

## Student Evaluations for “Listening to Films”

### Sources of Evaluation Summary Data & Comments

- 3 course iterations over 3 years (2006-2008)
- DePaul University
- 33 students (27 undergraduate & 6 graduate – music majors and Honors students)

### Summary Data

- |  |             |
|--|-------------|
| • Knowledge of the material:                                 | 4.79 / 5.00 |
| • Student challenge and motivation                           | 4.51 / 5.00 |
| • Material/assignment quality, preparation, and presentation | 4.19 / 5.00 |
| • Communication / helpfulness                                | 4.51 / 5.00 |
| • Overall rating/usefulness of course                        | 4.72 / 5.00 |
| • Overall rating of instructor                               | 4.75 / 5.00 |

### Summary Comments

#### Positive

- “The best class I have had so far in my graduate studies.”
- “Why doesn’t this guy teach more classes? This is probably the best course I’ve taken in the music school.”
- “Pantelis is a challenging and focused Prof. Really knows & loves his stuff & teaches well.”
- “Course and professor were immensely interesting and informative.”
- “Knowledgeable, organized, willing to go the extra mile to make sure we understand the material.”
- “He has an immense wealth of knowledge and is very enthusiastic to share as much of it as possible.”
- “Very knowledgeable, great lecturer, personable.”
- “Very enjoyable and interesting. Gave me a great appreciation for the art of music.”
- “Organized and well planned lessons. Assignments were very appropriate.”
- “The weekly writing assignments were highly influential and gave the class direction.”
- “Challenging but worth it. A lot of work and a lot of learning in return.”
- “I thought this was a challenging but very rewarding course.”
- “The theoretical concepts of how we understand music will be very helpful in my career.”
- “Multi-faceted background allows him to address multiple dimensions of topics covered.”
- “Normally I don’t like group projects but the weekly online discussions were very thought-provoking and really encouraged me to do my best work.”
- “I really liked the small group discussion on Blackboard because it really shaped my own understanding of the musical conventions & techniques used in films... It has helped me become a stronger writer and also strengthened my analytical skills.”
- “The online group assignments because you had to evaluate others & yourself, as well as explain your own perspective thoroughly.”
- “It has tremendously broadened my understanding of films, film music, and music in general.”

## **Negative**

- “Sometimes too “smart” – the class moves at a very fast pace and sometimes he could step back a bit.”
- “I remember why I never thought about being a music major.”
- “Not thrilling but not horrible either.”
- “Group-work online was unexpected and did not work out well.”
- “It wasn’t what I expected. Much more work & less art than I had imagined. I guess I didn’t expect the technical analysis.”
- “I didn’t really enjoy it. I felt that because I lacked formal musical training of any kind I couldn’t really participate.”

## **Course Design Award Blackboard Greenhouse Exemplary Course Program**

### **2007 Award Finalist**

Course: “Listening to Films: Film music’s role in meaning construction within the cinematic experience.”

The course was a finalist at the Blackboard Greenhouse Exemplary Course Award ([www.blackboard.com/greenhouse](http://www.blackboard.com/greenhouse)). This is an annual, National, competitive award with >100 online, hybrid, or web-enhanced Blackboard courses considered each year. The course did not receive the top 2007 award because it did not include sufficient accessibility features for students with disabilities.

### **Selected Comments by the 3 Reviewers**

“This is one of the best examples of how a Blackboard site can be used effectively to supplement a classroom course I have ever seen. The instructor obviously has not just a profound grasp of his subject matter, but also of how to teach. The site is a pleasure to look at, easy to navigate, content-rich, and creates a meaningful online learning and collaborating environment for the students.”

“The care that went into creating and developing this site is to be commended. It is not often a teacher will go these extra 100 miles to make the learning process so dynamic. It was a pleasure, and a learning experience, exploring and evaluating the site. I took away from it ideas that I will definitely incorporate into my own teaching.”

“The course contains exemplary content and well aligned goals, assessments and activities. The interweaving of supporting theoretical material (the pattern recognition examples under gestalt principles/rules in Week 10, for example) with film clips and articles, both scholarly and trade, provide an effective and satisfying experience.”

“Your ability to present complex, specialized knowledge clearly and effectively to undergraduates through the online medium is a rare gift. Your commitment to student learning through your blended course sets the bar high for the rest of us.”

## **Student Evaluations for “Music Education Research Literature and Methods”**

### **Sources of Evaluation Summary Data & Comments**

- 2 course iterations over 2 years (2007-2008)
- DePaul University
- 7 graduate students (music education majors)

### **Summary Data**

- |  |             |
|--|-------------|
| • Knowledge of the material:                                 | 4.87 / 5.00 |
| • Student challenge and motivation                           | 4.71 / 5.00 |
| • Material/assignment quality, preparation, and presentation | 4.52 / 5.00 |
| • Communication / helpfulness                                | 4.57 / 5.00 |
| • Overall rating/usefulness of course                        | 3.72 / 5.00 |
| • Overall rating of instructor                               | 4.29 / 5.00 |

### **Summary Comments**

#### **Positive**

- “Great knowledge of research and technology. Gets back to you on email very quickly.”
- “Pantelis is an incredibly intelligent professor. I think he knows something about every research topic ever!”
- “Very knowledgeable about research design and techniques.”
- “Instructor limitations: None.”
- “Really challenged me to think.”
- “I liked the online setting because it let me work at my own pace.”
- “The online discussion forums were very productive.”

#### **Negative**

- “It was WAY too much work for a two credit hours course.”
- “The course work seemed a little overwhelming.”

## **Student Evaluations for “Introduction to Music Research Methods”**

### **Sources of Evaluation Summary Data & Comments**

- 3 course iterations over 4 years (2003-2006)
- DePaul University
- 56 graduate students (music performance majors)

### **Summary Data**

- |  |             |
|--|-------------|
| • Knowledge of the material:                                 | 4.86 / 5.00 |
| • Student challenge and motivation                           | 4.31 / 5.00 |
| • Material/assignment quality, preparation, and presentation | 3.58 / 5.00 |
| • Communication / helpfulness                                | 3.93 / 5.00 |
| • Overall rating/usefulness of course                        | 3.52 / 5.00 |
| • Overall rating of instructor                               | 3.84 / 5.00 |

### **Summary Comments**

#### **Positive**

- “Instructor stimulates fascinating discussions and shows enthusiasm for the material. He encourages active participation in the class. He is open to suggestions from students. This is the best class I’ve had at DePaul.”
- “I love what I learned.”
- “He is very motivated and knowledgeable and extremely interested in his students’ ideas and needs as well as in the subject matter he teaches.”
- “The instructor has a master’s grasp of the field and the proper techniques of research and writing.”
- “Extensive knowledge of the subject matter and great enthusiasm about the class.”
- “Encourages us to converse intellectually. Challenges us to apply critical thinking to general aspects of daily and musical life. Thought-provoking.”
- “He’s incredibly knowledgeable and very clear on his instructions. Also, the course materials are obviously very carefully chosen.”
- “Great class, very knowledgeable instructor. Enjoyed the class greatly, made us challenge literature & ideas, forced us to actually think about music & how it is portrayed. Could apply this to all aspects of life.”
- “Very knowledgeable and intelligent. Interesting discussions.”
- “Strength: Explaining the material and cultivating discussion and interest. Also, prep. for the final project was great.”
- “Strength: Preparation of materials, attention to grading and providing feedback on student work.”
- “Strength: To provoke discussion and challenge the class in a variety of topics.”
- “Strength: Discussions and some incredibly interesting philosophical facts and statements about music in general.”
- “Strength: A thorough background in Research. An awareness of a very wide range of musical topics. The fact that the course was very demanding and challenging made it possible to take a lot from it.”

## Negative

- “Sometimes I felt that the discussion moved a little too quickly.”
- “Sometimes students don’t get to fully express their ideas because Dr. Vassilakis will finish their points impatiently(?)”
- “I find it frustrating that I had to take time from practicing to work for a class that I did not feel helped me improve in any noticeable way.”
- “He does not realize the amount of work he requires is too much for 2 credits.”
- “There is way too much extra material outside the textbook to read. It was thorough but very overwhelming.”
- “He forgets we are only music students, not research majors.”
- “The instructor’s expectations are too high for this intro to research class. Many of these students did not even go to a university for undergrad.”
- “Lack of respect for students’ questions – almost every question was argued with instead of listened to. Digression. Always.”
- “Weakness: Time-management, focus, organization.”
- “Extremely intelligent. I think it was hard for him to focus in a way helpful to this kind of class.”

## **Student Evaluations**

### **for “Acoustical and Cognitive Aspects of Music Composition and Performance”**

#### **Sources of Evaluation Summary Data & Comments**

- 5 course iterations over 8 years (1998-2005)
- 2 institutions (UCLA x 4; DePaul University x 1)
- 117 undergraduate students (109 @ UCLA; 8 @ DePaul University)

#### **Summary Data**

- |  |             |
|--|-------------|
| • Knowledge of the material:                                 | 8.66 / 9.00 |
| • Student challenge and motivation                           | 8.39 / 9.00 |
| • Material/assignment quality, preparation, and presentation | 8.07 / 9.00 |
| • Communication / helpfulness                                | 8.27 / 9.00 |
| • Overall rating/usefulness of course                        | 7.76 / 9.00 |
| • Overall rating of instructor                               | 8.23 / 9.00 |

#### **Summary Comments**

##### **Positive**

- “This is undoubtedly the best instructor I’ve ever had at UCLA. He’s dedicated to the material on every level and is a magnificent teacher. I feel privileged to have been in his class.”
- “This was the most organized course I’ve taken in my 4 years at UCLA. For once I was thoroughly prepared for the exam.”
- “He is truly one of the hardest working instructors I’ve seen. He cares that we learn.”
- “Pantelis showed us heart and properly displayed that he could connect with the students on some intermediate focus of mind.”
- “He is very thorough & knows what he is talking about. I definitely learned a lot from him. He’s also very organized & cares about the individual learning of each student.”
- “He has very friendly demeanor which made being in this class fun. He was one of the best instructors I’ve ever had.”
- “I really enjoyed the class and had fun attending.”
- “Pantelis was one of the most helpful and concerned instructors I’ve had at UCLA. He really clarified and expanded upon materials.”
- “The best instructor ever.”
- “Awesome lecturer, good communication skills, and well organized.”
- “Very effective communicator and expanded on many interesting concepts.”
- “Very knowledgeable in subject matter, presents materials well.”
- “Pantelis is very knowledgeable, very patient and helpful.”
- “Knowledge of subject matter. Enthusiasm and passion for subject matter. Organization.”

## **Negative**

- “I think he maybe expects a little too much from the students – as far as time put into the class & level of understanding material that is very new to us.”
- “Expects students to be more knowledgeable in subject than they realistically can be.”
- “Sometimes hard to understand (verbal communication; speaks too fast).”
- “Moves too quickly”
- “Needs to explain technical stuff in more layman’s terms...tended to go overtime often.”
- “Weakness: keeping student interest/attention during long sessions.”

## **Student Evaluations for “Fieldwork and Laboratory Methods in Ethnomusicology”**

### **Sources of Evaluation Summary Data & Comments**

- 1 course iteration (2000)
- UCLA
- 14 graduate students (ethnomusicology majors)

### **Summary Data**

- |  |             |
|--|-------------|
| • Knowledge of the material:                                 | 8.85 / 9.00 |
| • Student challenge and motivation                           | 8.49 / 9.00 |
| • Material/assignment quality, preparation, and presentation | 7.77 / 9.00 |
| • Communication / helpfulness                                | 8.62 / 9.00 |
| • Overall rating/usefulness of course                        | 8.46 / 9.00 |
| • Overall rating of instructor                               | 8.39 / 9.00 |

### **Summary Comments**

#### **Positive**

- “Pantelis is an excellent teacher, has tremendous knowledge and skill and is friendly and helpful.”
- “Pantelis has an excellent command of the technological tools required for the development of modern ethnomusicological techniques. I learned much valuable information in this class. The information will help me develop lesson plans for web based educational endeavors.”
- “Great course. Very well needed component of the grad. Ethno program.”
- “Pantelis is a veritable encyclopedia of knowledge.”
- “I liked his manner of explanation – gets right to the gist of things without wasting words. I found the class highly useful and enjoyable overall.”
- “Considering the ambitious goals of the course to introduce students to so much information while only meeting once a week, the instructor was highly successful in providing thorough introductory knowledge. He is highly efficient and articulate and extraordinarily welcoming for help outside class.”

#### **Negative**

- “The time period of ten weeks seems to be short for the amount of information presented. It was WAY too much work for a two credit hours course.”
- “I found him to be a bit impatient with student questions and unnecessarily overbearing at times.”