

Course-Section: THTR 100 0101  
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP  
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1613  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	4.50	644/1649	4.51	4.69	4.28	4.11	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	897/1648	4.07	4.46	4.23	4.16	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	546/1375	4.05	4.56	4.27	4.10	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	236/1595	4.02	4.48	4.20	4.03	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1441/1533	3.67	4.44	4.04	3.87	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1428/1512	3.67	4.19	4.10	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1029/1623	3.54	4.02	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1193/1646	4.71	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	234/1621	4.09	4.31	4.06	3.96	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	636/1568	4.38	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	4.69	4.89	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	473/1564	4.34	4.54	4.28	4.20	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	901/1559	4.39	4.63	4.29	4.20	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	690/1352	4.22	4.41	3.98	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	795/1384	4.32	4.57	4.08	3.86	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1382	4.17	4.74	4.29	4.03	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	522/1368	3.62	4.32	4.30	4.01	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	4.67	4.56	3.95	3.75	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	3.87	3.25	3.68	3.54	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.45	3.68	3.51	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 100 0201  
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP  
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1614  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	4.67	433/1649	4.51	4.69	4.28	4.11	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1546/1648	4.07	4.46	4.23	4.16	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1360/1375	4.05	4.56	4.27	4.10	2.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1067/1595	4.02	4.48	4.20	4.03	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1441/1533	3.67	4.44	4.04	3.87	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1428/1512	3.67	4.19	4.10	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1533/1623	3.54	4.02	4.16	4.08	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	4.71	4.67	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	914/1621	4.09	4.31	4.06	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1460/1568	4.38	4.70	4.43	4.39	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1463/1572	4.69	4.89	4.70	4.64	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1388/1564	4.34	4.54	4.28	4.20	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1370/1559	4.39	4.63	4.29	4.20	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1049/1352	4.22	4.41	3.98	3.86	3.50	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	4.75	3.83	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	83/ 288	3.87	3.25	3.68	3.54	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.45	3.68	3.51	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 100 0301  
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP  
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1615  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	247/1649	4.51	4.69	4.28	4.11	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	556/1648	4.07	4.46	4.23	4.16	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	546/1375	4.05	4.56	4.27	4.10	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	497/1595	4.02	4.48	4.20	4.03	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	366/1533	3.67	4.44	4.04	3.87	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	595/1512	3.67	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1222/1623	3.54	4.02	4.16	4.08	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1340/1646	4.71	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	754/1621	4.09	4.31	4.06	3.96	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	983/1568	4.38	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1146/1572	4.69	4.89	4.70	4.64	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1001/1564	4.34	4.54	4.28	4.20	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	586/1559	4.39	4.63	4.29	4.20	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	247/1352	4.22	4.41	3.98	3.86	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384	4.32	4.57	4.08	3.86	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	4.17	4.74	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	3.62	4.32	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	4.67	4.56	3.95	3.75	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	31/ 221	4.63	4.75	4.16	4.05	4.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	35/ 243	4.38	4.25	4.12	4.08	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 212	4.75	4.83	4.40	4.43	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	52/ 209	4.88	4.92	4.35	4.38	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	293/ 555	4.75	3.83	4.29	4.14	4.50	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.45	3.68	3.51	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 100 0401  
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP  
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1616  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	4.51	4.69	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	4.07	4.46	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	4.05	4.56	4.27	4.10	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1537/1595	4.02	4.48	4.20	4.03	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	3.67	4.44	4.04	3.87	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	3.67	4.19	4.10	3.86	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1029/1623	3.54	4.02	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	4.71	4.67	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	914/1621	4.09	4.31	4.06	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	4.38	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	4.69	4.89	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	4.34	4.54	4.28	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	4.39	4.63	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	4.22	4.41	3.98	3.86	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.32	4.57	4.08	3.86	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1316/1382	4.17	4.74	4.29	4.03	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1365/1368	3.62	4.32	4.30	4.01	1.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 100 0501  
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP  
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1617  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3								4	5
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1479/1649	4.51	4.69	4.28	4.11	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1558/1648	4.07	4.46	4.23	4.16	3.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1180/1375	4.05	4.56	4.27	4.10	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1231/1595	4.02	4.48	4.20	4.03	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	1	0	2	2.86	1483/1533	3.67	4.44	4.04	3.87	2.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	1428/1512	3.67	4.19	4.10	3.86	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	1565/1623	3.54	4.02	4.16	4.08	2.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	977/1646	4.71	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1302/1621	4.09	4.31	4.06	3.96	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1050/1568	4.38	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	765/1572	4.69	4.89	4.70	4.64	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	854/1564	4.34	4.54	4.28	4.20	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	695/1559	4.39	4.63	4.29	4.20	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	690/1352	4.22	4.41	3.98	3.86	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	937/1384	4.32	4.57	4.08	3.86	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	946/1382	4.17	4.74	4.29	4.03	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1071/1368	3.62	4.32	4.30	4.01	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	431/ 948	4.67	4.56	3.95	3.75	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	64/ 221	4.63	4.75	4.16	4.05	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	155/ 243	4.38	4.25	4.12	4.08	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	105/ 212	4.75	4.83	4.40	4.43	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 209	4.88	4.92	4.35	4.38	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	74/ 88	4.00	4.00	4.54	4.31	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	1	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	184/ 288	3.87	3.25	3.68	3.54	3.60
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.45	3.68	3.51	4.00
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.83	****

Frequency Distribution

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

I	0	Other	2
?	0		

Course-Section: THTR 104 0101  
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME  
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1618  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	4	4.67	433/1649	4.79	4.69	4.28	4.11	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	195/1648	4.83	4.46	4.23	4.16	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375	4.89	4.56	4.27	4.10	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	497/1595	4.54	4.48	4.20	4.03	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	815/1533	4.50	4.44	4.04	3.87	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	782/1512	4.45	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	915/1623	4.62	4.02	4.16	4.08	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	833/1646	4.89	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	374/1621	4.48	4.31	4.06	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	852/1568	4.88	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	4.92	4.89	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	473/1564	4.83	4.54	4.28	4.20	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.63	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	123/1352	4.81	4.41	3.98	3.86	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	326/1384	4.89	4.57	4.08	3.86	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	774/1382	4.67	4.74	4.29	4.03	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	522/1368	4.83	4.32	4.30	4.01	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.56	3.95	3.75	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	5.00	4.75	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	4.00	4.25	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	5.00	4.83	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	5.00	4.92	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	3.83	4.29	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1619  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1649	4.79	4.69	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1648	4.83	4.46	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1375	4.89	4.56	4.27	4.10	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	236/1595	4.54	4.48	4.20	4.03	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1533	4.50	4.44	4.04	3.87	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	156/1512	4.45	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	169/1623	4.62	4.02	4.16	4.08	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1646	4.89	4.67	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	165/1621	4.48	4.31	4.06	3.96	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1568	4.88	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	4.92	4.89	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1564	4.83	4.54	4.28	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.63	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	157/1352	4.81	4.41	3.98	3.86	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	4.89	4.57	4.08	3.86	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	4.67	4.74	4.29	4.03	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	4.83	4.32	4.30	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	5.00	4.75	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	4.00	4.25	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	5.00	4.83	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	5.00	4.92	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	3.83	4.29	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: THTR 104 0103  
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME  
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1620  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	2	4.50	644/1649	4.79	4.69	4.28	4.11	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	556/1648	4.83	4.46	4.23	4.16	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	296/1375	4.89	4.56	4.27	4.10	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	818/1595	4.54	4.48	4.20	4.03	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.44	4.04	3.87	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	380/1512	4.45	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	502/1623	4.62	4.02	4.16	4.08	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	913/1646	4.89	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	914/1621	4.48	4.31	4.06	3.96	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	4.88	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1071/1572	4.92	4.89	4.70	4.64	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	473/1564	4.83	4.54	4.28	4.20	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.63	4.29	4.20	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	208/1352	4.81	4.41	3.98	3.86	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	4.89	4.57	4.08	3.86	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	4.67	4.74	4.29	4.03	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	4.83	4.32	4.30	4.01	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.56	3.95	3.75	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0104  
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME  
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1621  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	5.00	1/1649	4.79	4.69	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648	4.83	4.46	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	4.89	4.56	4.27	4.10	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1595	4.54	4.48	4.20	4.03	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.44	4.04	3.87	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	595/1512	4.45	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1623	4.62	4.02	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	4.89	4.67	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	234/1621	4.48	4.31	4.06	3.96	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	4.88	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	4.92	4.89	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1564	4.83	4.54	4.28	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.63	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1352	4.81	4.41	3.98	3.86	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 221	5.00	4.75	4.16	4.05	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	155/ 243	4.00	4.25	4.12	4.08	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 212	5.00	4.83	4.40	4.43	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 209	5.00	4.92	4.35	4.38	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 202 0101  
 Title INTRO DRAMA LITERATURE  
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1622  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	0	1	2	2	6	17	4.29	933/1649	4.29	4.69	4.28	4.29	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	2	9	14	4.21	943/1648	4.21	4.46	4.23	4.25	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	1	3	7	15	4.38	684/1375	4.38	4.56	4.27	4.37	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	451/1595	4.54	4.48	4.20	4.22	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	1	24	4.64	256/1533	4.64	4.44	4.04	4.04	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	5	18	4.32	606/1512	4.32	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	5	8	13	4.11	979/1623	4.11	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	15	4.52	1184/1646	4.52	4.67	4.69	4.63	4.52	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	2	2	11	9	4.13	835/1621	4.13	4.31	4.06	4.01	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	387/1568	4.81	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	591/1572	4.90	4.89	4.70	4.73	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	3	2	13	4.20	1009/1559	4.20	4.63	4.29	4.33	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	3	4	4	1	8	3.35	1122/1352	3.35	4.41	3.98	4.07	3.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	2	18	4.68	310/1384	4.68	4.57	4.08	3.99	4.68	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	425/1382	4.73	4.74	4.29	4.19	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	2	19	4.73	461/1368	4.73	4.32	4.30	4.21	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	2	5	7	6	3.71	619/ 948	3.71	4.56	3.95	3.89	3.71	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 221	****	4.75	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.25	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.83	4.40	4.62	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	448/ 555	3.80	3.83	4.29	4.33	3.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.00	4.54	3.75	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	3	1	4	0	1	0	2.17	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	2	5	0	3	0	2.40	285/ 312	2.40	3.45	3.68	3.59	2.40	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	30	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: THTR 210 0101  
 Title HISTORY OF THEATRE I  
 Instructor: KALEBA, CASEY  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1623  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	256/1649	4.83	4.69	4.28	4.29	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	281/1648	4.74	4.46	4.23	4.25	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	258/1375	4.78	4.56	4.27	4.37	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	394/1595	4.59	4.48	4.20	4.22	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	249/1533	4.65	4.44	4.04	4.04	4.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	564/1512	4.36	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5	13	4.30	757/1623	4.30	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	17	4	4.09	1513/1646	4.09	4.67	4.69	4.63	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	125/1621	4.82	4.31	4.06	4.01	4.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	18	4.68	604/1568	4.68	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	296/1572	4.95	4.89	4.70	4.73	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	447/1564	4.68	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	250/1559	4.86	4.63	4.29	4.33	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	4	14	4.45	351/1352	4.45	4.41	3.98	4.07	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	326/1384	4.67	4.57	4.08	3.99	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	373/1382	4.78	4.74	4.29	4.19	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	403/1368	4.78	4.32	4.30	4.21	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	323/ 948	4.31	4.56	3.95	3.89	4.31	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 555	****	3.83	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	3.45	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 23	Non-major 18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 14		
				? 0			

Course-Section: THTR 220 0101  
 Title CRAFT OF ACTING I  
 Instructor: YATES, PEGGY  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1624  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	0	2	3	3.86	1311/1649	4.31	4.69	4.28	4.29	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	2	3.71	1375/1648	4.12	4.46	4.23	4.25	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	2	3.71	1305/1595	4.09	4.48	4.20	4.22	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	815/1533	4.00	4.44	4.04	4.04	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1266/1512	3.84	4.19	4.10	4.14	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1293/1623	3.67	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.41	4.67	4.69	4.63	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1261/1621	4.23	4.31	4.06	4.01	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1373/1568	4.42	4.70	4.43	4.39	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	1071/1572	4.83	4.89	4.70	4.73	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1336/1564	3.67	4.54	4.28	4.27	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1322/1559	3.67	4.63	4.29	4.33	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1160/1352	3.25	4.41	3.98	4.07	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1159/1384	3.98	4.57	4.08	3.99	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1382	4.95	4.74	4.29	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	948/1368	4.50	4.32	4.30	4.21	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	203/ 948	4.58	4.56	3.95	3.89	4.50	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	3.83	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	2	1	3	0	3.17	222/ 288	3.17	3.25	3.68	3.65	3.17	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	1	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	275/ 312	2.67	3.45	3.68	3.59	2.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1 Under-grad 7 Non-major 3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

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

Course-Section: THTR 220 0201  
 Title CRAFT OF ACTING I  
 Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1625  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	317/1649	4.31	4.69	4.28	4.29	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	533/1648	4.12	4.46	4.23	4.25	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	464/1375	4.60	4.56	4.27	4.37	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	552/1595	4.09	4.48	4.20	4.22	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1533	4.00	4.44	4.04	4.04	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	3	9	4.19	764/1512	3.84	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	1337/1623	3.67	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	799/1646	4.41	4.67	4.69	4.63	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	133/1621	4.23	4.31	4.06	4.01	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1568	4.42	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	4.83	4.89	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1564	3.67	4.54	4.28	4.27	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1559	3.67	4.63	4.29	4.33	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1352	3.25	4.41	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	351/1384	3.98	4.57	4.08	3.99	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1382	4.95	4.74	4.29	4.19	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1368	4.50	4.32	4.30	4.21	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	152/ 948	4.58	4.56	3.95	3.89	4.67	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	3.83	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.00	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.17	3.25	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	2.67	3.45	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	4

Course-Section: THTR 222 0101  
 Title: VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I  
 Instructor: FORTE, ELIZABET  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1626  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	12	4.92	149/1649	4.82	4.69	4.28	4.29	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	323/1648	4.70	4.46	4.23	4.25	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	226/1375	4.84	4.56	4.27	4.37	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	462/1595	4.60	4.48	4.20	4.22	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	280/1533	4.52	4.44	4.04	4.04	4.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	711/1512	4.47	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	659/1623	4.26	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	1469/1646	4.15	4.67	4.69	4.63	4.15	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	374/1621	4.35	4.31	4.06	4.01	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1568	4.93	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	406/1564	4.86	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	261/1559	4.93	4.63	4.29	4.33	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1352	4.50	4.41	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	275/1384	4.73	4.57	4.08	3.99	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1382	4.91	4.74	4.29	4.19	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	461/1368	4.73	4.32	4.30	4.21	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	133/ 948	4.73	4.56	3.95	3.89	4.73	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 13 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 8	
			? 0		

Course-Section: THTR 222 0201  
 Title: VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I  
 Instructor: FORTE, ELIZABET  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1627  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	372/1649	4.82	4.69	4.28	4.29	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	300/1648	4.70	4.46	4.23	4.25	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	199/1375	4.84	4.56	4.27	4.37	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	321/1595	4.60	4.48	4.20	4.22	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	454/1533	4.52	4.44	4.04	4.04	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	225/1512	4.47	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	936/1623	4.26	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1476/1646	4.15	4.67	4.69	4.63	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	754/1621	4.35	4.31	4.06	4.01	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	4.93	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	4.86	4.54	4.28	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	4.93	4.63	4.29	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.41	3.98	4.07	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	4.73	4.57	4.08	3.99	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	4.91	4.74	4.29	4.19	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	4.73	4.32	4.30	4.21	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.45	3.68	3.59	****	

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	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						



Course-Section: THTR 229 0101  
 Title MOVEMENT FOR THE ACTOR  
 Instructor: CROCKER, TEMPLE  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1628  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1/1649	4.95	4.69	4.28	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	475/1648	4.79	4.46	4.23	4.25	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	733/1375	4.58	4.56	4.27	4.37	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	162/1595	4.88	4.48	4.20	4.22	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.44	4.04	4.04	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	915/1623	4.38	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1340/1646	4.42	4.67	4.69	4.63	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	288/1621	4.59	4.31	4.06	4.01	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	437/1384	4.70	4.57	4.08	3.99	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	312/1382	4.87	4.74	4.29	4.19	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1368	4.95	4.32	4.30	4.21	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	203/ 948	4.64	4.56	3.95	3.89	4.50	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	388/ 555	4.00	3.83	4.29	4.33	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	229/ 288	3.00	3.25	3.68	3.65	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 312	3.92	3.45	3.68	3.59	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 229 0201  
 Title MOVEMENT FOR THE ACTOR  
 Instructor: CROCKER, TEMPLE  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1629  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	10	4.91	186/1649	4.95	4.69	4.28	4.29	4.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1648	4.79	4.46	4.23	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	212/1375	4.58	4.56	4.27	4.37	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	133/1595	4.88	4.48	4.20	4.22	4.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.44	4.04	4.04	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	395/1623	4.38	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1193/1646	4.42	4.67	4.69	4.63	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	4.59	4.31	4.06	4.01	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1568	****	4.70	4.43	4.39	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1572	****	4.89	4.70	4.73	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1564	****	4.54	4.28	4.27	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1559	****	4.63	4.29	4.33	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	150/1384	4.70	4.57	4.08	3.99	4.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1382	4.87	4.74	4.29	4.19	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	264/1368	4.95	4.32	4.30	4.21	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	115/ 948	4.64	4.56	3.95	3.89	4.78	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 555	4.00	3.83	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	3.00	3.25	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	239/ 312	3.92	3.45	3.68	3.59	3.33	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	4.00	3.99	3.72	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	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 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	5

Course-Section: THTR 230 0101  
 Title DRAWING FOR THEATRE  
 Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1630  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	2	1	3.60	1471/1649	3.60	4.69	4.28	4.29	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	702/1648	4.40	4.46	4.23	4.25	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1595	****	4.48	4.20	4.22	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1533	****	4.44	4.04	4.04	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1387/1623	3.50	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	833/1646	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.63	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	687/1621	4.25	4.31	4.06	4.01	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1441/1564	3.33	4.54	4.28	4.27	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1424/1559	3.33	4.63	4.29	4.33	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.57	4.08	3.99	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.74	4.29	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1365/1368	1.00	4.32	4.30	4.21	1.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 948	****	4.56	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	522/ 555	2.00	3.83	4.29	4.33	2.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.45	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	2
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	1	Under-grad
			Electives	0	Major
			Other	4	Non-major
					2

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

Course-Section: THTR 234 0101  
 Title MAKE-UP FOR THE STAGE  
 Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1631  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.69	4.28	4.29	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1054/1648	4.11	4.46	4.23	4.25	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1375	****	4.56	4.27	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.48	4.20	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1533	****	4.44	4.04	4.04	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1512	****	4.19	4.10	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1359/1623	3.57	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	847/1621	4.11	4.31	4.06	4.01	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1028/1564	4.17	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	512/1559	4.67	4.63	4.29	4.33	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	399/1352	4.40	4.41	3.98	4.07	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1384	****	4.57	4.08	3.99	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	****	4.74	4.29	4.19	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	****	4.32	4.30	4.21	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.56	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	388/ 555	4.00	3.83	4.29	4.33	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	275/ 312	2.67	3.45	3.68	3.59	2.67	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 237 0101  
 Title SOUND DESIGN  
 Instructor: COBB, MILTON T.  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1632  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	577/1649	4.56	4.69	4.28	4.29	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.46	4.23	4.25	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	617/1375	4.44	4.56	4.27	4.37	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	440/1595	4.56	4.48	4.20	4.22	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	545/1533	4.33	4.44	4.04	4.04	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	782/1512	4.17	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	847/1621	4.11	4.31	4.06	4.01	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1121/1568	4.25	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	665/1572	4.88	4.89	4.70	4.73	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1064/1564	4.13	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	561/1559	4.63	4.63	4.29	4.33	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	495/1352	4.29	4.41	3.98	4.07	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1384	4.80	4.57	4.08	3.99	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.74	4.29	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	752/1368	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.21	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.56	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	388/ 555	4.00	3.83	4.29	4.33	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.45	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	9	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 239 0101  
 Title MOVEMT II:ALEXANDER TE  
 Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1633  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	12	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.69	4.28	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	195/1648	4.83	4.46	4.23	4.25	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	296/1375	4.75	4.56	4.27	4.37	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	174/1595	4.83	4.48	4.20	4.22	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	137/1533	4.83	4.44	4.04	4.04	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	507/1512	4.42	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1234/1623	3.82	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	133/1621	4.80	4.31	4.06	4.01	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	344/1568	4.83	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	234/1564	4.83	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	184/1559	4.92	4.63	4.29	4.33	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	195/1384	4.82	4.57	4.08	3.99	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.74	4.29	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.32	4.30	4.21	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.56	3.95	3.89	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	3.83	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.45	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 250 0101  
 Title INTRO PRODUCTION TECH  
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1634  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.69	4.28	4.29	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.46	4.23	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.56	4.27	4.37	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.48	4.20	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.44	4.04	4.04	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.02	4.16	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	4.83	4.67	4.69	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.31	4.06	4.01	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.54	4.28	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.63	4.29	4.33	5.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	291/ 312	3.00	3.45	3.68	3.59	2.00

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

Course-Section: THTR 250 0102  
 Title INTRO PRODUCTION TECH  
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1635  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.69	4.28	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.46	4.23	4.25	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.02	4.16	4.21	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1037/1646	4.83	4.67	4.69	4.63	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.31	4.06	4.01	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.54	4.28	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.63	4.29	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.57	4.08	3.99	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.74	4.29	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.32	4.30	4.21	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.56	3.95	3.89	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	388/ 555	4.00	3.83	4.29	4.33	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	283/ 288	1.00	3.25	3.68	3.65	1.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	3.00	3.45	3.68	3.59	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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



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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1636  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.69	4.28	4.29	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.46	4.23	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.67	4.69	4.63	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1617/1621	1.00	4.31	4.06	4.01	1.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.54	4.28	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.63	4.29	4.33	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: THTR 254 0101  
 Title TECHINICAL PRODUCTION  
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1637  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	4.75	328/1649	4.75	4.69	4.28	4.29	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	897/1648	4.25	4.46	4.23	4.25	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	855/1375	4.20	4.56	4.27	4.37	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	608/1595	4.43	4.48	4.20	4.22	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	272/1533	4.63	4.44	4.04	4.04	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1202/1512	3.60	4.19	4.10	4.14	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	1270/1623	3.75	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	547/1621	4.38	4.31	4.06	4.01	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	765/1572	4.83	4.89	4.70	4.73	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1028/1564	4.17	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	284/1559	4.83	4.63	4.29	4.33	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	879/1352	3.80	4.41	3.98	4.07	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	247/1384	4.75	4.57	4.08	3.99	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	394/1382	4.75	4.74	4.29	4.19	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.32	4.30	4.21	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	152/ 948	4.67	4.56	3.95	3.89	4.67	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.45	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.72	****	

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	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	2						

Course-Section: THTR 315 0101  
 Title ALEXANDER TECHNIQUE  
 Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1638  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.69	4.28	4.27	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.46	4.23	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	296/1375	4.75	4.56	4.27	4.22	4.75		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	186/1595	4.82	4.48	4.20	4.21	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	241/1533	4.67	4.44	4.04	4.05	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	595/1512	4.33	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	894/1623	4.18	4.02	4.16	4.08	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1121/1646	4.58	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	442/1621	4.45	4.31	4.06	4.02	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.54	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.63	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	613/1384	4.33	4.57	4.08	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	774/1382	4.33	4.74	4.29	4.37	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	796/1368	4.33	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.56	3.95	4.00	****	

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 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
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
			? 1		

Course-Section: THTR 324 0101  
 Title CRAFT OF ACTING III  
 Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1639  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	11	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.69	4.28	4.27	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	209/1648	4.82	4.46	4.23	4.18	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.56	4.27	4.22	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.48	4.20	4.21	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	264/1533	4.64	4.44	4.04	4.05	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	156/1512	4.80	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1180/1623	3.90	4.02	4.16	4.08	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	94/1621	4.90	4.31	4.06	4.02	4.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	387/1568	4.80	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	263/1564	4.80	4.54	4.28	4.25	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	318/1559	4.80	4.63	4.29	4.23	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.57	4.08	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.74	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.32	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	122/ 948	4.75	4.56	3.95	4.00	4.75	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	3.83	4.29	4.22	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	239/ 312	3.33	3.45	3.68	3.60	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 332 0101  
 Title ADV SCENE/COSTUME DESI  
 Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1640  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	328/1649	4.75	4.69	4.28	4.27	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1347/1648	3.75	4.46	4.23	4.18	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.48	4.20	4.21	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.44	4.04	4.05	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	720/1623	4.33	4.02	4.16	4.08	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.31	4.06	4.02	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.54	4.28	4.25	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.63	4.29	4.23	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1254/1384	3.00	4.57	4.08	4.11	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.74	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1356/1368	2.00	4.32	4.30	4.39	2.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.56	3.95	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	522/ 555	2.00	3.83	4.29	4.22	2.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.45	3.68	3.60	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	4.00	3.99	4.05	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 360 0101  
 Title MODERN THEATRE I  
 Instructor: KALEBA, CASEY  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1641  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	203/1649	4.88	4.69	4.28	4.27	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	920/1648	4.24	4.46	4.23	4.18	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	13	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1375	****	4.56	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.48	4.20	4.21	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	174/1533	4.76	4.44	4.04	4.05	4.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	422/1512	4.47	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	1	6	4	5	3.81	1234/1623	3.81	4.02	4.16	4.08	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	1121/1646	4.59	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	348/1621	4.53	4.31	4.06	4.02	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	424/1568	4.79	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.54	4.28	4.25	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	448/1559	4.71	4.63	4.29	4.23	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	117/1352	4.86	4.41	3.98	3.97	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.57	4.08	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1382	4.91	4.74	4.29	4.37	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	264/1368	4.91	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 948	****	4.56	3.95	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 5
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 3		

Course-Section: THTR 371 0101  
 Title PLAYWRITING  
 Instructor: MCCULLY, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1642  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	5	4.57	550/1649	4.57	4.69	4.28	4.27	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	862/1648	4.29	4.46	4.23	4.18	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.56	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	383/1595	4.60	4.48	4.20	4.21	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	815/1533	4.00	4.44	4.04	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.19	4.10	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1347/1623	3.60	4.02	4.16	4.08	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1377/1646	4.29	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	812/1621	4.14	4.31	4.06	4.02	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1241/1572	4.50	4.89	4.70	4.64	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1564	****	4.54	4.28	4.25	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1559	****	4.63	4.29	4.23	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.57	4.08	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	342/1382	4.80	4.74	4.29	4.37	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	752/1368	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	152/ 948	4.67	4.56	3.95	4.00	4.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	3.45	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 390 0101  
 Title THEATRE IN PRODUCTION  
 Instructor: ROCKWELL, JUANI  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1643  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	4.71	372/1649	4.71	4.69	4.28	4.27	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	862/1648	4.29	4.46	4.23	4.18	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1595	****	4.48	4.20	4.21	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	288/1533	4.60	4.44	4.04	4.05	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1512	****	4.19	4.10	4.11	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1533/1623	3.00	4.02	4.16	4.08	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	288/1621	4.60	4.31	4.06	4.02	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.54	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	512/1559	4.67	4.63	4.29	4.23	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	247/1384	4.75	4.57	4.08	4.11	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.74	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	426/1368	4.75	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.56	3.95	4.00	5.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.25	4.12	3.89	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.92	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	3.83	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	3.45	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: THTR 450 0101  
 Title SENIOR PROJECT  
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1644  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	776/1649	4.40	4.69	4.28	4.50	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1448/1648	3.60	4.46	4.23	4.36	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.56	4.27	4.48	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	192/1595	4.80	4.48	4.20	4.36	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1533	4.67	4.44	4.04	4.14	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1428/1512	3.00	4.19	4.10	4.26	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1347/1623	3.60	4.02	4.16	4.27	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.31	4.06	4.24	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.57	4.08	4.35	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	****	4.74	4.29	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	****	4.32	4.30	4.58	****
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.56	3.95	4.31	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	4.22	****

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
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	5
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	4

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

Course-Section: THTR 490 0101  
 Title PRODUCTION WORKSHOP  
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1645  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	9	4.90	186/1649	4.90	4.69	4.28	4.50	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.46	4.23	4.36	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1375	****	4.56	4.27	4.48	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	672/1595	4.38	4.48	4.20	4.36	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	327/1533	4.56	4.44	4.04	4.14	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	240/1512	4.70	4.19	4.10	4.26	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	757/1623	4.30	4.02	4.16	4.27	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1103/1646	4.60	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	720/1621	4.22	4.31	4.06	4.24	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.70	4.43	4.54	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	524/1564	4.63	4.54	4.28	4.40	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	561/1559	4.63	4.63	4.29	4.41	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	379/1352	4.43	4.41	3.98	4.07	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	165/1384	4.88	4.57	4.08	4.35	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	394/1382	4.75	4.74	4.29	4.56	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	295/1368	4.88	4.32	4.30	4.58	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.56	3.95	4.31	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	3.83	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.25	3.68	3.71	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	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	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						