31	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.00	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.56	4.08	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.51	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1087/1504	4.50	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	108/1483	4.83	4.54	4.06	4.08	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.56	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.50	3.97	4.02	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.36	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.24	4.01	4.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307I 0101  
 Title GUITAR  
 Instructor: KING, TROY  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1104  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	3	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.67	4.27	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.68	4.20	4.22	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.80	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.00	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.56	4.08	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.51	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	1274/1504	4.25	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.54	4.06	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	967/1426	4.67	4.92	4.69	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.56	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.50	3.97	4.02	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.36	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.24	4.01	4.00	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307J 0101  
 Title SAX QUARTET  
 Instructor: NEVIUS, SHEILA  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1105  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	Rank						
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.22	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.80	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.00	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.56	4.08	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.51	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.54	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.56	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.50	3.97	4.02	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.92	4.53	4.74	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.71	4.49	4.36	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.73	4.60	4.63	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	4.94	4.24	5.00	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 16	5.00	4.60	4.51	3.95	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant



Course-Section: MUSC 307K 0101  
 Title VOCAL ARTS ENSEMBLE  
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1106  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	7	4.88	153/1504	4.88	4.67	4.27	4.27	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	125/1503	4.88	4.68	4.20	4.22	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.80	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	158/1453	4.80	4.66	4.21	4.23	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.00	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.56	4.08	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1485	4.80	4.51	4.16	4.17	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1193/1504	4.38	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.56	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.50	3.97	4.02	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1312	****	4.36	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1303	****	4.60	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1299	****	4.46	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 308 0101  
 Title UMBC CONCERT BAND  
 Instructor: VILLANEUVA, JAR  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1107  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	864/1504	4.27	4.67	4.27	4.27	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	449/1503	4.55	4.68	4.20	4.22	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.80	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	479/1421	4.33	4.52	4.00	4.01	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1365	****	4.56	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.51	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	830/1504	4.80	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	211/1483	4.67	4.54	4.06	4.08	4.67
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	572/1425	4.67	4.63	4.41	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	667/1426	4.83	4.92	4.69	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	905/1418	4.20	4.56	4.25	4.26	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	255/1416	4.80	4.65	4.26	4.27	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	****	4.50	3.97	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	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 312 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: SMITH, STUART S  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1108  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1304/1503	3.50	4.68	4.20	4.22	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.66	4.21	4.23	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.00	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.56	4.08	4.08	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.51	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1308/1425	3.50	4.63	4.41	4.43	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1250/1418	3.50	4.56	4.25	4.26	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.65	4.26	4.27	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	919/1199	3.50	4.50	3.97	4.02	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.36	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	680/ 758	3.00	4.24	4.01	4.00	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.12	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	145/ 244	4.00	4.00	4.09	4.20	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	219/ 227	3.00	3.00	4.40	4.46	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.84	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	63/ 70	3.00	3.00	4.35	4.24	3.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	60/ 67	3.00	3.00	4.34	3.98	3.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	56/ 56	1.00	1.00	4.23	4.13	1.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.77	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	43/ 47	3.00	3.00	4.29	4.14	3.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	37/ 39	3.00	3.00	4.44	4.47	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.92	4.53	4.74	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	31/ 35	3.00	4.71	4.49	4.36	3.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/ 36	4.00	4.73	4.60	4.63	4.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	4.94	4.24	5.00	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	15/ 16	3.00	4.60	4.51	3.95	3.00

Course-Section: MUSC 312 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: SMITH, STUART S  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1108  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 313 0101  
 Title ADVANCED GAMELAN  
 Instructor: BECK, GINA C  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1109  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	357/1504	4.67	4.67	4.27	4.27	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.22	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1290	****	4.80	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1453	****	4.66	4.21	4.23	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.52	4.00	4.01	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1365	****	4.56	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	200/1485	4.75	4.51	4.16	4.17	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	409/1483	4.44	4.54	4.06	4.08	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1425	****	4.63	4.41	4.43	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1426	****	4.92	4.69	4.71	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1416	****	4.65	4.26	4.27	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1312	****	4.36	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1303	****	4.60	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1299	****	4.46	4.25	4.30	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors		1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General		3	Under-grad	9	Non-major	4
84-150	2	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		3				
				?	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 319 0101  
 Title RECORDING PRACTICUM II  
 Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1110  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.68	4.20	4.22	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.80	4.28	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.66	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1113/1421	3.50	4.52	4.00	4.01	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.51	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.54	4.06	4.08	4.50
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1367/1425	3.00	4.63	4.41	4.43	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.56	4.25	4.26	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.50	3.97	4.02	4.50
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.36	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.30	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 322 0101  
 Title MUSIC HISTORY II  
 Instructor: COX, FRANKLIN  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1111  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	2	2	2	3	10	3.89	1199/1504	3.89	4.67	4.27	4.27	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	751/1503	4.33	4.68	4.20	4.22	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.80	4.28	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	5	12	4.37	643/1453	4.37	4.66	4.21	4.23	4.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	4	9	3.89	871/1421	3.89	4.52	4.00	4.01	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	8	8	4.16	681/1365	4.16	4.56	4.08	4.08	4.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	1	5	9	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.51	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1006/1504	4.63	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	457/1483	4.40	4.54	4.06	4.08	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	474/1425	4.73	4.63	4.41	4.43	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	502/1426	4.91	4.92	4.69	4.71	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	745/1418	4.36	4.56	4.25	4.26	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	854/1416	4.27	4.65	4.26	4.27	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	519/1199	4.22	4.50	3.97	4.02	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.36	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.24	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	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	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 362 0101  
 Title ARTS IN EDUCATION  
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1112  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1247/1503	3.67	4.68	4.20	4.22	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1017/1421	3.67	4.52	4.00	4.01	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.56	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1284/1485	3.50	4.51	4.16	4.17	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.54	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.56	4.25	4.26	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.65	4.26	4.27	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	636/1199	4.00	4.50	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	922/1299	4.00	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: MUSC 385 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE CONDUCTIN  
 Instructor: CAMERON, WAYNE  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1113  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.67	4.27	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.22	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.80	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.00	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.56	4.08	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.51	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1480/1504	3.50	4.66	4.69	4.65	3.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.54	4.06	4.08	4.00
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.63	4.41	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.56	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.65	4.26	4.27	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.50	3.97	4.02	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 390I 0101  
 Title FLUTE  
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1114  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.66	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.00	4.01	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.51	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.56	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1197/1199	1.00	4.50	3.97	4.02	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.36	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.30	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390P 0101  
 Title TROMBONE  
 Instructor: BANGE, DARREN  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1115  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1092/1504	4.00	4.67	4.27	4.27	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.23	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.92	4.53	4.74	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.73	4.60	4.63	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	4.94	4.24	5.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 390Q 0101  
 Title SAXOPHONE  
 Instructor: NEVIUS, SHEILA  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1116  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.22	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.80	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.00	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.56	4.08	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.51	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.54	4.06	4.08	4.00
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.56	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.50	3.97	4.02	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390V 0101  
 Title ELECTRIC BASS  
 Instructor: KEMP, WILLIAM M  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1117  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1453/1504	3.00	4.67	4.27	4.27	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1499/1503	1.00	4.68	4.20	4.22	1.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1453/1453	1.00	4.66	4.21	4.23	1.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1416/1418	1.00	4.56	4.25	4.26	1.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1324/1416	3.00	4.65	4.26	4.27	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.50	3.97	4.02	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.36	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.30	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390W 0101  
 Title UPRIGHT BASS  
 Instructor: BALDWIN, THOMAS  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1118  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.22	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.51	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	4.08	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390X 0101  
 Title SENIOR PROJECT  
 Instructor: STAFF  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1119  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.23	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1087/1504	4.50	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	4.08	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.92	4.53	4.74	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.73	4.60	4.63	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 400 0101  
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS  
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1120  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.80	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.00	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.56	4.08	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.51	4.16	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	4.89	4.66	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	4.56	4.54	4.06	4.11	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: MUSC 400 0201  
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS  
 Instructor: STAFF  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1121  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.00	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.56	4.08	4.09	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	983/1504	4.89	4.66	4.69	4.73	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1170/1483	4.56	4.54	4.06	4.11	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.56	4.25	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.26	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.50	3.97	4.05	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.36	4.00	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.38	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 400 0301  
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS  
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1122  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.00	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.56	4.08	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.51	4.16	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	4.89	4.66	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	4.56	4.54	4.06	4.11	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.56	4.25	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.26	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.50	3.97	4.05	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.36	4.00	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.38	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 428 0101  
 Title ELECTRONIC MUSIC  
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA I.  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1123  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.68	4.20	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.80	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.00	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.56	4.08	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.51	4.16	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	4.11	5.00
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.63	4.41	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.56	4.25	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.26	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.50	3.97	4.05	5.00
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	364/1312	4.50	4.36	4.00	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.38	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 480 0101  
 Title TOPICS IN MUSC/ART/SOC  
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1124  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.80	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	320/1421	4.50	4.52	4.00	4.02	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	211/1365	4.63	4.56	4.08	4.09	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	200/1485	4.75	4.51	4.16	4.14	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1014/1504	4.63	4.66	4.69	4.73	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	94/1483	4.88	4.54	4.06	4.11	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	825/1426	4.75	4.92	4.69	4.72	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1418	4.75	4.56	4.25	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.65	4.26	4.26	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	129/1199	4.75	4.50	3.97	4.05	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.36	4.00	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	580/ 758	3.50	4.24	4.01	4.17	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 492 0101  
 Title SENIOR PROJECT  
 Instructor: STAFF  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1125  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.00	4.02	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.51	4.16	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	983/1504	4.67	4.66	4.69	4.73	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	4.11	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 691 8010  
 Title AMERICAN MUSIC  
 Instructor: STAFF  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1126  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.80	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.52	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.56	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.51	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.56	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.38	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.36	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.60	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.24	4.01	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 0	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 2 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 694 8010  
 Title SOLO PERFORMANCE STUDY  
 Instructor: STAFF  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1127  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.68	4.20	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.80	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.66	4.21	4.34	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.51	4.16	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.66	4.69	4.79	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.54	4.06	4.20	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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