

Course-Section: THTR 100 0101
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1612
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4.38 | 780/1639 | 4.39 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 4.38 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 393/1639 | 4.55 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.63 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4.38 | 687/1397 | 4.34 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.38 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4.38 | 640/1583 | 4.34 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 4.38 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3.75 | 1046/1532 | 3.82 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 3.75 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4.00 | 824/1504 | 3.80 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 3.78 | 4.00 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4.25 | 814/1612 | 4.31 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 4.25 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.25 | 1350/1635 | 4.58 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 4.25 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 569/1579 | 4.47 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 4.54 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4.14 | 1175/1518 | 4.52 | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 4.57 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.61 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 510/1517 | 4.72 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.79 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 556/1550 | 4.72 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.79 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.17 | 529/1295 | 4.15 | 4.27 | 3.94 | 3.84 | 4.42 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | 770/1398 | 4.17 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 3.85 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.25 | 816/1391 | 4.29 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.07 | 4.25 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.25 | 834/1388 | 4.25 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.25 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 958 | 5.00 | 4.33 | 3.93 | 3.71 | 5.00 | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 100 0101
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1613
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4.38 | 780/1639 | 4.39 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 4.38 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 393/1639 | 4.55 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.63 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4.38 | 687/1397 | 4.34 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.38 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4.38 | 640/1583 | 4.34 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 4.38 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3.75 | 1046/1532 | 3.82 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 3.75 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4.00 | 824/1504 | 3.80 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 3.78 | 4.00 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4.25 | 814/1612 | 4.31 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 4.25 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.25 | 1350/1635 | 4.58 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 4.25 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 175/1579 | 4.47 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 4.54 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1518 | 4.52 | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 4.57 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.61 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1517 | 4.72 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.79 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1550 | 4.72 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.79 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 185/1295 | 4.15 | 4.27 | 3.94 | 3.84 | 4.42 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | 770/1398 | 4.17 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 3.85 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.25 | 816/1391 | 4.29 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.07 | 4.25 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.25 | 834/1388 | 4.25 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.25 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 958 | 5.00 | 4.33 | 3.93 | 3.71 | 5.00 | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 100 0201
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1614
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.00 | 1138/1639 | 4.39 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.17 | 948/1639 | 4.55 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.17 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | 973/1397 | 4.34 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.00 | 1010/1583 | 4.34 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 4.00 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3.17 | 1390/1532 | 3.82 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 3.17 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.20 | 1358/1504 | 3.80 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 3.78 | 3.20 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 718/1612 | 4.31 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 4.33 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 766/1635 | 4.58 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 4.83 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4.00 | 889/1579 | 4.47 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 4.00 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 1021/1518 | 4.52 | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 4.33 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.61 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 597/1517 | 4.72 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.50 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 638/1550 | 4.72 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.50 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3.75 | 838/1295 | 4.15 | 4.27 | 3.94 | 3.84 | 3.75 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 329/1398 | 4.17 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 3.85 | 4.67 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 489/1391 | 4.29 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.07 | 4.67 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 944/1388 | 4.25 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 958 | 5.00 | 4.33 | 3.93 | 3.71 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 3.61 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 3.51 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 100 0301
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1615
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 257/1639 | 4.39 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 4.80 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 199/1639 | 4.55 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.80 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 417/1397 | 4.34 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.60 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 371/1583 | 4.34 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 4.60 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 276/1532 | 3.82 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 4.60 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4.00 | 824/1504 | 3.80 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 3.78 | 4.00 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 632/1612 | 4.31 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 4.40 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 4.58 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 137/1579 | 4.47 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 4.80 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 684/1518 | 4.52 | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 4.60 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.61 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 239/1517 | 4.72 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.80 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 288/1550 | 4.72 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.80 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4.00 | 623/1295 | 4.15 | 4.27 | 3.94 | 3.84 | 4.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 770/1398 | 4.17 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 3.85 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 983/1391 | 4.29 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.07 | 4.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 647/1388 | 4.25 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.50 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 958 | 5.00 | 4.33 | 3.93 | 3.71 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 224 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.10 | 3.90 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 240 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.11 | 4.01 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 219 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.44 | 4.44 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 215 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.35 | 4.43 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.25 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.50 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 4.12 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.25 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.39 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 3.90 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 3.61 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 3.51 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | **** | 4.75 | 4.79 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.60 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 4.54 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 4.69 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 5.00 | **** | |

Course-Section: THTR 100 0301
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1615
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0101
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1616
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 257/1639 | 4.74 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 4.80 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 915/1639 | 4.68 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.20 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.80 | 1151/1397 | 4.57 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 3.80 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 597/1583 | 4.50 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 4.40 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 1421/1532 | 3.95 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 3.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 824/1504 | 4.44 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 3.78 | 4.00 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 1044/1612 | 4.75 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 4.00 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 1001/1635 | 4.52 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 4.67 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 889/1579 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 4.00 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 684/1518 | 4.52 | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 4.60 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 802/1520 | 4.95 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.61 | 4.80 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 947/1517 | 4.57 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.20 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 288/1550 | 4.87 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.80 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 346/1295 | 4.80 | 4.27 | 3.94 | 3.84 | 4.40 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4.00 | 770/1398 | 4.00 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 3.85 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3.40 | 1247/1391 | 3.86 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.07 | 3.40 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3.60 | 1157/1388 | 3.70 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 3.60 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | 917/ 958 | 2.50 | 4.33 | 3.93 | 3.71 | 2.50 | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0102
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1617
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1639 | 4.74 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1639 | 4.68 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1397 | 4.57 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 371/1583 | 4.50 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 4.60 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.20 | 633/1532 | 3.95 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 4.20 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 291/1504 | 4.44 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 3.78 | 4.60 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1612 | 4.75 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 5.00 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 1235/1635 | 4.52 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 4.40 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 137/1579 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 4.80 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 947/1518 | 4.52 | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 4.40 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 4.95 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.61 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 474/1517 | 4.57 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.60 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1550 | 4.87 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1295 | 4.80 | 4.27 | 3.94 | 3.84 | 5.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 217/1398 | 4.00 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 3.85 | 4.80 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 543/1391 | 3.86 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.07 | 4.60 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.20 | 872/1388 | 3.70 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.20 | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0104
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1618
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1639 | 4.74 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1639 | 4.68 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1397 | 4.57 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1583 | 4.50 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1532 | 3.95 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 5.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 182/1504 | 4.44 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 3.78 | 4.75 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1612 | 4.75 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 5.00 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 1135/1635 | 4.52 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 4.50 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 241/1579 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 4.67 | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 454/1518 | 4.52 | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 4.75 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 4.95 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.61 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1517 | 4.57 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1550 | 4.87 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1295 | 4.80 | 4.27 | 3.94 | 3.84 | 5.00 | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1398 | 4.00 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 3.85 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 816/1391 | 3.86 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.07 | 4.25 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | 944/1388 | 3.70 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.00 | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0105
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1619
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4.17 | 990/1639 | 4.74 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 4.17 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 517/1639 | 4.68 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 517/1397 | 4.57 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.50 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | 1010/1583 | 4.50 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 4.00 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3.60 | 1184/1532 | 3.95 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 3.60 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 491/1504 | 4.44 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 3.78 | 4.40 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1612 | 4.75 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 5.00 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 1135/1635 | 4.52 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 4.50 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 382/1579 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 4.50 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4.33 | 1021/1518 | 4.52 | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 4.33 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 4.95 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.61 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 597/1517 | 4.57 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.50 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 457/1550 | 4.87 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.67 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 109/1295 | 4.80 | 4.27 | 3.94 | 3.84 | 4.80 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2.20 | 1378/1398 | 4.00 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 3.85 | 2.20 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3.20 | 1289/1391 | 3.86 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.07 | 3.20 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.00 | 1320/1388 | 3.70 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 3.00 | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 120 0101
 Title INTRODUCTION TO THEATR
 Instructor: MCCULLY, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1620
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 4.38 | 771/1639 | 4.38 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 4.38 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 15 | 4.48 | 567/1639 | 4.48 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.48 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 4.56 | 457/1397 | 4.56 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.56 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 14 | 4.48 | 512/1583 | 4.48 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 4.48 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 13 | 4.48 | 366/1532 | 4.48 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 4.48 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 11 | 4.48 | 404/1504 | 4.48 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 3.78 | 4.48 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 4.29 | 779/1612 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 4.29 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 4.90 | 662/1635 | 4.90 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 4.90 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 4.44 | 461/1579 | 4.44 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 4.44 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 4.61 | 670/1518 | 4.61 | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 4.61 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 4.94 | 328/1520 | 4.94 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.61 | 4.94 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 4.56 | 535/1517 | 4.56 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.56 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 4.65 | 478/1550 | 4.65 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.65 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 4.50 | 265/1295 | 4.50 | 4.27 | 3.94 | 3.84 | 4.50 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 4.73 | 285/1398 | 4.73 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 3.85 | 4.73 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 4.64 | 516/1391 | 4.64 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.07 | 4.64 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 4.73 | 423/1388 | 4.73 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.73 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4.50 | 201/ 958 | 4.50 | 4.33 | 3.93 | 3.71 | 4.50 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 224 | **** | 5.00 | 4.10 | 3.90 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 5.00 | 4.11 | 4.01 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 219 | **** | 5.00 | 4.44 | 4.44 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 215 | **** | 5.00 | 4.35 | 4.43 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | **** | 4.18 | 4.25 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.50 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 4.12 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.25 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.39 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 3.90 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 3.61 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 3.51 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | **** | 4.75 | 4.79 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.60 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 4.54 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 4.69 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 5.00 | **** | |

Course-Section: THTR 120 0101
 Title INTRODUCTION TO THEATR
 Instructor: MCCULLY, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1620
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 10 | Required for Majors | 6 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 1 | General | 3 | Under-grad | 21 | Non-major | 21 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 0 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: THTR 202 0101
 Title INTRO DRAMA LITERATURE
 Instructor: KALEBA, CASEY
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1621
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|----|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 12 | 4.46 | 684/1639 | 4.46 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.46 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 8 | 3.92 | 1244/1639 | 3.92 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 3.92 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 8 | 4.18 | 859/1397 | 4.18 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 4.18 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 4.22 | 822/1583 | 4.22 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.22 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 21 | 4.83 | 133/1532 | 4.83 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.83 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 3.95 | 896/1504 | 3.95 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 3.95 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 14 | 4.36 | 681/1612 | 4.36 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.36 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 3 | 4.13 | 1434/1635 | 4.13 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.13 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 13 | 4.57 | 322/1579 | 4.57 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.57 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 4.29 | 1061/1518 | 4.29 | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.29 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 4.83 | 725/1520 | 4.83 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.83 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 9 | 4.29 | 843/1517 | 4.29 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.29 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 16 | 4.54 | 591/1550 | 4.54 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.54 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 3.90 | 731/1295 | 3.90 | 4.27 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 3.90 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 4.48 | 451/1398 | 4.48 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 4.48 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 4.67 | 489/1391 | 4.67 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.67 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 16 | 4.67 | 496/1388 | 4.67 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.67 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 3.86 | 554/ 958 | 3.86 | 4.33 | 3.93 | 4.00 | 3.86 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.00 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 22 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 2.00 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 22 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.00 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---|--------|
| 00-27 | 9 | 0.00-0.99 2 | A 3 | Required for Majors | 6 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 14 | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 0 | C 5 | General | 0 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 0 | D 0 | Under-grad | 24 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 3 | F 0 | | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | | |
| | | | ? 0 | | |
| | | | | Electives | 0 |
| | | | | Other | 17 |
| | | | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | |

Course-Section: THTR 210 0101
 Title HISTORY OF THEATRE I
 Instructor: MESSER, KRISTEN
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1622
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|----|------|----------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 16 | 4.44 | 698/1639 | 4.44 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.44 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 15 | 4.33 | 774/1639 | 4.33 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.33 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 18 | 4.69 | 342/1397 | 4.69 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 4.69 | | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 14 | 4.35 | 683/1583 | 4.35 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.35 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 15 | 4.42 | 419/1532 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.42 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 13 | 4.22 | 638/1504 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.22 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 13 | 4.30 | 767/1612 | 4.30 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.30 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 7 | 4.26 | 1350/1635 | 4.26 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.26 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 16 | 4.68 | 227/1579 | 4.68 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.68 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 17 | 4.67 | 602/1518 | 4.67 | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.67 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 4.96 | 273/1520 | 4.96 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.96 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 16 | 4.54 | 547/1517 | 4.54 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.54 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 17 | 4.67 | 457/1550 | 4.67 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.67 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 13 | 4.33 | 398/1295 | 4.33 | 4.27 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.33 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 4.76 | 251/1398 | 4.76 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 4.76 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 4.88 | 248/1391 | 4.88 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.88 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 4.82 | 307/1388 | 4.82 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.82 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 4.44 | 247/ 958 | 4.44 | 4.33 | 3.93 | 4.00 | 4.44 | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 3.24 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.33 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | **** | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 1.00 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 3.00 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 14 | Required for Majors | 5 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 11 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B | 10 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 27 | Non-major | 16 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | Other | 19 | | | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: THTR 220 0101
 Title CRAFT OF ACTING I
 Instructor: YATES, PEGGY
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1623
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|----|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 4.73 | 342/1639 | 4.80 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.73 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 4.60 | 415/1639 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.60 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 282/1397 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 4.75 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 4.57 | 402/1583 | 4.50 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.57 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 3.87 | 942/1532 | 4.31 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 3.87 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3.80 | 1010/1504 | 3.97 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 3.80 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3.86 | 1214/1612 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 3.86 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 4.87 | 721/1635 | 4.61 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.87 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 4.21 | 702/1579 | 4.43 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.21 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 4.75 | 454/1518 | 4.75 | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.75 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 4.64 | 439/1517 | 4.64 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.64 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 4.73 | 388/1550 | 4.73 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.73 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/1295 | **** | 4.27 | 3.94 | 4.07 | **** | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 211/1398 | 4.71 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 4.82 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1391 | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1388 | 4.80 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.70 | 143/ 958 | 4.74 | 4.33 | 3.93 | 4.00 | 4.70 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | A 12 | Required for Majors | 1 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | B 2 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | C 1 | General | 2 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 15 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 2 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 10 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: THTR 220 0201
 Title CRAFT OF ACTING I
 Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1624
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.86 | 214/1639 | 4.80 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.86 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 4.57 | 445/1639 | 4.59 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.57 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 795/1397 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 4.25 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4.43 | 572/1583 | 4.50 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.43 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 178/1532 | 4.31 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.75 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4.14 | 724/1504 | 3.97 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.14 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4.15 | 924/1612 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.15 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 4.36 | 1273/1635 | 4.61 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.36 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 4.64 | 255/1579 | 4.43 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.64 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1518 | 4.75 | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.48 | **** | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1520 | 5.00 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/1517 | 4.64 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.34 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1550 | 4.73 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.33 | **** | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1295 | **** | 4.27 | 3.94 | 4.07 | **** | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 4.60 | 369/1398 | 4.71 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 4.60 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 4.60 | 543/1391 | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.60 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 4.60 | 571/1388 | 4.80 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.60 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4.78 | 111/ 958 | 4.74 | 4.33 | 3.93 | 4.00 | 4.78 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 5 | 0.00-0.99 3 | A 8 | Required for Majors 0 | Graduate 0 Major 11 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 4 | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 1 | C 1 | General 1 | Under-grad 14 Non-major 3 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 2 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 1 | F 0 | Electives 1 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 12 | |
| | | | ? 1 | | |

Course-Section: THTR 222 0101
 Title: VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I
 Instructor: WATSON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1625
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 154/1639 | 4.71 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.92 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 115/1639 | 4.78 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.92 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4.67 | 367/1397 | 4.60 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 4.67 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 4.50 | 476/1583 | 4.42 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.50 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4.36 | 478/1532 | 4.37 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.36 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4.10 | 770/1504 | 4.14 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.10 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3.91 | 1175/1612 | 3.95 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 3.91 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 4.83 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 4.42 | 484/1579 | 4.25 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.42 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.83 | 315/1518 | 4.67 | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.83 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 491/1520 | 4.83 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.92 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4.67 | 405/1517 | 4.52 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.67 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4.67 | 457/1550 | 4.65 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.67 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.30 | 421/1295 | 4.30 | 4.27 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.30 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 4.58 | 380/1398 | 4.79 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 4.58 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4.67 | 489/1391 | 4.83 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.67 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 4.42 | 730/1388 | 4.71 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.42 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.50 | 201/ 958 | 4.65 | 4.33 | 3.93 | 4.00 | 4.50 | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 222 0201
 Title: VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I
 Instructor: FORTE, ELIZABET
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1626
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 4.50 | 615/1639 | 4.71 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 4.64 | 371/1639 | 4.78 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.64 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 4.54 | 487/1397 | 4.60 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 4.54 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.33 | 697/1583 | 4.42 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.33 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 4.38 | 459/1532 | 4.37 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.38 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4.18 | 678/1504 | 4.14 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.18 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 4.00 | 1044/1612 | 3.95 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.00 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4.67 | 1001/1635 | 4.83 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.67 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 4.08 | 841/1579 | 4.25 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.08 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 807/1518 | 4.67 | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4.75 | 890/1520 | 4.83 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.75 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4.38 | 758/1517 | 4.52 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.38 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 500/1550 | 4.65 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.63 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/1295 | 4.30 | 4.27 | 3.94 | 4.07 | **** | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1398 | 4.79 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1391 | 4.83 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1388 | 4.71 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 99/ 958 | 4.65 | 4.33 | 3.93 | 4.00 | 4.80 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | A 6 | Required for Majors | 0 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | B 7 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | C 0 | General | 14 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Non-major 9 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 1 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 10 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: THTR 229 0101
 Title MOVEMENT FOR THE ACTOR
 Instructor: CROCKER, TEMPLE
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1627
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|----|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 248/1639 | 4.91 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.82 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 4.73 | 284/1639 | 4.72 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.73 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 230/1397 | 4.90 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 4.80 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 143/1583 | 4.88 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.91 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 141/1532 | 4.83 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.82 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4.50 | 367/1504 | 4.63 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.50 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.18 | 892/1612 | 4.44 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.18 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 4.09 | 1458/1635 | 4.25 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.09 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 4.64 | 262/1579 | 4.60 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.64 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1518 | **** | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.48 | **** | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1520 | **** | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1517 | **** | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.34 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1550 | **** | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.33 | **** | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1295 | **** | 4.27 | 3.94 | 4.07 | **** | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1398 | 4.79 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 4.14 | **** | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1391 | 4.93 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.35 | **** | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/1388 | 4.93 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.37 | **** | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 958 | 4.55 | 4.33 | 3.93 | 4.00 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 8 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 6 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 2 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 11 | Non-major | 5 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 10 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: THTR 229 0201
 Title MOVEMENT FOR THE ACTOR
 Instructor: CROCKER, TEMPLE
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1628
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1639 | 4.91 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 4.71 | 295/1639 | 4.72 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.71 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1397 | 4.90 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.86 | 164/1583 | 4.88 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.86 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 4.85 | 129/1532 | 4.83 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.85 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4.77 | 176/1504 | 4.63 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.77 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 4.69 | 281/1612 | 4.44 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.69 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 4.42 | 1225/1635 | 4.25 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.42 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 4.57 | 312/1579 | 4.60 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.57 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1518 | **** | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.48 | **** | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 4.79 | 234/1398 | 4.79 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 4.79 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 4.93 | 181/1391 | 4.93 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.93 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 4.93 | 179/1388 | 4.93 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.93 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.55 | 192/ 958 | 4.55 | 4.33 | 3.93 | 4.00 | 4.55 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 7 | 0.00-0.99 3 | A 10 | Required for Majors | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 3 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 2 | C 0 | General | 2 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 1 | D 0 | | Under-grad 14 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 0 | F 0 | Electives | 0 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 11 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: THTR 230 0101
 Title DRAWING FOR THEATRE
 Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1629
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3.57 | 1466/1639 | 3.57 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 3.57 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2.71 | 1615/1639 | 2.71 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 2.71 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | 1324/1583 | 3.67 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 3.67 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.20 | 1605/1612 | 1.20 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 1.20 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3.43 | 1354/1579 | 3.43 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 3.43 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | 1481/1518 | 3.00 | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 3.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.25 | 1424/1517 | 3.25 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 3.25 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2.75 | 1476/1550 | 2.75 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 2.75 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/1398 | **** | 4.41 | 4.07 | 4.14 | **** | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1391 | **** | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.35 | **** | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1388 | **** | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.37 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 232 0101
 Title SCENE DESIGN
 Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1630
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.00 | 1138/1639 | 4.00 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3.71 | 1381/1639 | 3.71 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 3.71 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 973/1397 | 4.00 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.14 | 900/1583 | 4.14 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.14 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 1421/1532 | 3.00 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 3.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.80 | 1010/1504 | 3.80 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 3.80 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3.00 | 1519/1612 | 3.00 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 3.00 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4.57 | 1087/1635 | 4.57 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.57 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4.14 | 783/1579 | 4.14 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.14 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 807/1518 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.67 | 1033/1520 | 4.67 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.67 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4.17 | 973/1517 | 4.17 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.17 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | 1077/1550 | 4.00 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.00 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 623/1295 | 4.00 | 4.27 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 | 965/1398 | 3.75 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 3.75 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 616/1391 | 4.50 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | 944/1388 | 4.00 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | 917/ 958 | 2.50 | 4.33 | 3.93 | 4.00 | 2.50 | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 4.28 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 3.24 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 234 0101
 Title MAKE-UP FOR THE STAGE
 Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1631
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1639 | 5.00 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4.50 | 517/1639 | 4.50 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1397 | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 476/1583 | 4.50 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.50 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1532 | 5.00 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 5.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1504 | **** | 4.17 | 4.05 | 4.09 | **** | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 4.00 | 1044/1612 | 4.00 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.00 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4.14 | 783/1579 | 4.14 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.14 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4.70 | 561/1518 | 4.70 | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.70 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 622/1520 | 4.88 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.88 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.56 | 535/1517 | 4.56 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.56 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.67 | 457/1550 | 4.67 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.67 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4.13 | 561/1295 | 4.13 | 4.27 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.13 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 260/1398 | 4.75 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 4.75 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 616/1391 | 4.50 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 387/1388 | 4.75 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.75 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 958 | **** | 4.33 | 3.93 | 4.00 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 3.24 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.33 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | **** | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 235 0101
 Title LIGHTING DESIGN I
 Instructor: COBB, MILTON T.
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1632
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.64 | 469/1639 | 4.64 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.64 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 3.91 | 1262/1639 | 3.91 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 3.91 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4.27 | 776/1397 | 4.27 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 4.27 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 4.20 | 852/1583 | 4.20 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.20 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4.00 | 774/1532 | 4.00 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3.55 | 1188/1504 | 3.55 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 3.55 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3.90 | 1175/1612 | 3.90 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 3.90 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 3.82 | 1125/1579 | 3.82 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 3.82 | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4.50 | 807/1518 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.70 | 992/1520 | 4.70 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.70 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 4.00 | 1083/1517 | 4.00 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4.50 | 638/1550 | 4.50 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.50 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3.43 | 1023/1295 | 3.43 | 4.27 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 3.43 | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 770/1398 | 4.00 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 694/1391 | 4.40 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.40 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 834/1388 | 4.25 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.25 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 267/ 958 | 4.40 | 4.33 | 3.93 | 4.00 | 4.40 | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 250 0101
 Title INTRO PRODUCTION TECH
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1633
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 318/1639 | 4.88 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.75 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 517/1639 | 4.75 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.50 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 1010/1583 | 4.00 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.00 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | 718/1612 | 4.67 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.33 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 1350/1635 | 4.63 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.25 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1579 | 4.90 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 5.00 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1518 | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1517 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1550 | 5.00 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 5.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 770/1398 | 4.00 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 983/1391 | 4.00 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 944/1388 | 4.00 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.00 | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 250 0102
 Title INTRO PRODUCTION TECH
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1634
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1639 | 4.88 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1639 | 4.75 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1397 | **** | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.39 | **** | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1583 | **** | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.28 | **** | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1532 | **** | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.09 | **** | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1504 | **** | 4.17 | 4.05 | 4.09 | **** | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1612 | 4.67 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 5.00 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 4.63 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 137/1579 | 4.90 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.80 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1518 | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.48 | **** | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1520 | 5.00 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1517 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.34 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1550 | 5.00 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.33 | **** | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1295 | **** | 4.27 | 3.94 | 4.07 | **** | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1398 | 4.00 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 4.14 | **** | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1391 | 4.00 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.35 | **** | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1388 | 4.00 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.37 | **** | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 958 | **** | 4.33 | 3.93 | 4.00 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: THTR 252 0101
 Title THEATRE LAB
 Instructor: COBB, MILTON T.
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1635
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1639 | 5.00 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1639 | 5.00 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 5.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1579 | 5.00 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 5.00 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 324 0101
 Title CRAFT OF ACTING III
 Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1636
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1639 | 5.00 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 163/1639 | 4.86 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.86 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 367/1397 | 4.67 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.67 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 402/1583 | 4.57 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.57 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1532 | 5.00 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 5.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 138/1504 | 4.83 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.83 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.80 | 1253/1612 | 3.80 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 3.80 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 4.00 | 1497/1635 | 4.00 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1579 | 5.00 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 5.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 200/1398 | 4.83 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 4.83 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 300/1391 | 4.83 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.83 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1388 | 5.00 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 958 | 5.00 | 4.33 | 3.93 | 3.97 | 5.00 | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 329 0101
 Title MOVEMENT FOR ACTOR III
 Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1637
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|---|--------|-----------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 196/1639 | 4.88 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.88 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1639 | 5.00 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 973/1397 | 4.00 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 355/1583 | 4.63 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.63 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 335/1532 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.43 | 466/1504 | 4.43 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.43 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3.88 | 1198/1612 | 3.88 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 3.88 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 4.13 | 1441/1635 | 4.13 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.13 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 205/1579 | 4.71 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.71 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1398 | 5.00 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1391 | 5.00 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1388 | 5.00 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 958 | 5.00 | 4.33 | 3.93 | 3.97 | 5.00 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 360 0101
 Title MODERN THEATRE I
 Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1638
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|----|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 3 | 3.94 | 1206/1639 | 3.94 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 3.94 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 3.53 | 1473/1639 | 3.53 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 3.53 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 14 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.33 | ****/1397 | **** | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.26 | **** | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 3.60 | 1367/1583 | 3.60 | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 3.60 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 4.59 | 287/1532 | 4.59 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.59 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 4.12 | 758/1504 | 4.12 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.12 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 3.44 | 1428/1612 | 3.44 | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 3.44 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 4.38 | 1257/1635 | 4.38 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.38 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 1 | 3.81 | 1125/1579 | 3.81 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.81 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 4.47 | 863/1518 | 4.47 | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.47 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 4.80 | 802/1520 | 4.80 | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.80 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 4.07 | 1048/1517 | 4.07 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.07 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 4.60 | 522/1550 | 4.60 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.60 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4.00 | 623/1295 | 4.00 | 4.27 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 4.17 | 695/1398 | 4.17 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 4.17 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 4.33 | 752/1391 | 4.33 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.33 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 4.33 | 783/1388 | 4.33 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.33 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3.30 | 794/ 958 | 3.30 | 4.33 | 3.93 | 3.97 | 3.30 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 4 | Required for Majors | 2 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | B 9 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | C 4 | General | 1 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 18 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 0 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 14 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: THTR 490 0101
 Title PRODUCTION WORKSHOP
 Instructor: MEHTA, XERXES J
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1639
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 4.95 | 103/1639 | 4.95 | 4.62 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.95 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 4.60 | 415/1639 | 4.60 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.60 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1397 | **** | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.38 | **** | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | ****/1583 | **** | 4.37 | 4.19 | 4.31 | **** | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 4.77 | 171/1532 | 4.77 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.07 | 4.77 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1504 | **** | 4.17 | 4.05 | 4.20 | **** | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/1612 | **** | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.18 | **** | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.59 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 4.53 | 362/1579 | 4.53 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 4.53 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1518 | **** | 4.50 | 4.43 | 4.51 | **** | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1520 | **** | 4.91 | 4.70 | 4.75 | **** | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1517 | **** | 4.46 | 4.27 | 4.34 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1550 | **** | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.24 | **** | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 4.80 | 217/1398 | 4.80 | 4.41 | 4.07 | 4.23 | 4.80 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 4.60 | 543/1391 | 4.60 | 4.47 | 4.30 | 4.48 | 4.60 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 14 | 4.58 | 593/1388 | 4.58 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 4.58 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 96/ 958 | 4.82 | 4.33 | 3.93 | 4.24 | 4.82 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 1 | A 18 | Required for Majors | 0 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 0 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 0 | C 0 | General | 9 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 3 | D 0 | | Under-grad 21 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 10 | F 0 | Electives | 3 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 7 |
| | | | ? 2 | | |