Course-Section: THTR 100 0101 University of Maryla Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP Baltimore County Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID (Instr. A) Fall 2005

University of Maryland Page 1638
Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

1

Enrollment:	6	
Questionnaires:	5	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

I

?

0

0

								-	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_	-	Level	Sect
		Question	.s 		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did y	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1674	4.53	4.58	4.27	4.07	4.75
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	931/1674	4.00	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.25
3. Did t	he exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	575/1423	4.45	4.60	4.27	4.16	4.50
4. Did o	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	490/1609	4.20	4.40	4.22	4.05	4.50
5. Did a	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1049/1585	3.87	4.22	3.96	3.88	3.75
6. Did w	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1147/1535	3.72	4.12	4.08	3.89	3.75
7. Was t	he gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	866/1651	4.06	3.98	4.18	4.10	4.25
	-	was class cand			1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1203/1673		4.85	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	615/1656	4.28	4.41	4.07	3.96	4.67
		Lectur	е															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1144/1586	4.44	4.57	4.43	4.37	4.63
2. Did t	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1225/1585	4.68	4.80	4.69	4.60	4.75
3. Was l	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	935/1582	4.22	4.49	4.26	4.17	4.63
4. Did t	he lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1138/1575	4.19	4.58	4.27	4.17	4.25
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	489/1380	3.49	4.08	3.94	3.78	4.38
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	572/1520	3.88	4.00	4.01	3.76	4.33
2. Were	all stude:	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1024/1515	3.65	4.10	4.24	3.97	4.00
3. Did t	he instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	4.10	4.26	4.27	4.00	5.00
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	ssful		2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	4.00	4.35	3.94	3.73	****
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 2								_	_		_			
56-83						Ger	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	4
84-150						-						_						_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	ŗh	
				P 0		_							respons	es to k	e sign	nifican	ıt	

Other

Course-Section: THTR 100 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP Baltimore County Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID (Instr. B)

JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Page 1639

Enrollment:	6	
Questionnaires:	5	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1674	4.53	4.58	4.27	4.07	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	931/1674	4.00	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	575/1423	4.45	4.60	4.27	4.16	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	490/1609	4.20	4.40	4.22	4.05	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1049/1585	3.87	4.22	3.96	3.88	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1147/1535	3.72	4.12	4.08	3.89	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	866/1651	4.06	3.98	4.18	4.10	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1203/1673	4.56	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1656	4.28	4.41	4.07	3.96	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	4.44	4.57	4.43	4.37	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	4.68	4.80	4.69	4.60	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1582	4.22	4.49	4.26	4.17	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	692/1575	4.19	4.58	4.27	4.17	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1380	3.49	4.08	3.94	3.78	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	572/1520	3.88	4.00	4.01	3.76	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1024/1515	3.65	4.10	4.24	3.97	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	4.10	4.26	4.27	4.00	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	4.00	4.35	3.94	3.73	****
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 0		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	 S	1	Graduat	 e	 0	 Majo	 r	1

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	1	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	_		
				2	0						

Course-Section: THTR 100 0201

Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP

KAPLAN, DAVID

Instructor:

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1640 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	735/1674	4.53	4.58	4.27	4.07	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1465/1674	4.00	4.25	4.23	4.16	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1131/1423	4.45	4.60	4.27	4.16	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1511/1609	4.20	4.40	4.22	4.05	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1084/1585	3.87	4.22	3.96	3.88	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	0	3.14	1419/1535	3.72	4.12	4.08	3.89	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	988/1651	4.06	3.98	4.18	4.10	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	796/1673	4.56	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	955/1656		4.41		3.96	4.00
									,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1224/1586	4.44	4.57	4.43	4.37	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	4		1383/1585	4.68	4.80	4.69	4.60	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	3	_		1381/1582	4.22		4.26	4.17	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2			1355/1575	4.19		4.27	4.17	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	1	0			1359/1380	3.49	4.08		3.78	
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding		J	_	_		U	U	2.00	1339/1300	3.49	4.00	3.71	3.70	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	3 E0	1169/1520	3.88	4.00	4.01	3.76	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	1	0		1420/1515	3.65	4.10	4.24	3.70	3.00
	5	0	0	1	0	1	0			4.10			4.00	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5 5	1	0	1	0	0	0		1420/1511 ****/ 994			4.27 3.94	3.73	3.UU ****
4. Were special techniques successful	5	Τ	U	Т	U	U	U	2.00	***/ 994	4.00	4.35	3.94	3./3	
T all area harres														
Laboratory	_	0	_	0	0	_	_	4 00	170 / 065	4 1 7	4 20	4 00	2 07	4 00
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	178/ 265	4.17	4.38	4.23	3.97	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	276/ 278	4.17	4.38	4.19	3.97	2.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	215/ 260	4.44		4.46	4.41	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	4.58	4.72	4.33	4.19	****
Seminar	_				_		_							
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work	_	_	_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 76	****	5.00	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	1	0	0	0		,	****	4.50	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 48	****	4.00	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	4.75	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Course-Section: THTR 100 0201

Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP

Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID

Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1640 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	6
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 100 0301 University of Maryland Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP Baltimore County

3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0

4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance

INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP Baltimore County KAPLAN, DAVID Fall 2005

Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID

Enrollment: 7
Ouestionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1641 JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

1/ 260 4.44 4.58 4.46 4.41 5.00

1/ 233 5.00 5.00 4.20 4.00 5.00

0 0 1 1 4.50 115/ 259 4.58 4.72 4.33 4.19 4.50

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 2 4.33 854/1674 4.53 4.58 4.27 4.07 4.33 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 830/1674 4.00 4.25 4.23 4.16 4.33 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1423 4.45 4.60 4.27 4.16 5.00 0 0 1 1 4.50 490/1609 4.20 4.40 4.22 4.05 4.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 482/1585 3.87 4.22 3.96 3.88 4.33 0 0 2 1 4.33 578/1535 3.72 4.12 4.08 3.89 4.33 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 1377/1651 4.06 3.98 4.18 4.10 3.67 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 1361/1673 4.56 4.85 4.69 4.67 4.33 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 615/1656 4.28 4.41 4.07 3.96 4.33 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Ω Ω Ω Ω 0 0 3 5.00 1/1586 4.44 4.57 4.43 4.37 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1585 4.68 4.80 4.69 4.60 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 1 2 4.67 438/1582 4.22 4.49 4.26 4.17 4.67 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 495/1575 4.19 4.58 4.27 4.17 4.67 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 1036/1380 3.49 4.08 3.94 3.78 3.50 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 4.00 810/1520 3.88 4.00 4.01 3.76 4.00 1 0 4.00 1024/1515 3.65 4.10 4.24 3.97 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 1050/1511 4.10 4.26 4.27 4.00 4.00 4. Were special techniques successful 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 474/994 4.00 4.35 3.94 3.73 4.00 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 229/265 4.17 4.38 4.23 3.97 3.50 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 278 4.17 4.38 4.19 3.97 5.00

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 1 0 0 0 1 5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	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 a	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	3		

1 0

Frequency Distribution

0

0

0 0 0 2 5.00

Course-Section: THTR 100 0401

INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP

Title

Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1642 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	anier	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	768/1674	4.53	4.58	4.27	4.07	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1451/1674	4.00	4.25	4.23	4.16	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	697/1423	4.45	4.60	4.27	4.16	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	930/1609	4.20	4.40	4.22	4.05	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1006/1585	3.87	4.22	3.96	3.88	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1240/1535	3.72	4.12	4.08	3.89	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1097/1651	4.06	3.98	4.18	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1135/1673	4.56	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1237/1656	4.28	4.41	4.07	3.96	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1400/1586	4.44	4.57	4.43	4.37	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1142/1585	4.68	4.80	4.69	4.60	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1371/1582	4.22	4.49	4.26	4.17	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	3		1010/1575	4.19	4.58	4.27	4.17	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	2	0		1178/1380	3.49	4.08	3.94	3.78	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3 25	1284/1520	3.88	4.00	4.01	3.76	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	1	1		1381/1515	3.65	4.10	4.24	3.97	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	1		1308/1511	4.10	4.26	4.27	4.00	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 994		4.35	3.94	3.73	****
i. Wele special ecciniques successful	_	3	Ü	O	_	Ü	O	3.00	, ,,,,,,,	1.00	1.33	3.71	3.75	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 265	4.17	4.38	4.23	3.97	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 278	4.17	4.38	4.19	3.97	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	175/ 260	4.44	4.58	4.46	4.41	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	89/ 259	4.58	4.72	4.33	4.19	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	5.00	5.00	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	89/ 103	3.50	3.50	4.41	4.33	3.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.50	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	5.00	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	4.00	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.75	4.27	4.30	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	***

Course-Section: THTR 100 0401

Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP

Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID

Enrollment: 7
Questionnaires: 5

KAPLAN, DAVID

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1642 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	5	Non-major	4
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 104 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO COSTUME Baltimore County

INTRO TO COSTUME Baltimore County
JOYCE, SHELLEY (Instr. A) Fall 2005

Instructor: JOYCE Enrollment: 5

Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1643 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	ructor	2	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rar	ık	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1																
1 Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1 / 1	L674	4.74	4.58	4.27	4.07	5.00
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	,	1674		4.25	4.23	4.16	5.00
		estions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	203/1		4.75	4.60	4.27	4.16	4.80
	_	ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1		4.75	4.40	4.22	4.05	4.80
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	612/1		4.24	4.22	3.96	3.88	4.20
	_	_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	131/1		4.49	4.12	4.08	3.89	4.80
		system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	- ,	1651	4.80	3.98	4.18	4.10	5.00
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	,	1673	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00
	-			ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00		1656	4.70	4.41	4.07	3.96	5.00
		Lectur																	
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	_	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	389/1	586	4.68	4.57	4.43	4.37	4.65
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	,	1585	4.91	4.80	4.69	4.60	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	246/1		4.73	4.49	4.26	4.17	4.65
		s contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00		1575	4.95	4.58	4.27	4.17	5.00
				our understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00		1380	4.88	4.08		3.78	5.00
		-																	
1 Did al	ace dican	Discus		what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	397/1	520	3.80	4.00	4.01	3.76	4.50
				ed to participate	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	898/1		3.65	4.10	4.24		4.25
				nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	414/1		3.95	4.16	4.24	4.00	4.75
		chniques succe		id Open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	474/		4.00	4.35	3.94		4.75
1	poorar oo	omitques succe			_	Ü	_	Ü	Ü	ŭ	J	1.00		,,,	1.00	1.55	5.71	3.73	1.00
0		Labora	-		4	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	******/	070	F 00	4 20	4 10	2 07	****
2. were y	ou provide	ed with adequa	те раск	ground information	4	0	0	0	U	0	Τ	5.00	****/	2/8	5.00	4.38	4.19	3.97	* * * *
		Field	Work																
				hat you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/	76	5.00	5.00	3.98	3.32	5.00
2. Did yo	u clearly	understand yo	ur eval	uation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/	77	5.00	4.50	3.93	3.42	5.00
		tor available			3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	53	****	5.00	4.45	4.34	****
	-	could you disc	_		3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	19/	48	4.50	4.00	4.12		4.50
5. Did co	nferences	help you carr	y out f	field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/	49	5.00	4.75	4.27	4.30	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons					Тур	pe			Majors	
	1																		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3 B 1		Rec	quire	ea fo	or Ma	jors	3	2	Grad	uate	3	0	Majo	or	2
28-55 56-83	0 1	1.00-1.99	1			0		1				1	TIm -1 -			_	Morr	ma i a	3
56-83 84-150	1	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	T				Т	Unde	er-gi	rad	5	Non-	-major	3
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-3.49	1	D 0 F 0		רה.	ectiv	a				0	###1	4 _ T	Means t	horo s	ro not	- onom	h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	1	P 0		тт€	=CLT1	ves				U			means t es to b			_	11
				I 0		Otł	ner					2	TESF	OIIS	נו טו פב	c sign	iiiidl	.1 C	
				5 0		ULI	1CT					4							
				. 0															

Course-Section: THTR 104 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO COSTUME Baltimore County

INTRO TO COSTUME Baltimore County JOYCE, SHELLEY (Instr. B) Fall 2005

Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1644 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eauei	ncies			Inst	ructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran		Mean	Mean	Mean		Mean
		Genera									_					4 = 0			= 00
_	_	insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1				4.27	4.07	5.00
		or make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1		4.76	4.25	4.23	4.16	5.00
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	203/1		4.75	4.60	4.27	4.16	4.80
		tions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1		4.75	4.40	4.22		4.80
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0		4.20	612/1		4.24	4.22	3.96	3.88	4.20
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	131/1		4.49	4.12	4.08	3.89	4.80
		system clearl		ined	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1		4.80	3.98	4.18	4.10	5.00
		as class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1		5.00	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	ıld you gr	ade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1	656	4.70	4.41	4.07	3.96	5.00
		Lectur	e																
1. Were th	ne instruc	tor's lecture	s well	orepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	858/1	586	4.68	4.57	4.43	4.37	4.65
		or seem inter			3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1	585	4.91	4.80	4.69	4.60	5.00
				xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1		4.73	4.49	4.26	4.17	4.65
		contribute t			3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1		4.95	4.58	4.27	4.17	5.00
				our understanding	3	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/1		4.88	4.08	3.94		5.00
		-	_	_															
		Discus			_	_	_												
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	397/1		3.80	4.00	4.01		4.50
				d to participate	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	898/1		3.65	4.10	4.24		4.25
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.75	414/1		3.95	4.26	4.27	4.00	4.75
4. Were sp	pecial tec	chniques succe	sstul		1	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	474/	994	4.00	4.35	3.94	3.73	4.00
		Labora	tory																
2. Were yo	ou provide	ed with adequa	te back	ground information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	278	5.00	4.38	4.19	3.97	****
1 513 61	. 1	Field		h	2	0	0	0	0	0	_	F 00	1 /	7.0	F 00	F 00	2 00	2 20	F 00
				hat you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/	76	5.00	5.00	3.98	3.32	5.00
				uation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/	77	5.00	4.50	3.93	3.42	5.00
		or available			3	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/	53	****	5.00	4.45	4.34	****
		could you disc		r evaluations ield activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	1 2	4.50	19/ 1/	48 49	4.50 5.00	4.00 4.75	4.12	4.00	4.50 5.00
J. Dia coi	ircrences	ncip you carr	y out I	icia accivities	3	O	O	Ü	O	O		3.00	1/	10	3.00	1.75	1.27	1.50	3.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	n										
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr							Rea	asons					Тур	oe .			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	2	Grad	uate	9	0	Majo	or	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1															
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				1	Unde	r-gr	rad	5	Non-	-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0															
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0						t enoug	ſh
				P 0									resp	onse	es to b	e sign	nifican	nt	
				I 0		Oth	ıer					2							
				? 0															

Course-Section: THTR 104 0102 University of Maryland Page 1645
Title INTRO TO COSTUME Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY Fall 2005
Enrollment: 6

Ouestionnaires:	6	Student Cours	se Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Questionnaties	0	Deddelle court	oc hvaraacron	Queberonnarie

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1674	4.74	4.58	4.27	4.07	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	737/1674	4.76	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1423	4.75	4.60	4.27	4.16	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1609	4.75	4.40	4.22	4.05	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1006/1585	4.24	4.22	3.96	3.88	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	737/1535	4.49	4.12	4.08	3.89	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	393/1651	4.80	3.98	4.18	4.10	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	381/1656	4.70	4.41	4.07	3.96	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	753/1586	4.68	4.57	4.43	4.37	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	811/1585	4.91	4.80	4.69	4.60	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1582	4.73	4.49	4.26	4.17	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1575	4.95	4.58	4.27	4.17	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1380	4.88	4.08	3.94	3.78	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	397/1520	3.80	4.00	4.01	3.76	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	384/1515	3.65	4.10	4.24	3.97	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	414/1511	3.95	4.26	4.27	4.00	4.75
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	ı									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				2	0						

Course-Section: THTR 104 0104 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO COSTUME Baltimore County Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY

3.00-3.49 1

3.50-4.00 0

D 0

F

Ρ 0

I

Fall 2005

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

84-150

Grad.

1

0

F	age	1646
JAN	21,	2006
Job	IRBE	3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

							Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did y	you qain n	ew insights,ski	ills fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	954/1674	4.74	4.58	4.27	4.07	4.25
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	270/1674	4.76	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.75
3. Did t	the exam q	uestions reflec	ct the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	575/1423	4.75	4.60	4.27	4.16	4.50
4. Did o	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	743/1609	4.75	4.40	4.22	4.05	4.33
5. Did a	assigned r	eadings contrik	oute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	482/1585	4.24	4.22	3.96	3.88	4.33
6. Did v	written as	signments contr	ribute 1	to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	870/1535	4.49	4.12	4.08	3.89	4.00
7. Was t	the gradin	g system clearl	ly expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	231/1651	4.80	3.98	4.18	4.10	4.75
8. How r	many times	was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How v	would you	grade the overa	all tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	381/1656	4.70	4.41	4.07	3.96	4.50
		Lectur	ce															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	es well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	858/1586	4.68	4.57	4.43	4.37	4.50
2. Did t	the instru	ctor seem inter	rested :	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	917/1585	4.91	4.80	4.69	4.60	4.75
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	313/1582	4.73	4.49	4.26	4.17	4.75
4. Did t	the lectur	es contribute t	to what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	359/1575	4.95	4.58	4.27	4.17	4.75
5. Did a	audiovisua	l techniques er	nhance y	your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1380	4.88	4.08	3.94	3.78	4.75
		Discus	ssion															
				what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1515/1520	3.80	4.00	4.01	3.76	1.00
				ed to participate	3	0	1	0	0	0	0		1513/1515	3.65	4.10	4.24	3.97	1.00
3. Did t	the instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1511/1511	3.95	4.26	4.27	4.00	1.00
		Labora	atory															
1. Did t	the lab in	crease understa	anding o	of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 265	5.00	4.38	4.23	3.97	5.00
2. Were	you provi	ded with adequa	ate bacl	kground information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 278	5.00	4.38	4.19	3.97	5.00
3. Were	necessary	materials avai	ilable :	for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 260	5.00	4.58	4.46	4.41	5.00
4. Did t	the lab in	structor provid	de assi	stance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 259	5.00	4.72	4.33	4.19	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe.			Majors	:
			- 							- 								
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 0		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	-major	3

Electives

Other

Baltimore County

Course-Section: THTR 104 0105

6

INTRO TO COSTUME

3. Was the instructor available for consultation

4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations

5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities

JOYCE, SHELLEY

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

Fall 2005

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 1647 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** 5.00 4.45 4.34 ****

0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 4.50 4.00 4.12 4.00 ****

0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 49 5.00 4.75 4.27 4.30 ****

													_	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			Fre	-	ncies	5			ructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	406/1674	4.74	4.58	4.27	4.07	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1674	4.76	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1423	4.75	4.60	4.27	4.16	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1609	4.75	4.40	4.22	4.05	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	224/1585	4.24	4.22	3.96	3.88	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained		0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	238/1535	4.49	4.12	4.08	3.89	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	330/1651	4.80	3.98	4.18	4.10	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	381/1656	4.70	4.41	4.07	3.96	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1586	4.68	4.57	4.43	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	4.91	4.80	4.69	4.60	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1582	4.73	4.49	4.26	4.17	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1575	4.95	4.58	4.27	4.17	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	4.88	4.08	3.94	3.78	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	397/1520	3.80	4.00	4.01	3.76	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1024/1515	3.65	4.10	4.24	3.97	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	1		642/1511	3.95	4.26	4.27	4.00	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	4.00	4.35	3.94	3.73	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	5.00	5.00	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	5.00	4.50	3.93	3.42	***

Frequency Distribution

5 0

5 0

5 0 0

0

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

Course-Section: THTR 120 0101

INTRODUCTION TO THEATR

Title McCULLY, SUSAN

Instructor:

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1648 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	quer	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	12	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.58	4.27	4.07	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	0	5	3	12	4.35	803/1674	4.35	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	10	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.60	4.27	4.16	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	1	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	771/1609	4.32	4.40	4.22	4.05	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	1	1	1	3	2	12	4.21	593/1585	4.21	4.22	3.96	3.88	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.12	4.08	3.89	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	0	1	5	2	12	4.25	866/1651	4.25	3.98	4.18	4.10	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	1051/1673	4.68	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	437/1656	4.46	4.41	4.07	3.96	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	453/1586		4.57	4.43	4.37	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	340/1585	4.94	4.80	4.69	4.60	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	578/1582	4.56	4.49	4.26	4.17	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	246/1575	4.83	4.58	4.27	4.17	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	2	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	603/1380	4.13	4.08	3.94	3.78	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	309/1520	4.65	4.00	4.01	3.76	4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	503/1515	4.65	4.10	4.24	3.70	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	470/1511	4.71	4.26	4.27	4.00	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	287/ 994	4.40	4.35	3.94	3.73	4.40
i. Note apecial commiques successful		_	O	_	-	-		1.10	2077 331	1.10	1.55	3.71	3.75	1.10
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 265	****	4.38	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 278	****	4.38	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.58	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 259	****	4.72	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 233	****	5.00	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar			_			_								
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 103	****	3.50	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	2	 • ·	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	5.00	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 77	****	4.50	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 48	****	4.00	4.45	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	1	2	3.00	****/ 49	****	4.75	4.12	4.30	****
3. Did conferences help you carry out fred accivities	2,7	U	U	U	U	1	2	1.07	/ =>		1.75	1.2/	1.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Course-Section: THTR 120 0101

Title INTRODUCTION TO THEATR

Instructor: McCULLY, SUSAN

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1648 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	3	А	 11	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 202 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO DRAMA LITERATURE Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 28

Ctudant	Course	Fralustion	Ouestionnaire

Page 1649

							Fr	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	4	0	0	0	0	9	15	4.63	458/1674	4.63	4.58	4.27	4.32	4.63
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	kpected goals	4	0	0	0	4	10	10	4.25	931/1674	4.25	4.25	4.23	4.26	4.25
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the	expected goals	5	1	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	470/1423	4.59	4.60	4.27	4.36	4.59
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	4	0	0	0	1	13	10	4.38	687/1609	4.38	4.40	4.22	4.23	4.38
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	77/1585	4.92	4.22	3.96	3.91	4.92
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute 1	to what you learned	4	0	1	2	6	4	11	3.92	1006/1535	3.92	4.12	4.08	4.03	3.92
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	4	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	419/1651	4.58	3.98	4.18	4.20	4.58
		was class cand			4	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	352/1656	4.54	4.41	4.07	4.10	4.54
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	8	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	678/1586	4.65	4.57	4.43	4.48	4.65
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	313/1582	4.75	4.49	4.26	4.35	4.75
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	343/1575	4.76	4.58	4.27	4.39	4.76
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	7	2	0	0	6	4	9	4.16	576/1380	4.16	4.08	3.94	4.03	4.16
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	244/1520	4.74	4.00	4.01	4.03	4.74
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	254/1515	4.87	4.10	4.24	4.28	4.87
				nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	436/1511	4.74	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.74
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		5	1	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	307/ 994	4.36	4.35	3.94	3.98	4.36
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 13		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	5	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	12
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 8		~		,				2	1					1.0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	Τ				3	Under-g	rad 2	28	Non-	-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0								0			1			.1-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0 P 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - I				_	Jn.
													_					

Other

15

I

?

0

2

Course-Section: THTR 210 0101 University of Maryland Title

HISTORY OF THEATRE I

Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 28 Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1650 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Studen	t Course	Evaluatio	on Questi	lonna:	ire
--------	----------	-----------	-----------	--------	-----

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	320/1674	4.74	4.58	4.27	4.32	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	2	4	16	4.52	554/1674	4.52	4.25	4.23	4.26	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	505/1423	4.57	4.60	4.27	4.36	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	374/1609	4.61	4.40	4.22	4.23	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	422/1585	4.39	4.22	3.96	3.91	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	355/1535	4.52	4.12	4.08	4.03	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	0	3	0	19	4.57	445/1651	4.57	3.98	4.18	4.20	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	18	5	4.22	1449/1673	4.22	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	283/1656	4.63	4.41	4.07	4.10	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	431/1586	4.78	4.57	4.43	4.48	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	762/1585	4.83	4.80	4.69	4.76	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	5	3	15	4.43	733/1582	4.43	4.49	4.26	4.35	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	311/1575	4.78	4.58	4.27	4.39	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	2	0	1	4	13	4.30	447/1380	4.30	4.08	3.94	4.03	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	1141/1520	3.57	4.00	4.01	4.03	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	568/1515	4.57	4.10	4.24	4.28	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	586/1511	4.57	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	21	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 994	****	4.35	3.94	3.98	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: THTR 220 0101
Title CRAFT OF ACTING I

Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1651 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	367/1674	4.79	4.58	4.27	4.32	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	1001/1674	4.54	4.25	4.23	4.26	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.60	4.27	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	930/1609	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.23	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1006/1585	4.23	4.22	3.96	3.91	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	6	0	3.20	1406/1535	3.99	4.12	4.08	4.03	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1352/1651	4.07	3.98	4.18	4.20	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	706/1673	4.95	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	118/1656	4.83	4.41	4.07	4.10	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.57	4.43	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	917/1585	4.88	4.80	4.69	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	438/1582	4.83	4.49	4.26	4.35	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1138/1575	4.50	4.58	4.27	4.39	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	****	4.08	3.94	4.03	* * * *
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1520	4.90	4.00	4.01	4.03	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	5		1/1515	5.00	4.10	4.24	4.28	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.26	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 994	4.88	4.35	3.94	3.98	5.00
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.75	4.27	4.82	***
Theorem		D	la-											

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: THTR 220 0201

10

CRAFT OF ACTING I

SEARLS, COLETTE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

Fall 2005

Page 1652

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	gain ne	w insights,skil	=	n this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	167/1674	4.79	4.58	4.27	4.32	4.89
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	153/1674	4.54	4.25	4.23	4.26	4.89
		estions reflect			0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1423	****	4.60	4.27	4.36	****
		ations reflect			1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	136/1609	4.54	4.40	4.22	4.23	4.88
5. Did ass	igned re	adings contribu	ıte to v	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	224/1585	4.23	4.22	3.96	3.91	4.67
6. Did wri	tten ass	ignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	154/1535	3.99	4.12	4.08	4.03	4.78
7. Was the	grading	system clearly	expla:	ined	1	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	643/1651	4.07	3.98	4.18	4.20	4.43
8. How man	y times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wou	ild you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	170/1656	4.83	4.41	4.07	4.10	4.78
		Lecture	2															
1 Were th	e instru	ctor's lecture.		renared	4	0	0	0	Λ	0	5	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.57	4.43	4.48	5.00
		tor seem inter			4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585		4.80	4.69	4.76	5.00
				plained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1582		4.49	4.26	4.35	5.00
		s contribute to			5	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1575		4.58	4.27	4.39	5.00
			_	our understanding	5	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/1380		4.08	3.94	4.03	****
J. Dia ada	iiovibuai	ccciniiques cin	lance ye	our understanding	3	3	O	U	O	O	_	3.00	/ 1300		1.00	3.51	1.05	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ss discu	ssions contribu	ate to v	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	4.90	4.00	4.01	4.03	5.00
2. Were al	l studen	ts actively end	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.10	4.24	4.28	5.00
3. Did the	instruc	tor encourage i	fair and	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.26	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Were sp	ecial te	chniques succes	ssful		0	1	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	115/ 994	4.88	4.35	3.94	3.98	4.75
				Fred	uencs	, Dis	tri bi	1+ i 01	1									
				ried	uency	DIS	CIID	20101	.1									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	рe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Re	guir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			-			,						3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													_	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					9	_					
				? 1														

Course-Section: THTR 222 0101 University of Maryland Title VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I Baltimore County

Instructor: WATSON, LYNN

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1653

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

					Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new		com this course	Λ	0	1	0	Λ	2	6	4.33	854/1674	4.56	4.58	4.27	4.32	4.33
2. Did the instructo	J ,		0	0	1	1	0	1	6		1068/1674	4.28	4.25	4.23	4.26	4.11
	tions reflect the	_	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	376/1423	4.46	4.60	4.27	4.36	4.67
_	ions reflect the e		n	0	1	0	2	3	3		1306/1609	4.22	4.40	4.22	4.23	3.78
	lings contribute to	1 3	0	0	2	0	1	2	4		1121/1585		4.22	3.96	3.91	3.67
6. Did written assig	_	_	0	0	2	1	2	3	1		1435/1535	3.61	4.12	4.08	4.03	3.00
7. Was the grading s			1	1	1	1	0	3	2		1414/1651	3.72	3.98	4.18	4.20	3.57
8. How many times wa		ainea	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673		4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you gra		ching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	871/1656		4.41	4.07	4.10	4.13
J. How would you gra	ac the overall tea	criting cricect venebb	_	O	_	Ü	Ü	3	-	1.13	07171030	1.17		1.07	1.10	1.13
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct	or's lectures well	prepared	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	1074/1586	4.56	4.57	4.43	4.48	4.33
2. Did the instructo	r seem interested	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	615/1585	4.94	4.80	4.69	4.76	4.89
3. Was lecture mater	ial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	578/1582	4.61	4.49	4.26	4.35	4.56
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what	you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1138/1575	4.39	4.58	4.27	4.39	4.00
5. Did audiovisual t	echniques enhance	your understanding	1	1	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	930/1380	3.93	4.08	3.94	4.03	3.71
	-1															
1 544 -1 44	Discussion		^	0	_	0	^	2	4	2 70	1010/1500	4 00	4 00	4 01	4 02	2 70
1. Did class discuss		_	0	0	2	0	0	3	4		1010/1520		4.00	4.01	4.03	3.78
2. Were all students	•		1	0	1	0	1	Ţ	5	4.13	982/1515	4.34	4.10	4.24	4.28	4.13
3. Did the instructo	_	nd open discussion	Ţ	0	1	0	Ţ	0	6	4.25	896/1511	4.46	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.25
4. Were special tech	niques successful		0	2	Τ	0	0	2	4	4.14	420/ 994	4.20	4.35	3.94	3.98	4.14
		Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	า									
		_	_													
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	

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

Course-Section: THTR 222 0201 University of Maryland
Title VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I Baltimore County

Instructor: WATSON, LYNN

Enrollment: 11

Ouestionnaires: 9

Fall 2005
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1654

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions 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 7 4.78 276/1674 4.56 4.58 4.27 4.32 4.78 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 5 4 4.44 673/1674 4.28 4.25 4.23 4.26 4.44 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 1 0 3 4 4.25 845/1423 4.46 4.60 4.27 4.36 4.25 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 312/1609 4.22 4.40 4.22 4.23 4.67 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 295/1585 4.11 4.22 3.96 3.91 4.56 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0 4 4 4.22 703/1535 3.61 4.12 4.08 4.03 4.22 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 0 0 3 3 2 3.88 1246/1651 3.72 3.98 4.18 4.20 3.88 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1673 5.00 4.85 4.69 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 6 2 4.25 719/1656 4.19 4.41 4.07 4.10 4.25Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 Ω 0 2 7 4.78 453/1586 4.56 4.57 4.43 4.48 4.78 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1585 4.94 4.80 4.69 4.76 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 3 6 4.67 438/1582 4.61 4.49 4.26 4.35 4.67 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 7 4.78 327/1575 4.39 4.58 4.27 4.39 4.78 0 0 0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 0 1 0 3 3 4.14 585/1380 3.93 4.08 3.94 4.03 4.14 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 213/1520 4.28 4.00 4.01 4.03 4.78 2 6 4.56 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 586/1515 4.34 4.10 4.24 4.28 4.56 0 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 507/1511 4.46 4.26 4.27 4.28 4.67 4. Were special techniques successful 0 1 1 1 1 5 4.25 360/994 4.20 4.35 3.94 3.98 4.25

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

Course-Section: THTR 229 0101 University of Maryland Title MOVEMENT FOR THE ACTOR Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: ALLEN, ROBERT

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 12

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1655

Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	.1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	607/1674	4.56	4.58	4.27	4.32	4.50
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	3	3.75	1370/1674	3.66	4.25	4.23	4.26	3.75
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	771/1423	4.33	4.60	4.27	4.36	4.33
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	1	1	2	1	7	4.00	1094/1609	4.25	4.40	4.22	4.23	4.00
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	715/1585	3.67	4.22	3.96	3.91	4.08
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	4	4	3.73	1170/1535	3.49	4.12	4.08	4.03	3.73
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	3	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	1504/1651	3.74	3.98	4.18	4.20	3.33
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	958/1673	4.88	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.75
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	.ll teac	ching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	955/1656	4.07	4.41	4.07	4.10	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	5	0	2	0	0	4	1	3.29	1518/1586	3.98	4.57	4.43	4.48	3.29
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1225/1585	4.75	4.80	4.69	4.76	4.50
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	6	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1255/1582	4.17	4.49	4.26	4.35	3.83
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	6	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1138/1575	4.43	4.58	4.27	4.39	4.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	6	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	****	4.08	3.94	4.03	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	743/1520	4.29	4.00	4.01	4.03	4.14
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	5	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	971/1515	4.29	4.10	4.24	4.28	4.14
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	6	0	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	1177/1511	4.20	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.83
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		5	2	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	474/ 994	4.42	4.35	3.94	3.98	4.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quir	ea I	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0	B 2 C 0		<i>a</i>		7				0	TTm d a sa au		2	Man		1
56-83 84-150	1 1	3.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	Т				U	Under-g	rau 1	.2	Non-	-major	4
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-3.49	2	D 0 F 0		ma.	ecti [.]					0	#### - 1	Moona +	homo -	n-+		-h
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	۷	P 0		E16	ECCT.	ves				U	respons				_	ìīī
				I 0		O+1	her				1	.0	respons	es to L	e sign	ıııcaı	16	
				Ι 0		OLI	ner.				1	·U						

Course-Section: THTR 229 0201

Title MOVEMENT FOR THE ACTOR

Instructor: ALLEN, ROBERT

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 14

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1656 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

		Questions		NR	NA	Fro	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Ranl	ς	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights, skills	from this course	6	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	458/1	574	4.56	4.58	4.27	4.32	4.63
		tor make clear the		7	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1465/1	574	3.66	4.25	4.23	4.26	3.57
		estions reflect th		6	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1	123	4.33	4.60	4.27	4.36	****
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect the	expected goals	6	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	490/1	509	4.25	4.40	4.22	4.23	4.50
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribute	to what you learned	6	0	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1364/1	585	3.67	4.22	3.96	3.91	3.25
			e to what you learned	6	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1386/1	535	3.49	4.12	4.08	4.03	3.25
		system clearly ex		6	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	988/1	551	3.74	3.98	4.18	4.20	4.14
	-	was class cancelle		7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1		4.88	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overall t	eaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	849/1	556	4.07	4.41	4.07	4.10	4.14
		Lecture																
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures we	ll prepared	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	663/1	586	3.98	4.57	4.43	4.48	4.67
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem intereste	d in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1!	585	4.75	4.80	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented an	d explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	632/1	582	4.17	4.49	4.26	4.35	4.50
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute to wh	at you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1	575	4.43	4.58	4.27	4.39	4.86
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enhanc	e your understanding	9	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/13	380	****	4.08	3.94	4.03	****
		Discussion																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribute	to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	489/1	520	4.29	4.00	4.01	4.03	4.43
2. Were al	ll studen	ts actively encour	aged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	733/1	515	4.29	4.10	4.24	4.28	4.43
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage fair	and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	586/1	511	4.20	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.57
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques successfu	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	89/ 9	994	4.42	4.35	3.94	3.98	4.83
		Laboratory																
1. Did the	e lab inc	rease understandin	g of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	265	****	4.38	4.23	4.34	****
2. Were yo	ou provid	ed with adequate b	ackground information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	278	****	4.38	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were ne	ecessary	materials availabl	e for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	260	****	4.58	4.46	4.51	****
		tructor provide as		13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	259	****	4.72	4.33	4.42	****
5. Were re	equiremen	ts for lab reports	clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	233	***	5.00	4.20	4.48	****
		Seminar																
3. Did res	search pr	ojects contribute	to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	95	****	****	4.31	4.33	****
4. Did pre	esentatio	ns contribute to w	hat you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	99	****	****	4.39	4.22	****
5. Were ca	riteria f	or grading made cl	ear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	97	****	****	4.14	4.63	****
		Field Work																
1. Did fie	eld exper	ience contribute t	o what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	76	****	5.00	3.98	3.97	***
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
	_		-	-														
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons					Тур	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 6		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Grad	ıate	9	0	Majo	or	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	В 2				_							_				
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0		Ge	nera	1				1	Unde	r-gr	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		_						_				_			_
Grad.					El	ecti	ves				0			Means t			_	jh .
			P 0		۵. ۰	L					_	respo	onse	es to b	e sigr	nificar	ıt	
			I 0		Ot1	her					5							

? 0

Course-Section: THTR 230 0101

Title DRAWING FOR THEATRE

ZLOTESCU, ELENA

Instructor:

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1657 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation (Questionnaire
-----------------------------	---------------

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	cies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	406/1674	4.67	4.58	4.27	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	673/1674	4.44	4.25	4.23	4.26	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1423	****	4.60	4.27	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	312/1609	4.67	4.40	4.22	4.23	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1585	****	4.22	3.96	3.91	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1535	****	4.12	4.08	4.03	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	0	3	0	3		1525/1651	3.25	3.98	4.18	4.20	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	493/1656	4.43	4.41	4.07	4.10	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1		4.63	723/1586	4.63	4.57	4.43	4.48	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	917/1585	4.75	4.80	4.69	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	1	2			1129/1582	4.00	4.49	4.26	4.35	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.58	4.27	4.39	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1380	****	4.08	3.94	4.03	****
Discussion	_				_									
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	2	1		1221/1520	3.40	4.00	4.01	4.03	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	543/1515	4.60	4.10	4.24	4.28	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	358/1511	4.80	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	4.35	3.94	3.98	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 265	****	4.38	4.23	4.34	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 278	****	4.38	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 260	****	4.58	4.46	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 259	****	4.72	4.33	4.42	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	5.00	4.20	4.48	****
Seminar				_										
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 103	****	3.50	4.41	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.45	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0 0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 95	****	****	4.31	4.33	****
 Did presentations contribute to what you learned Were criteria for grading made clear 	10 10	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 99 ****/ 97	****	****	4.39 4.14	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	U	U	1	U	U	U	2.00	***/ 9/			4.14	4.03	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	3.98	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 77	****	4.50	3.93	4.20	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 48	****	4.00	4.12	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	4.75	4.27	4.82	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	4.23	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	4.53	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	4.63	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****

Course-Section: THTR 230 0101

Title DRAWING FOR THEATRE

Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1657 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: THTR 232 0101

7

SCENE DESIGN

ZLOTESCU, ELENA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

Fall 2005

Page 1658

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Di	id vou gain	new insights, ski	_	m this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.58	4.27	4.32	5.00
		ructor make clear			2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	460/1674	4.60	4.25	4.23	4.26	4.60
		questions reflec			2	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.60	4.27	4.36	4.50
4. Di	id other ev	aluations reflect	the ex	pected goals	2	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.40	4.22	4.23	4.50
5. Di	id assigned	readings contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.22	3.96	3.91	4.00
6. Di	id written	assignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	3	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.12	4.08	4.03	4.50
7. Wa	as the grad	ing system clearl	y expla	ined	3	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1377/1651	3.67	3.98	4.18	4.20	3.67
8. Ho	ow many tim	es was class canc	elled		3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. Ho	ow would yo	u grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	310/1656	4.60	4.41	4.07	4.10	4.60
		Lectur	۵															
1 We	ere the ins	tructor's lecture		prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.57	4.43	4.48	4.50
		ructor seem inter			3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.76	5.00
		material presente		_	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.49	4.26	4.35	4.50
		ures contribute t			3	0	0	0	1	1	2		958/1575	4.25	4.58	4.27	4.39	4.25
		ual techniques en		<u>.</u>	3	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	200/1380		4.08	3.94	4.03	4.67
1 -		Discus				0	0	_	-	•	0	4 22	EEO /1500	4 22	4 00	4 01	4 00	4 22
		scussions contrib		_	4	0	0	0	Ţ	0	2	4.33	572/1520	4.33	4.00	4.01	4.03	4.33
		dents actively en	_		4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1515	4.67	4.10	4.24	4.28	4.67
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	816/1511	4.33	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.33
4. W∈	ere special	techniques succe	ssiul		4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	4.35	3.94	3.98	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credi	its Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-2	 27 0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 3					or Ma			0	Graduat		0	Majo		3
28-5		1.00-1.99	0	B 1		re(4urr,	a I	⊃⊥ I ^ν Ic	2 JOE 8	>	U	Graduati	=	U	Ma JC	, <u>T</u>	3
56-8		2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera:	ı				1	Under-q	rad	7	Non-	major	4
84-1		3.00-3.49	0	D 0		Gei	лста.	L				-	onder -g.	Luu	,	INOII-	ilia JOI	T
Grad		3.50-4.00	1	F 0		E14	ectiv	7es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
Grac	. 0	3.30 1.00	_	P 0		11.17		,				J	respons				_	111
				I O		O+1	ner					3	I CDPOID	L	.c brgn			
				2 0		001						5						
				. 0														

Course-Section: THTR 234 0101 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County MAKE-UP FOR THE STAGE Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA Fall 2005

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 13

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

Ρ

I

?

0

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1659

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did	vou gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	2	0	0	Ο	1	1	9	4.73	331/1674	4.73	4.58	4.27	4.32	4.73
		ctor make clear			2	0	1	0	3	3	4		1333/1674	3.82	4.25	4.23	4.26	3.82
		uestions reflec			2	8	0	0	1	0	2		****/1423	****	4.60	4.27	4.36	****
	_	uations reflect		_	2	2	0	0	3	1	5		892/1609	4.22	4.40	4.22	4.23	4.22
				what you learned	4	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1585	****	4.22	3.96	3.91	****
	_	-		to what you learned	3	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1535	****	4.12	4.08	4.03	****
		g system clearl		-	2	2	0	2	2	4	1	3.44	1467/1651	3.44	3.98	4.18	4.20	3.44
8. How 1	many times	was class canc	elled		3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll tea	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1353/1656	3.56	4.41	4.07	4.10	3.56
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	-	prepared	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1168/1586	4.22	4.57	4.43	4.48	4.22
		ctor seem inter			4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	615/1585	4.89	4.80	4.69	4.76	4.89
				explained clearly	4	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	967/1582	4.22	4.49	4.26	4.35	4.22
		es contribute t			4	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	768/1575	4.44	4.58	4.27	4.39	4.44
				your understanding	5	4	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	902/1380	3.75	4.08	3.94	4.03	3.75
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc			what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	4.00	4.01	4.03	3.00
				ed to participate	9	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1381/1515	3.25	4.10	4.24	4.28	3.25
		_	_	nd open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1308/1511	3.50	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.50
4. Were	special to	echniques succe	ssful	_	9	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	4.35	3.94	3.98	***
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	rib	utio	n									
									-									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	 S	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 5			-			_						J -		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	3	Non-	-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														

Electives

8

Other

Course-Section: THTR 235 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County

LIGHTING DESIGN I COBB, MILTON T. Fall 2005

I

0

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

							Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.58	4.27	4.32	5.00
		ctor make clear			4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	830/1674		4.25	4.23	4.26	4.33
		uestions reflec			5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.60	4.27	4.36	5.00
		uations reflect			4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.40	4.22	4.23	4.33
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	224/1585	4.67	4.22	3.96	3.91	4.67
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	578/1535	4.33	4.12	4.08	4.03	4.33
		g system clearl			4	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	3.98	4.18	4.20	4.00
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	257/1656	4.67	4.41	4.07	4.10	4.67
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1074/1586	4.33	4.57	4.43	4.48	4.33
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1071/1585	4.67	4.80	4.69	4.76	4.67
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	850/1582	4.33	4.49	4.26	4.35	4.33
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.58	4.27	4.39	4.67
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	200/1380	4.67	4.08	3.94	4.03	4.67
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.00	4.01	4.03	4.00
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.10	4.24	4.28	4.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.50
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.35	3.94	3.98	5.00
				Frequ	ency	, Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
				- 										- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ijor	S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				Р 0									respons	es to b	oe sign	ificar	ıt	

Other

2

Page 1660

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: THTR 250 0101 University of Maryland
Title INTRO PRODUCTION TECH Baltimore County

Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID

Enrollment: 2

Questionnaires: 2

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1661

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did vou	gain ne	ew insights,skil	-	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1196/1674	4.50	4.58	4.27	4.32	4.00
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	0		1499/1674		4.25	4.23	4.26	3.50
		system clearly			0	1	0	0	0	1	0		1097/1651		3.98	4.18	4.20	4.00
	-	was class cance	_		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673		4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	381/1656		4.41	4.07	4.10	
		Lecture																
1 Were th	ne instri	ctor's lectures		prepared	1	0	0	0	0	Ο	1	5.00	1/1586	4.75	4.57	4.43	4.48	5.00
		tor seem intere			1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1585	4.75	4.80	4.69	4.76	5.00
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1582		4.49	4.26	4.35	5.00
		es contribute to		-	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1575		4.58	4.27	4.39	5.00
				our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1380		4.08	3.94		5.00
		Discuss	ui on															
1 Did ala	ee diea			what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	Λ	0	1 00	1515/1520	1.00	4.00	4.01	4.03	1.00
				d to participate	e 1 0 0 0 1 0			0	0		1420/1515		4.10	4.24	4.28	3.00		
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	0		1420/1513		4.10	4.27		3.00
				_	1 0 0 0 1 0													
		Field W			_						_							
				hat you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76		5.00	3.98	3.97	5.00
		understand you			1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 77 1/ 49		4.50 4.75	3.93	4.20 4.82	5.00
5. Dia con	irerences	s help you carry	out I	leid activities	1	U	U	U	U	0	Τ	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	4.75	4.27	4.82	5.00
				Frequ	quency Distribution													
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	es Reasons						Ту	pe			Majors	3		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	 guire	ed fo	or Ma	iors	 S	0	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo		1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1		1.0.	1			- ,		-	2_3000	-	-	- 10) 0	=	-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives						0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ιh	

Other

Ρ

I

?

0

0

Course-Section: THTR 250 0102 University of Maryland INTRO PRODUCTION TECH Baltimore County

Page 1662 Title JAN 21, 2006 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	5	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
		Program of a s

Enrollment:

7

			Fre	equei	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	5	5.00	1/1674	4.50	4.58	4.27	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	460/1674	4.05	4.25	4.23	4.26	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.60	4.27	4.36	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	231/1651	4.38	3.98	4.18	4.20	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	887/1673	4.90	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1237/1656	4.13	4.41	4.07	4.10	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	858/1586	4.75	4.57	4.43	4.48	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1225/1585	4.75	4.80	4.69	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1582	4.75	4.49	4.26	4.35	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1575	5.00	4.58	4.27	4.39	****

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

Course-Section: THTR 253 0101 University of Maryland Title STAGE MANAGEMENT Baltimore County

Hall, Amanda

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1663

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	equei	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 I															
1. Did voi	u gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.58	4.27	4.32	5.00
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	176/1674		4.25	4.23	4.26	4.86
		uestions reflect			1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86		4.86	4.60		4.36	4.86
		uations reflect			1	2	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	930/1609	4.20	4.40	4.22	4.23	4.20
				what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60		4.60	4.22	3.96	3.91	4.60
				o what you learned	1	2	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	737/1535	4.20	4.12	4.08	4.03	4.20
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearly	/ expla	ined	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	3.98	4.18	4.20	4.00
3. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	796/1673	4.86	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.86
. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	493/1656	4.43	4.41	4.07	4.10	4.43
		Lecture	9															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	301/1586	4.86	4.57	4.43	4.48	4.86
		ctor seem intere			1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.49	4.26	4.35	5.00
4. Did the	e lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1575	4.86	4.58	4.27	4.39	4.86
				our understanding	1	5	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1217/1380	3.00	4.08	3.94	4.03	3.0
		Discus																
l Did al:	acc dica			what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.00	4.01	4.03	5.00
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86		4.86	4.10	4.24		4.86
		-	_	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	301/1511	4.86	4.26	4.27		
		echniques succes		d open discussion	1	1	0	1	0	1		4.33	322/ 994				3.98	
		Semina	_															
1. Were as	ssigned			announced theme	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	***	3.50	4.41	4.07	***
		Field V																
1. Did fi	eld expe			hat you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	3.98	3.97	****
	-			•														
1. Did se	lf-paced	Self I system contrib		what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	4.23	***
				Frequ	encv	. Diei	-rih	utio	n									
				_	cricy	DIB	-110	acioi										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту]	pe 			Majors	; ·
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sigr	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					3						
				? 1														

Course-Section: THTR 324 0101 University of Maryland
Title CRAFT OF ACTING III Baltimore County
Instructor: ALLEN, ROBERT Fall 2005

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

12

University of Maryland Page 1664
Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

G: 1 :	~		
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

					Frequencies					3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	1420/1674	3.73	4.58	4.27	4.26	3.73
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	3	5	2	1	3.09	1599/1674	3.09	4.25	4.23	4.21	3.09
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	2	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1018/1609	4.11	4.40	4.22	4.27	4.11
5. Did as:	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1223/1585	3.50	4.22	3.96	3.95	3.50
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	8	2	3.91	1022/1535	3.91	4.12	4.08	4.15	3.91
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	3	2	2	1	3	0	2.63	1606/1651	2.63	3.98	4.18	4.16	2.63
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	1	1	2	6	1	3.45	1399/1656	3.45	4.41	4.07	4.07	3.45
		Lectur	0															
1 Were t	he instr		_	nrenared	11	0	1	Λ	0	Ο	Λ	1 00	****/1586	****	4.57	4.43	4.42	****
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	1	0	0	0		****/1585		4.80	4.69	4.66	****
	3					0	1	0	0	0	•		****/1582		4.49	4.26	4.26	****
	Was lecture material presented and explained clea Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1	0	0	0			****/1575		4.58	4.27	4.25	****
4. Dia cin	e recture	es concribate t	O WIIAC	you rearned	11	U	1	U	U	U	U	1.00	/13/3		4.50	1.2/	1.23	
		Discus																
				what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/1520		4.00	4.01	4.09	****
				d to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/1515		4.10	4.24	4.32	****
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1511	****	4.26	4.27	4.34	****
				Freq	uency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00 27	1	0 00 0 00		7 G											0			1
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Ked	quir	ea I	or Ma	ıjor	S	U	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or.	1
	28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 4					a		1				0	TTm d and a		2	Mar		11
56-83						Gei	nera	T				0	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	11
84-150												1			1			1.
Grad.	F 0 P 0					E⊥€	ecti [,]	ves				1	#### -				_	111
				- 0		0+1	L				-	0	respons	es to r	e sign	ııııcan	ιτ	
				I 0		Other						.0						

Course-Section: THTR 329 0101 University of Maryland
Title MOVEMENT FOR ACTOR III Baltimore County

Title MOVEMENT FOR ACTOR III Baltimore County Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY Fall 2005

?

1

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1665

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

	Questions						Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.58	4.27	4.26	5.00
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.25	4.23	4.21	4.50
		estions reflec			0	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	517/1423	4.56	4.60	4.27	4.27	4.56
	_	ations reflect		_	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	312/1609	4.67	4.40	4.22	4.27	4.67
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	204/1585	4.70	4.22	3.96	3.95	4.70
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	283/1535	4.60	4.12	4.08	4.15	4.60
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1031/1651	4.10	3.98	4.18	4.16	4.10
8. How max	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	522/1656	4.40	4.41	4.07	4.07	4.40
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1586	****	4.57	4.43	4.42	****
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1585	****	4.80	4.69	4.66	****
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1582	****	4.49	4.26	4.26	****
4. Did the					9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1575	****	4.58	4.27	4.25	****
5. Did au	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand				9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	****	4.08	3.94	4.01	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	****	4.00	4.01	4.09	****
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1515	****	4.10	4.24	4.32	****
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1511	****	4.26	4.27	4.34	****
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	4.35	3.94	3.96	****
				Frequ	iency	r Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
	rearts Earnea Cum. GPA Expected Gr																	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83						Gei	nera.	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	10
84-150						_						_						
Grad.						Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ufican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					8						

Course-Section: THTR 347 0101 University of Maryland Title

CHARACTER/SCENE STUDY Baltimore County Instructor: MEHTA, XERXES J Fall 2005

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1666

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1. Did y	you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	342/1674	4.71	4.58	4.27	4.26	4.71
2. Did t	the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	314/1674	4.71	4.25	4.23	4.21	4.71
3. Did t	the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.60	4.27	4.27	4.50
4. Did o	other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	152/1609	4.85	4.40	4.22	4.27	4.85
5. Did a	assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1585	****	4.22	3.96	3.95	****
6. Did v	written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	200/1535	4.71	4.12	4.08	4.15	4.71
7. Was t	the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	658/1651	4.42	3.98	4.18	4.16	4.42
8. How r	many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	915/1673	4.79	4.85	4.69	4.68	4.79
9. How v	would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	144/1656	4.82	4.41	4.07	4.07	4.82
	Lecture														
1. Were	the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1586	****	4.57	4.43	4.42	***
	audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1380	****	4.08	3.94	4.01	****
	Discussion														
1. Did o	class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	274/1520	4.69	4.00	4.01	4.09	4.69
	all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.10	4.24	4.32	5.00
	the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	312/1511	4.85	4.26	4.27	4.34	4.85
	special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	70/ 994		4.35	3.94	3.96	4.92
		_	_	-	-	-	_			,					

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	0						

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Course-Section: THTR 360 0101 University of Maryland Page 1667 MODERN THEATRE I JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029 KREIZENBECK, AL

Enrollment:	23	
Questionnaires:	23	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

?

0

Title

Instructor:

						Fre	equer	ncie	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	6	0	1	1	3	1	11	4.18	1046/1674	4.18	4.58	4.27	4.26	4.18
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	6	0	0	1	5	3	8	4.06	1111/1674	4.06	4.25	4.23	4.21	4.06
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	6	1	1	0	1	2	12	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.60	4.27	4.27	4.50
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	6	1	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	1055/1609	4.06	4.40	4.22	4.27	4.06
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	126/1585	4.82	4.22	3.96	3.95	4.82
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	691/1535	4.24	4.12	4.08	4.15	4.24
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	6	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	497/1651	4.53	3.98	4.18	4.16	4.53
8. How max	ny times	was class canc	elled		6	0	0	0	0	11	6	4.35	1347/1673	4.35	4.85	4.69	4.68	4.35
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	7	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	641/1656	4.31	4.41	4.07	4.07	4.31
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	7	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	1034/1586	4.38	4.57	4.43	4.42	4.38
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	7	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	640/1585	4.88	4.80	4.69	4.66	4.88
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	8	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	777/1582	4.40	4.49	4.26	4.26	4.40
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	7	0	2	0	1	1	12	4.31	905/1575	4.31	4.58	4.27	4.25	4.31
5. Did au	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					2	1	0	3	0	10	4.29	463/1380	4.29	4.08	3.94	4.01	4.29
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	2	10	4.36	555/1520	4.36	4.00	4.01	4.09	4.36
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	9	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	432/1515	4.71	4.10	4.24	4.32	4.71
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.26	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		9	0	3	0	0	3	8	3.93	549/ 994	3.93	4.35	3.94	3.96	3.93
				Frequ	ency	r Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	1	
												- 						
00-27							quire	ed i	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	4
28-55						~		1				2	77 J			37		1.0
56-83						Gei	nera	L				3	Under-g	rad 2	23	Non-	major	19
84-150 Grad.	0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0					TO 7	ectiv					2	#### - 1	Moona +	homo -	**		h
Grau.	U	3.50-4.00	4	P 0		ĽΙ	=CL1	/es				4	respons				_	11
				P 0		∩ -1	0.030					9	respons	es lo E	e sign	ıııcan	IL	
				Ι υ		Oti	ner					9						

Course-Section: THTR 390 0101 University of Maryland Page 1668 JAN 21, 2006

Title THEATRE IN PRODUCTION Baltimore County Instructor: Mehta, Xerxes Marino, Christopher Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 5 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.58	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.25	4.23	4.21	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1609	***	4.40	4.22	4.27	***
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1585	****	4.22	3.96	3.95	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1442/1651	3.50	3.98	4.18	4.16	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.68	5.00
Discussion														
		0	0	0	0	•	-	- 00		ale ale ale ale	4 00	4 01	4 00	als als als als
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	U	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/1520	****	4.00	4.01	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1515	****	4.10	4.24	4.32	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1511	****	4.26	4.27	4.34	***
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	***	4.35	3.94	3.96	***

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	4
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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2005

Course-Section: THTR 450 0201 Title SENIOR PROJECT Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA

3. Was the instructor available for consultation

4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations

5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities

Enrollment: 3 Ouestionnaires: 3

Page 1669 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

1/ 53 5.00 5.00 4.45 4.86 5.00

43/ 48 3.00 4.00 4.12 4.13 3.00

34/ 49 4.00 4.75 4.27 4.48 4.00

5.00

0 3.00

0 4.00

0

0 1

			_							_				
			Fre	-	ncies				ructor	Course	-	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1656/1674	2.67	4.58	4.27	4.42	2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1559/1674	3.33	4.25	4.23	4.31	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.40	4.22	4.30	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.22	3.96	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.12	4.08	4.18	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1651/1651	1.00	3.98	4.18	4.23	1.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.41	4.07	4.19	4.50
<u>.</u> .														
Lecture		_			_									
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	0		1472/1585		4.80	4.69	4.76	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	0		1129/1582		4.49	4.26	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575		4.58	4.27	4.35	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1217/1380	3.00	4.08	3.94	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	4.00	4.01	4.18	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	0	0		1493/1515	2.00	4.10	4.24	4.40	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	n		1420/1511	3.00	4.26	4.27	4.45	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	0	٥	3.00	881/ 994		4.35	3.94	4.19	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	U	U	U		U	U	3.00	001/ 994	3.00	4.33	3.94	4.19	3.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	3.98	4.86	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	63/ 77	3.00	4.50	3.93	4.24	3.00

Frequency Distribution

2 0

2 0

0 0 0 0 0 1

> 0 0 1

2

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: THTR 490 0101 University of Maryland PRODUCTION WORKSHOP Baltimore County

Title Fall 2005 Instructor: MEHTA, XERXES J Enrollment: 8

	0	a. 1 .	~		
Questionnaires:	8	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	8	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.58	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	433/1674	4.63	4.25	4.23	4.31	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.60	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.40	4.22	4.30	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	251/1585	4.63	4.22	3.96	4.01	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	238/1535	4.67	4.12	4.08	4.18	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	2	0	0	3	3.33	1504/1651	3.33	3.98	4.18	4.23	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	136/1656	4.83	4.41	4.07	4.19	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	173/1520	4.83	4.00	4.01	4.18	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	289/1515	4.83	4.10	4.24	4.40	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.26	4.27	4.45	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	4.35	3.94	4.19	5.00

Page 1670

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

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