Course-Section: THTR 100 0101

University of Maryland INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG

Enrollment: 8 Ouestionnaires: 4

Title

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1613 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Instructor Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 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 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 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 1 2 1 4.00 1029/1623 3.54 4.02 4.16 4.08 4.00 0 0 0 8. How many times was class cancelled 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 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 00 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 1 0 4.00 68/312 4.00 3.45 3.68 3.51 4.00 Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				_	0						

Course-Section: THTR 100 0201 University of Maryland Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP

Baltimore County

Page 1614

FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Instructor:	SCHRAVEN, GREGG	Fall	2008
Enrollment:	7		

Questionnaires: 3 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	433/1649	4.51	4.69	4.28	4.11	4.67
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	0			1546/1648			4.23		3.33
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	2	0	1			1360/1375		4.56	4.27	4.10	
		uations reflect			1	0	0	0	1	0			1067/1595		4.48	4.20	4.03	
				what you learned	1	0	1	0		0			1441/1533				3.87	
				o what you learned	1		1	0	0	0			1428/1512			4.10	3.86	
		g system clearl			1	0	1	0	0	0			1533/1623		4.02	4.16	4.08	
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1646				4.67	
				hing effectiveness	2	•	0	0	0	1	_		914/1621			4.06		
		Lectur																
1 Word +	ho ingtr	uctor's lecture	propared	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	2 E0	1460/1568	4.38	4 70	4.43	4.39	3.50	
		ctor seem inter		1	-	0	0	1	-			1460/1508			4.43			
			xplained clearly	1		0						1388/1564		4.54		4.20		
		es contribute t		1		0	1					1370/1559		4.63		4.20		
			our understanding	1		0	1					1049/1352						
5. Did au	laiovisua.	ı techniques en	our understanding	Т	U	U	Т	U	U	1	3.50	1049/1352	4.22	4.41	3.98	3.80	3.50	
		Labora	tory															
5. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	4.75	3.83	4.29	4.14	5.00
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading made	e 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 co	nferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.45	3.68	3.51	4.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	'arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pe:	asons				Ty	ne			Majors	
									· ·								, . – – – –	
00-27	0	A 0		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2														_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	T				1	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0 0	D 0		_												
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### -					ſh	
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				Ι 0		Otl	her					0						
				? 0														

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

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

							LIE	quer.	icres	,		TIIS	LIUCLOI	Course	: Dept	UMBC	телет	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 1101	. goin no	Genera insights,ski		m this source	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	247/1649	4.51	4.69	4.28	4.11	4.83
		or make clear			0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	556/1648	4.07	4.46	4.23	4.11	4.50
		stions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	1		4.50		4.05	4.56	4.27	4.10	4.50
		tions reflect			0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50		4.02	4.48	4.20	4.03	4.50
5. Did ass	signed rea	dinas contrib	ute to s	what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0			366/1533	3.67	4.44		3.87	
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0			595/1512	3.67	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.33
		system clearly			0	0	0	1	1	2			1222/1623	3.54	4.02	4.16	4.08	3.83
		as class canc		11104	0	0	0	0	1	2			1340/1646		4.67	4.69	4.67	
				hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	-		754/1621				3.96	
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	ne instruc	tor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	983/1568	4.38	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.40
		or seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	2	3		1146/1572	4.69	4.89	4.70	4.64	4.60
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0			1001/1564			4.28		4.20
		contribute to			1	0	0	0	1	0		4.60		4.39		4.29		4.60
				our understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	247/1352			3.98	3.86	4.60
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	sions contrib	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384	4.32	4.57	4.08	3.86	4.50	
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1382		4.74	4.29	4.03	5.00
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1368	3.62			4.01	5.00
		hniques succe		•	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	4.67			3.75	
		Labora	torv															
1. Did the	e lab incr		_	f the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	31/ 221	4.63	4.75	4.16	4.05	4.75
				ground information	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	35/ 243	4.38		4.12		4.75
				or lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 212	4.75	4.83		4.43	
		ructor provid			2	0	0	0	0	1		4.75	52/ 209	4.88		4.35	4.38	4.75
				early 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 co	nferences			ield activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.45	3.68	3.51	4.00
		Self	Dogod															
5. Were tl	nere enoug	h proctors for		he students	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	***	4.00	3.99	3.83	****
			Frequ	encu	, Diet	rih	ıt i or	1										
				_	cricy	DISC	.1 100											
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Тур	pe 			Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors		2	Graduate	9	0	Majo	or	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3			_							_	_			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	neral	-				0	Under-gi	rad	6	Non-	-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0								_						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1				_	h	
				P 0								_	response	es to b	e sign	ıficar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ıer					2						
				3 0														

Course-Section: THTR 100 0401 University of Maryland Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1616

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	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		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		1365/1368	3.62	4.32	4.30	4.01	1.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
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	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: THTR 100 0501

INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP

Title SCHRAVEN, GREGG

Instructor:

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1617 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequen							Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General	0	0	1	-1	1	1	2	2 57	1470/1640	4 51	4 60	4 00	4 11	2 57
 Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 	0	0	1 1	1	1 2	1	3 2		1479/1649 1558/1648	4.51 4.07	4.69	4.28	4.11 4.16	3.57 3.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	1		1180/1375	4.07	4.46	4.23	4.10	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	2		1231/1595	4.03	4.48	4.27	4.10	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	1	0	2		1483/1533	3.67	4.44	4.20	3.87	2.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	0	2		1428/1512	3.67		4.10	3.86	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	1	1		1565/1623	3.54		4.16	4.08	2.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5		977/1646	4.71		4.69		4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	1	2		1302/1621		4.31		3.96	
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	U		U	_	1	2	3.00	1302/1021	4.00	4.51	1.00	3.90	3.00
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		4.57	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		1071/1368	3.62	4.32	4.30	4.01	
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		4.92	4.35		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		****/ 81	****	****	4.43	1.00	****
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	
3. Dia conferences help you carry out field activities	1	_	U	J	U	۷	J	1.00	00/ 512	1.00	5.15	3.00	3.31	1.00
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	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grad	es Reasons		Туре		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	В 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	1
				P 0			responses to	be sig	nificant	

I 0 Other 2 ? 0

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Page 1618

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

I

?

0

0

Course-Section: THTR 104 0101

7

INTRO TO COSTUME

JOYCE, SHELLEY

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

								_	ncies		_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	433/1649	4.79	4.69	4.28	4.11	4.67
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	,		4.46	4.23	4.16	4.83
		estions reflec			1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375		4.56	4.27	4.10	4.80
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	497/1595		4.48	4.20	4.03	4.50
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	815/1533	4.50	4.44	4.04	3.87	4.00
				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	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	915/1623	4.62	4.02	4.16	4.08	4.17
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	833/1646	4.89	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.80
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	374/1621	4.48	4.31	4.06	3.96	4.50
		Ŧ - · ·	_															
1 1/1 +1	ha 3	Lectur			0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.50	050/1560	4.88	4.70	1 12	4 20	4 50
		ctor's lecture tor seem inter		0	0	0	0	1 0	1	6	5.00	852/1568 1/1572		4.70	4.43	4.39 4.64	4.50 5.00	
			explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	, -		4.54	4.70	4.20	4.67	
		es contribute t		0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559		4.63	4.29	4.20	5.00	
				you rearned your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	,		4.41	3.98		4.83
J. Did ad	alovisuai	. ceciniiques en	nance j	your understanding	U	U	U	U	U	_	5	1.05	123/1332	1.01	1.11	3.90	3.00	1.03
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute 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 a	ll studen	its actively en	courage	ed 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	e instruc	tor encourage	fair ar	nd 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 s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		3	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.56	3.95	3.75	4.00
		Labora	torv															
1 Did th	e lah ind		-	of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 221	5.00	4.75	4.16	4.05	****
				ground information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 243		4.25	4.12	4.08	****
				for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 212		4.83	4.40	4.43	****
		structor provid			5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 209		4.92	4.35	4.38	***
				learly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 555		3.83	4.29	4.14	****
			Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utior	ı										
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	;		
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Rec	nnir	 ed fo	or Ma	iors		1	 Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 r	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		2000	.1~++,	_ ~		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	-	_	52 44440	-	-		-	5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	6	Non-	major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													3	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									respons					
													_		_			

Other

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Course-Section: THTR 104 0102 University of Maryland Page 1619 INTRO TO COSTUME FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029 JOYCE, SHELLEY

Enrollment:	5					
Questionnaires:	5	S	tudent	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

							Fr	eane.	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
		Genera	1															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1649	4.79	4.69	4.28	4.11	5.00
		ctor make clear			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 q	uestions reflec	t 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 eval	uations reflect	the e	xpected 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 r	eadings contrib	ute 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 as	signments contr	ibute	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 gradin	g system clearl	y expl	ained	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 cand	elled		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 overa	ll tea	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	165/1621	4.48	4.31	4.06	3.96	4.75
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were	e the instr	uctor's lecture	s 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 instru	ctor seem inter	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 ma	terial presente	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 lectur	es contribute t	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	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance	your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	157/1352	4.81	4.41	3.98	3.86	4.75
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc	ussions contrib	ute 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	e all stude	nts actively en	courag	ed to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	4.67	4.74	4.29	4.03	****
3. Did	the instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	4.83	4.32	4.30	4.01	****
		Labora	itory															
1. Did	the lab in	crease understa	nding	of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	5.00	4.75	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were	e you provi	ded with adequa	te bac	kground information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	4.00	4.25	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were	e necessary	materials avai	lable	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 in	structor provid	le assi	stance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	5.00	4.92	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were	e requireme	learly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	3.83	4.29	4.14	****		
			Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n										
Credita	s Earned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	l
00-27	0	A 3		 Re	anir	 ed f	or Ma	ior		0	Graduat		0	Majo		0		
28-55		0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	В 0		110	-quit	Ca I	OT 1410	. 101	_	J	Graduat	_	J	1.10	-	O
56-02	0	2 00-2 00	Λ	C 0		Co	noro	1				1	IIndox-a	rad	5	Non	major	5

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				2	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: THTR 104 0103

6

INTRO TO COSTUME

JOYCE, SHELLEY

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

Fall 2008

Page 1620

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

		Ouestionnaire

		Ouestion	q		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Di	d you gain i	new insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	644/1649	4.79	4.69	4.28	4.11	4.50
2. Di	d the instr	uctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	556/1648	4.83	4.46	4.23	4.16	4.50
3. Di	d the exam	questions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	296/1375	4.89	4.56	4.27	4.10	4.75
4. Di	d other eval	luations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	818/1595	4.54	4.48	4.20	4.03	4.25
5. Di	d assigned :	readings contrib	ute 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. Di	d written a	ssignments contr	ibute t	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. Wa	s the gradin	ng system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	502/1623	4.62	4.02	4.16	4.08	4.50
8. Ho	w many time:	s was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	913/1646	4.89	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.75
9. Ho	w would you	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	914/1621	4.48	4.31	4.06	3.96	4.00
		Lectur	-															
		ructor's lecture			1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	4.88	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00
		uctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	2		1071/1572	4.92	4.89	4.70	4.64	4.67
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	473/1564	4.83	4.54	4.28	4.20	4.67
		res contribute t			1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.63	4.29	4.20	5.00
5. Di	d audiovisua	al techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	208/1352	4.81	4.41	3.98	3.86	4.67
		Discus																
		cussions contrib			2	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1384	4.89	4.57		3.86	5.00
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1382	4.67	4.74	4.29	4.03	5.00
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1368	4.83	4.32	4.30	4.01	5.00
4. We	re special	techniques succe	ssful		3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.56	3.95	3.75	4.00
				Frequ	lency	/ Dist	tribu	ıtioı	ı									
Credi	ts Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-2	7 0	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	aiors	. – – –	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	2
28-5		1.00-1.99	0	В 1			1					-		-	-		_	_
56-8		2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	2
84-1		3.00-3.49	0	D 0								-					5 2	=
Grad		3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	1h
	-		-	P 0									respons				_	•
				I O		Otl	her					1			5			
				? 0														

Baltimore County

Page 1621 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: THTR 104 0104 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO COSTUME Fall 2008 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY

Enrollment:	3	
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions								Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
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 4.64 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 2 4.67 321/1595 4.54 4.48 4.20 4.03 4.67 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 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 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 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 0 3 5.00 1/1624 4.89 4.67 4.69 4.67 5.00 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 234/1621 4.48 4.31 4.06 3.96 4.67 5.00 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1646 4.88 4.70 4.43 4.39 5.00 3.00 3.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00			Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did dassigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the lab increase understanding effectivenes 1. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3. Were pou provided with adequate background information 4. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding of the material 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3. Did General 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 4. Did General 5. Did General 6. Di			Genera	 1															
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 4. 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 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 4.57 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 559/1512 4.45 4.19 4.10 3.86 4.33 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 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 0 3 5.00 1/1624 4.89 4.67 4.69 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 234/1621 4.48 4.31 4.06 3.96 4.67 1.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 234/1621 4.48 4.31 4.06 3.96 4.67 1.00 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1568 4.88 4.70 4.43 4.39 5.00 1.00 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 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 1/1574 4.83 4.54 4.29 4.20 5.00 5.01 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 5.01 4. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 5.00 5.01 4.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	1. Did v	zou gain ne		_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1649	4.79	4.69	4.28	4.11	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 321/1595 4.54 4.89 4.56 4.27 4.10 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.67 321/1595 4.54 4.89 4.56 4.27 4.10 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 1 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 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 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 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 0 0 3 5.00 1/1664 4.89 4.67 4.69 4.67 5.00 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 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 1/1568 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 1/1568 4.88 4.70 4.64 5.00 4.01 did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1569 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 4.01 did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 4.01 did the lab increase understanding of the material 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 4.01 did the lab instructor provide assistance 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/212 5.00 4.83 4.04 4.43 5.00 4.01 did the lab instructor provide assistance 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/212 5.00 4.83 4.04 4.43 5.00 4.01 did the lab instructor provide assistance 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/212 5.00 4.83 4.04 4.43 5.00 4.01 did the lab instructor provide assistance 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/212 5.00 4.83 4.04 4.43 5.00 4.01 did the lab instructor provide assistance 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0						0	0	0			0	3						4.16	
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 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 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 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 0 1 2 4.67 234/1621 4.48 4.31 4.06 3.96 4.67 Lecture Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 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 1/1572 4.92 4.89 4.70 4.64 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 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 0 0 1 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/215 5.00 4.75 4.16 4.05 5.00 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/225 5.00 4.83 4.40 4.43 5.00 2.85 5.00 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 5.00 1/209 5.00 4.92 4.35 4.38 5.00 2.85 5.00 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 5.00 1/209 5.00 4.92 4.35 4.38 5.00 2.85 5.00 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 5.00 1/209 5.00 4.92 4.35 4.38 5.00 2.85 5.00 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 6.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.						0	0	0	0	0	0	3			4.89	4.56		4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 1 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 0 2 1 4.33 595/1512 4.45 4.19 4.10 3.86 4.33 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 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 0 3 5.00 1/1624 4.89 4.67 4.69 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 234/1621 4.48 4.31 4.06 3.96 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 234/1621 4.48 4.31 4.06 3.96 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 234/1621 4.48 4.31 4.06 3.96 4.67 5.00 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1568 4.88 4.70 4.43 4.39 5.00 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1568 4.88 4.70 4.43 4.39 5.00 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1568 4.83 4.54 4.28 5.00 9. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1569 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 9. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 9. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1259 5.00 4.75 4.16 4.05 5.00 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/125 5.00 4.75 4.16 4.05 5.00 9. Did the lab instructor provided with adequate background information 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/125 5.00 4.75 4.16 4.05 5.00 9. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/125 5.00 4.83 4.40 4.35 5.00 9. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/125 5.00 4.83 4.40 4.35 5.00 9. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0						0	0	0	0	0	1	2				4.48		4.03	
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 0 3 5.00 1/1646 4.89 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 5.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1568 4.88 4.70 4.43 4.39 5.00 2.00 1/1569 5.00 1/1568 4.88 4.70 4.43 4.39 5.00 1/1569 5						0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.44	4.04	3.87	4.50
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 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 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 1/1574 4.92 4.89 4.70 4.64 5.00 3. Was 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 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	6. Did w	vritten as:	signments contr	ibute 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
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1568 4.88 4.70 4.43 4.39 5.00 2.00 1.	7. Was t	he grading	g system clearly	y explai	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1623	4.62	4.02	4.16	4.08	5.00
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 9. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10. Did the lab	8. How m	many times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	4.89	4.67	4.69	4.67	5.00
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 0 3 5.00 1/1572 4.92 4.89 4.70 4.64 5.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 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 0 3 5.00 1/1352 4.81 4.41 3.98 3.86 5.00 5.00 5. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1352 4.81 4.41 3.98 3.86 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.0	9. How w	vould you	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	234/1621	4.48	4.31	4.06	3.96	4.67
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 0 3 5.00 1/1572 4.92 4.89 4.70 4.64 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 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 1/1352 4.81 4.41 3.98 3.86 5.00 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/221 5.00 4.75 4.16 4.05 5.00 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 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 September 2 Under-grad 3 Non-major 3 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																			
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 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 5.01 daudiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1552 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 1/252 4.81 4.41 3.98 3.86 5.00 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/221 5.00 4.75 4.16 4.05 5.00 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 O0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 3 Non-major 3 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						•	•	•			•	_				4 50	4 40		
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 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 0 3 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.29 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.20 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.63 4.20 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.20 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.20 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.20 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.20 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.20 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.20 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.20 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.20 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.20 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.20 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.20 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.20 4.20 5.00 1/1559 5.00						-	-	-	-	0	0								
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 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 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 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 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 O0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 3 Non-major 3 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Gradu. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant						-	-	-	-	-	-	_							
Laboratory Lab						0						-							
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2 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 5.00 155/243 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 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 3 Non-major 3 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						0		-	-		-	-							
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 Erequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 3 Non-major 3 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	5. Did a	audiovisua.	I techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	U	U	U	0	U	U	3	5.00	1/1352	4.81	4.41	3.98	3.86	5.00
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 Erequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 3 Non-major 3 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			Laborat	tory															
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 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 3 Non-major 3 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	1 Did +	he lah in		-	f the material	2	Ω	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	5 00	1 / 221	5 00	4 75	4 16	4 05	5 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 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 3 Non-major 3 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																			
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 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 3 Non-major 3 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												-							
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 3 Non-major 3 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								-		-	-	_							
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 0 0 General 2 Under-grad 3 Non-major 3 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			reconstruction provides			_			-	-		_		_, _,					
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 3 Non-major 3 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					Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
28-55	Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
28-55	00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Re	 quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	 S	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant		0		0	в 1			1									3		
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	56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				2	Under-q	rad	3	Non-	major	3
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant		0			D 0									3				3	
P 0 responses to be significant		0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	_j h
					P 0													_	
I 0 Other 0					I 0		Ot1	her					0	-					
? 0					? 0														

Course-Section: THTR 202 0101

Title INTRO DRAMA LITERATURE

Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE

Enrollment: 35
Questionnaires: 30

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1622 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fr 1	eque:	ncies 3	5 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did y	you gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m 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 t	the instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	2	0	0	3	2	9	14	4.21	943/1648	4.21	4.46	4.23	4.25	4.21
3. Did t	the exam qu	uestions reflect	t the e	xpected goals	2	2	0	1	3	7	15	4.38	684/1375	4.38	4.56	4.27	4.37	4.38
4. Did c	other evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	3	3	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	451/1595	4.54	4.48	4.20	4.22	4.54
5. Did a	assigned re	eadings contrib	ute 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 w	written ass	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 t	the grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	2	0	1	1	5	8	13	4.11	979/1623	4.11	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.11
8. How m	many times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	14	15	4.52	1184/1646	4.52	4.67	4.69	4.63	4.52
9. How w	would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	6	0	0	2	2	11	9	4.13	835/1621	4.13	4.31	4.06	4.01	4.13
		Lecture	е															
		uctor's lecture:			9	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	387/1568	4.81	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.81
		ctor seem inter		_	9	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	591/1572	4.90	4.89	4.70	4.73	4.90
				xplained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.50
		es contribute to		-	10	0	2	0	3	2	13		1009/1559		4.63	4.29	4.33	4.20
5. Did a	audiovisual	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	9	1	3	4	4	1	8	3.35	1122/1352	3.35	4.41	3.98	4.07	3.35
		Discus			_	_	_	_	_	_			040					
				what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	2	18	4.68	310/1384		4.57	4.08	3.99	4.68
				d to participate	8	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	425/1382		4.74	4.29	4.19	4.73
		_		d open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	2	19	4.73	461/1368		4.32	4.30	4.21	4.73
4. Were	special te	echniques succes	ssful		8	1	1	2	5	7	6	3.71	619/ 948	3.71	4.56	3.95	3.89	3.71
1 1		Labora	_		0.0	-	•	-	0	•	0	0 00	**** / 001	****	4 55	4 16	4 45	****
		crease understa	_		28	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 221		4.75	4.16	4.45	****
				ground information	28	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 243		4.25	4.12	4.47	****
	_			or lab activities early specified	29 19	1	0	1	4	1	1 4	3.80	****/ 212 448/ 555		4.83	4.40 4.29	4.62	3.80
3	104411001	_		cdil, phocilica		_	Ü	_	-	_	-	3.00	110, 000	3.00	3.03	1.27	1.00	3.00
_		Semina					_	_										
				announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 88		4.00	4.54	3.75	****
	_	-		what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 81		****	4.43	3.67	****
5. Were	criteria 1	for grading made	e clear		21	3	1	4	0	1	0	2.17	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.65	****
E D.1.1 -		Field V		1.7.7	20	0	0	_	0	2	0	0 40	205 / 210	0 40	2 45	2 60	2 50	0 40
5. Dia c	conferences	s help you carry	y out I	ield activities	20	0	2	5	0	3	0	2.40	285/ 312	2.40	3.45	3.68	3.59	2.40
5 Were	there eno	Self I		he students	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3 72	****
J. Weie	there enou	ugn proctors ro.	L AII L			-				U	U	2.00	/ 110		4.00	3.99	3.72	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	7	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 4		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 3	30	Non-	-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -				_	ſh
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	oe sigr	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Otl	ner				1	.0						

Course-Section: THTR 210 0101

Title HISTORY OF THEATRE I

Instructor: KALEBA, CASEY

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 23

Fall 2008

Page 1623 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

		Questions	3		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did vo	u gain new	General		this gourse	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	256/1649	4 83	4.69	4.28	4.29	4.83
		or make clear			0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	,		4.46	4.23	4.25	4.74
		stions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	258/1375	4.78	4.56	4.27	4.37	4.78
		tions reflect			0	1	0	0	3	3		4.59	394/1595	4.59	4.48	4.20	4.22	4.59
				hat you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	249/1533	4.65	4.44	4.04	4.04	4.65
				what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	7	12	4.36			4.19	4.10		4.36
		system clearl			0	0	0	1	4	5	13	4.30	757/1623		4.02	4.16	4.21	4.30
		as class cance			0	0	0	0	2	17			1513/1646		4.67	4.69		4.09
				ing effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	3			125/1621		4.31			4.82
		Lecture	е															
1. Were th	he instruc	tor's lectures	s well p	repared	1	0	0	1	1	2	18	4.68	604/1568	4.68	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.68
2. Did the	e instruct	or seem inter	ested 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 led	cture mate	rial presented	d and ex	plained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	447/1564	4.68	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.68
		contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	250/1559	4.86	4.63	4.29	4.33	4.86
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enl	nance yo	ur understanding	1	0	0	0	4	4	14	4.45	351/1352	4.45	4.41	3.98	4.07	4.45
		Discus	sion															
				hat 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 a	ll student	s actively end	couraged	to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	373/1382	4.78	4.74	4.29	4.19	4.78
				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 sp	pecial tec	hniques succes	ssful		5	5	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	323/ 948	4.31	4.56	3.95	3.89	4.31
		Labora	tory															
5. Were re	equirement	s for lab repo	orts cle	arly specified	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 555	****	3.83	4.29	4.33	****
		Semina																
5. Were c	riteria fo	r grading made	e clear		21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.65	****
		Field W																
5. Did co	nferences 1	help you carr	y out fi	eld activities	20	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	3.45	3.68	3.59	****
		Self I																
5. Were th	here enoug	h proctors for	r all th	e students	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.72	***
				Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	 0	A 16					or Ma			3	Graduat		0	Majo		5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 5		кес	4urr.e	=u 1(J⊥ IVIč	a JOE	D	3	Graduat	E	U	Ma Jo) <u>T</u>	5
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Cer	nera:	1				3	Under-g	rad ?	23	Non-	major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		061	ici a.	-				5	onaci -g.	Luu Z		14011		10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0		E14	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
oraa.	J	3.30 1.00	,	P 0		ידר						•	respons					
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.4						
				? 0		001					-	•						

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

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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		1375/1648		4.46	4.23	4.25	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	2		1305/1595		4.48	4.20		3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5			815/1533		4.44	4.04	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	2			1266/1512		4.19	4.10		3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2			1293/1623		4.02	4.16	4.21	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7			1544/1646		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		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		4.74	4.29	4.19	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	1		948/1368	4.50	4.32	4.30		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	2	-	0	0	0	1	0	0 65	085 / 272	0.65	2 45	2 66	2 52	0.65
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
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			ТУ	pe			Majors	1
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor:	 S	1	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo		4
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1												_		

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

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

							Fre	equei	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 I															
1 Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	317/1649	4 31	4.69	4.28	4.29	4.76
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	533/1648	4.12		4.23	4.25	4.53
		uestions reflect			0	12	0	0	1	0	4	4.60		4.60	4.56	4.27	4.37	
	_	uations reflect		_	0	2	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	552/1595	4.09	4.48	4.20	4.22	4.47
				what you learned	0	13	0	0	0	0	4		****/1533	4.00	4.44	4.04	4.04	****
				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
		g system clearly			0	1	1	2	4	4	5		1337/1623		4.02	4.16	4.21	
		was class cance		221100	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	799/1646	4.41	4.67	4.69	4.63	4.82
				ching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	2	8		133/1621		4.31		4.01	
		Lecture																
1 Were +	he inato	Lecture actor's lectures		nrenared	12	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1568	4.42	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00
		ctor seem intere			12	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1500		4.70	4.43	4.73	5.00
				explained clearly	14	0	0	1	0	0	2		****/1564	3.67		4.70	4.73	****
		es contribute to			15	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1559			4.29	4.33	****
					15	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1352				4.33	****
5. Did au	la TOVISUA.	r techniques em	iance y	your understanding	15	U	U	U	U	U	۷	5.00	****/1352	3.45	4.41	3.98	4.07	
		Discuss																
				what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	351/1384	3.98	4.57	4.08	3.99	4.64
				ed to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1382	4.95	4.74	4.29	4.19	4.91
				nd open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1368	4.50	4.32	4.30	4.21	
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssful		7	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	152/ 948	4.58	4.56	3.95	3.89	4.67
		Laborat	cory															
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab repo	orts cl	learly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	3.83	4.29	4.33	****
		Seminar	<u>-</u>															
1. Were a	ssigned t	topics relevant	to the	e announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.00	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was th	e instruc	ctor available f	or ind	dividual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****
5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading made	e clear	2	14	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.17	3.25	3.68	3.65	****
		Field V	Jork															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carry	out f	field activities	14	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	2.67	3.45	3.68	3.59	****
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utio	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	.
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		0		1				1	TTm d	- 5 cm	7	NT	mo = ===	0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1 D 0		Gei	nera	Т				1	Under-g	ıau l	.7	non-	-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0 0	- •		m1	0 a t d					1	- тттт	Moor- +	hore -			.h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	U			ΕIE	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	111
				P 0 I 0		0-1						4	respons	es to D	e sign	ııııcar	1L	
				T 0		Uti	her					4						

?

0

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

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1626

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FORTE, ELIZABET

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	Λ	0	Λ	Λ	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		4.46	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		4.44	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		4.70	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		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		4.54	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	Λ	Λ	2	Ω	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		4.74	4.29	4.19	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	461/1368		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
1. Here breezes eccumiques successful		O	3	3	0	3	O	1.75	133/ 310	1.75	1.50	3.75	5.05	1.75

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-			
				2	0						

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

Baltimore County

FORTE, ELIZABET Instructor:

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 7

FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 1627

Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------------	--------------	---------------

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	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		4.46	4.23	4.25	4.71
3. Did the exam guestions 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	Ο	Ο	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	_		•	•			_			4 50		4 00		****
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1384		4.57	4.08	3.99	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1382		4.74	4.29	4.19	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	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	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d 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	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	0						

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

Title MOVEMENT FOR THE ACTINSTRUCTOR: CROCKER, TEMPLE

Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 7

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1628 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	0	0	0	0	2	2	4 50	427/1204	4 70	4 57	4 00	2 00	4 50
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	Ţ	5		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		1/1368	4.95	4.32	4.30	4.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	Τ	4	0	0	U	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
P		<u> </u>	.,											

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	L.	Expected	d 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	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				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

responses to be significant

- ·					
St.udent.	('Ollred	F,212	liiation	Ougetio	nnaire

						Fr	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did v	zou gain n	ew insights,ski		this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	186/1649	4.95	4.69	4.28	4.29	4.91
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1648			4.23		5.00
		mestions reflec			1	4	0	0	0	1		4.83			4.56		4.37	
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	10		133/1595		4.48	4.20		4.91
		eadings contrib			1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1533		4.44	4.04		
	_	-		what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3			380/1512		4.19	4.10		4.50
		g system clearl			1	0	0	0	0	4			395/1623			4.16		4.60
	_	was class cand		iied	1	0	0	0	0	5			1193/1646		4.67			
	-			ing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	_		313/1621					
	-			5														
1 Woro	the instr	Lecture uctor's lecture		roparod	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/1568	****	4.70	4.43	4.39	****
		ctor seem inter			10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1572		4.89	4.70	4.73	****
					10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1564			4.70	4.27	****
	as lecture material presented and explained cleated the lectures contribute to what you learned				10	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/1559				4.33	
4. DIG (lie lectur	es contribute t	o what y	ou learned	10	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	****/1559		4.03	4.29	4.33	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	class disc	ussions contrib	ute to w	hat 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	Did class discussions contribute to what you learn 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 t	the instru	ctor 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 t	echniques succe	ssful		1	1	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	115/ 948	4.64	4.56	3.95	3.89	4.78
		Labora	torv															
5. Were	requireme	nts for lab rep		arly specified	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 555	4.00	3.83	4.29	4.33	****
5 Were	criteria	Semina for grading made			9	0	0	2	0	0	Λ	2 00	****/ 288	3 00	3 25	3 68	3 65	****
J. WEIE	CIICEIIA	TOT GLACING MAC	e Clear		,	U	U	2	U	U	U	2.00	/ 200	3.00	3.23	3.00	3.03	
		Field	Work															
5. Did c	conference	s help you carr	y out fi	eld activities	8	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	239/ 312	3.92	3.45	3.68	3.59	3.33
		Self	Daced															
5. Were	there eno	ugh proctors for		e students	8	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	4.00	3.99	3.72	4.00
				P		- 54	A											
				Frequ	iency	DIS	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	guir	 ed f	or Ma	ior	`====	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0		_				J						3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									3				5	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	t enoug	γh
	-		-	-		_												

Other

5

Ρ

Ι

?

0

0

0

Course-Section: THTR 230 0101 University of Maryland Title DRAWING FOR THEATRE ZLOTESCU, ELENA Instructor:

Enrollment:

6

Page 1630 FEB 11, 2009 Baltimore County Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires:	5	Student Course	e Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Quescronnarres.	5	brudelle cours	= Evaluation	Quescionnai

	Questions						Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,skil	lls 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	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	702/1648	4.40	4.46	4.23	4.25	4.40
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1595	****	4.48	4.20	4.22	****
		eadings contribu			0	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1533	****	4.44	4.04	4.04	****
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	explai	ned	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1387/1623	3.50	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.50
	2	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	833/1646	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.63	4.80
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overal	ll teach	ing 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 th	he instru	ctor's lectures	s well p	repared	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.67
		tor seem intere			2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.73	5.00
		erial presented			2	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1441/1564	3.33	4.54	4.28	4.27	3.33
		es contribute to			2	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1424/1559	3.33	4.63	4.29	4.33	3.33
			_															
1 541	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you lear					0	0	0	0	0	^	4 00	705 /1204	4 00	4 57	4 00	2 00	4 00
	oid class discussions contribute to what you learn Were all students actively encouraged to participa				3	0	0	0	0	2	0		795/1384		4.57		3.99	4.00
					3	0	0 2	0	0	0	2		1/1382		4.74	4.29	4.19	5.00
	id the instructor encourage fair and open discuss ere special techniques successful				3	0 1	0	1	0	0			1365/1368 ****/ 948		4.32	4.30	4.21	1.00
4. were sp	рестат се	ecimiques succes	SSIUI		3	Τ	U	1	U	U	U	2.00	****/ 948		4.50	3.95	3.89	
		Laborat	-															
5. Were re	equiremen	nts for lab repo	orts cle	arly 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 cr	riteria f	or grading made	e clear		4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.65	****
		Field W	Torels															
5. Did cor	nferences	help you carry		eld activities	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.45	3.68	3.59	****
				Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	atio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	 00-27						 anir	 ed f	 or Ms	 ajors		0	 Graduat		0	Majo		3
28-55						100	datt.	_u _i	OT 1/10	م د ا		•	Graduat	_		1-10.) (<i>,</i> _	5
56-83						Ge	nera:	1				1	Under-q	rad	5	Non-	major	2
84-150															-)	_
Grad.						El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enou	gh
	ad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0												respons					-
				I 0		Ot:	her					4	-					
		? 2																

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						Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.69	4.28	4.29	4.67
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1054/1648	4.11	4.46	4.23	4.25	4.11
		estions reflec		_	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1375	****	4.56	4.27	4.37	****
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	3	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.48	4.20	4.22	4.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1533	****	4.44	4.04	4.04	****
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1512	****	4.19	4.10	4.14	****
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	1	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1359/1623	3.57	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.57
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.63	5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	847/1621	4.11	4.31	4.06	4.01	4.11
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture		orepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.50
		ctor seem inter			3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572		4.89	4.70	4.73	5.00
				xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	2		1028/1564		4.54	4.28		4.17
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					0	0	0	0	2		4.67			4.63		4.33	
						1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	399/1352		4.41	3.98	4.07	
5. Dia aa		our understanding	3	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	J	_	1.10	0,0,7,2002	1.10		3.30	1.07	11.10		
1 541			0	0	0	0	0	1	^	4 00	**** /1 2 0 <i>1</i>		4 57	4 00	2 00	****		
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learn				8	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1384		4.57	4.08	3.99	****
	ere all students actively encouraged to participa id the instructor encourage fair and open discuss				8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1382		4.74	4.29	4.19	****
		_		d open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1368		4.32	4.30	4.21	****
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssiul		8	0	U	Ü	Ü	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.56	3.95	3.89	***
		Labora	_															
5. Were r	requiremer	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	388/ 555	4.00	3.83	4.29	4.33	4.00
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	criteria f	for grading mad	e clear		7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.65	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield 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 se	elf-paced			what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****
		agh proctors for			8	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 110		4.00		3.72	****
J. WCIC C	JICIC CITO	ign proceers ro	I dii c	ic beddefieb	Ü	J	O	O	O	_	Ü	1.00	/ 110		1.00	3.77	3.72	
		ency	Dist	trib	ution	1												
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	}			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27						Per	 muir		or Ma	iore		0	 Graduat		0	Majo	 r	3
	18-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1					1,50	2011	-u -()	ت <u>د</u> ب	•	•	Graduat	_	J	1.10.) (·±	5
	56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-9	rad	9	Non-	major	6
	84-150 3 3.00-3.49 2 D 0					061	iici a.	-				•	onacr -g	_ uu	_	14011		J
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0						ecti	760				0	#### -	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	h
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	1	P 0		11.1	CCLI	v CD				U	respons				_	11
						O+1	her					9	T CBPOIIS	-D -CO 1	oc bigi	cai		
	P 0						rict					J						

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Course-Section: THTR 237 0101

10

SOUND DESIGN

COBB, MILTON T.

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

Page 1632 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General	 															
1. Did vo	u gain nev	w insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	577/1649	4.56	4.69	4.28	4.29	4.56
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.46	4.23	4.25	4.67
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	617/1375	4.44	4.56	4.27	4.37	4.44
4. Did ot	her evalua	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	440/1595	4.56	4.48	4.20	4.22	4.56
5. Did as	signed rea	adings contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	545/1533	4.33	4.44	4.04	4.04	4.33
				what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	2	4.17		4.17	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.17
		system clearly		ned	0	0	0	0	2	5	2		1029/1623	4.00	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.00
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67		4.63	
9. How wo	uld you gi	rade the overal	ll teach	ing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	847/1621	4.11	4.31	4.06	4.01	4.11
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	well p	repared	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1121/1568	4.25	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.25
		tor seem intere			1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	665/1572	4.88	4.89	4.70	4.73	4.88
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clear Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1064/1564	4.13	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.13
	id 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 au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	495/1352	4.29	4.41	3.98	4.07	4.29
		Discuss	nion															
1 Did al	agg digons			hat you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1384	4.80	4.57	4.08	3.99	4.80
				l to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.74	4.29	4.19	5.00
				l open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	752/1368	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.21	4.40
		chniques succes			4	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 948	****	4.56	3.95	3.89	****
		T - 1																
5 Were r	equirement	Laborat		early specified	5	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	388/ 555	4 00	3 83	4 29	4 33	4 00
J. Wele I	equil emem	cb for fab repo	oreb ere	arry bpecifica	3	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	Ü	_	1.00	3007 333	1.00	3.03	1.25	1.55	1.00
		Seminar																
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading made	e clear		8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.65	****
		Field V	Jork															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	out fi	eld activities	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.45	3.68	3.59	***
				Frequ	onas	Diat	-rib	u+ i 01	2									
				rrequ	lency	DIS		ucioi	.1									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	рe			Majors			
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6					Rec	nuir	ed fo	or Ma	iors		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		1000	1411	ca i	J1 11a	. , 0 - 1	5	Ü	Gradaci	_	Ü	1145) <u> </u>	3
56-83						Ger	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	4
84-150													3				_	
Grad.						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - I	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	h
	P 0												response	es to b	oe sigr	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					7						
				? 0														

Course-Section: THTR 239 0101

University of Maryland MOVEMT II:ALEXANDER TE Baltimore County

Title SALKIND, WENDY Instructor:

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 12 Fall 2008

Page 1633 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre		ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean		
1 5'	,		General		1.1	0	•	0	0	0	•	1.0	F 00	1 /1 640	F 00	4 60	4 00	4 00	F 00
			new insights,skil			0	0	0	0	0 1	0	12 11	5.00 4.83	1/1649 195/1648	5.00 4.83	4.69 4.46	4.28	4.29 4.25	5.00 4.83
			questions reflect			0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.83	296/1375	4.83	4.46	4.23	4.25	
		_	uations reflect	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.73		4.83	4.48	4.20	4.22	
			eadings contribu			0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83		4.83	4.44	4.04	4.04	4.83
			signments contri		_	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42		4.42	4.19	4.10	4.14	
			g system clearly		-	0	1	0	2	2	3	4		1234/1623	3.82	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.82
			was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.63	5.00
9. Ho	w wou	ld you	grade the overal	l teachir	ng effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	133/1621	4.80	4.31	4.06	4.01	4.80
			Lecture																
			uctor's lectures			0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	344/1568	4.83	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.83
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearl Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.73	5.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				_	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.83			4.54		4.27	
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	0	1		4.92		4.92	4.63		4.33	
5. Di	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					0	4	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	4.07	5.00
	Discussion																		
	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned				-	1	0	0	0	0	2	9		195/1384	4.82	4.57	4.08	3.99	4.82
			nts actively enc			1	0	0	0	0	0	11		1/1382	5.00	4.74	4.29	4.19	
			ctor encourage f		pen discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1368	5.00		4.30	4.21	
4. We	ere sp	ecial t	echniques succes	sful		1	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.56	3.95	3.89	5.00
			Laborat	ory															
5. We	re re	quireme	ents for lab repo	rts clear	rly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	3.83	4.29	4.33	5.00
			Seminar																
5. We	ere cr	iteria	for grading made	clear		10	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.65	****
			Field W	ork															
5. Di	d con	ference	s help you carry	out fiel	d activities	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.45	3.68	3.59	***
	Fi							trib	utior	ı									
Credi	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								Rea	asons				Туј	pe.			Majors	
	00-27			'		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	9	0	Majo	r	1	
28-5		3	1.00-1.99	0	В 4		_							1	, -	•			
	56-83			Ger	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	11			
	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0					. רקד	ectiv					0	нини -	Moona +	homo -			h	
Grad	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0 P 0						ътe	=CL1	ves				U	#### - I				_	11
					I O		O+1	ner				1	1	T C P P O I I S	LD LU L	o argi	ııııdı	10	
					? 0		001						_						
					. •														

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

Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG

Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 2

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1634 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	quer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									

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

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

Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG Fall 2008
Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 3 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland	Page 1635
Baltimore County	FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008	Job IRBR3029

		Ouestion	e e			MD	NA			ncies 3		5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		_	UMBC Mean		Sect
		Quescion																	
		Genera	.1																
		ew insights,ski				0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/164	5.00	4.69	4.28	4.29	5.00
		ctor make clear			ls	0	0	0	0	0	0	3				4.46	4.23	4.25	5.00
		g system clearl		ined		0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/162		4.02		4.21	
	-	was class cand				0	0	0	0	0	1	2		1037/164			4.69	4.63	
9. How wor	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effec	tiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/162	1 5.00	4.31	4.06	4.01	5.00
		Lectur	e																
		uctor's lecture				1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/156	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subj	ect	1	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/157	2 5.00	4.89	4.70	4.73	5.00
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained c	learly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/156	4 5.00	4.54	4.28	4.27	5.00
		es contribute t				1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/155	5.00	4.63	4.29	4.33	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our unders	tanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/135	2 5.00	4.41	3.98	4.07	5.00
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you l	earned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/138	4 5.00	4.57	4.08	3.99	5.00
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to parti	cipate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/138	2 5.00	4.74	4.29	4.19	5.0
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open dis	cussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/136	5.00	4.32	4.30	4.21	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful			1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 94	5.00	4.56	3.95	3.89	5.00
		Labora	tory																
5. Were re	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early spec	ified	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	388/ 55	5 4.00	3.83	4.29	4.33	4.00
		Semina	_																
5. Were co	riteria 1	for grading mad	le clear			2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	283/ 28	3 1.00	3.25	3.68	3.65	1.00
		Field																	
5. Did con	nferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activ	ities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 31	2 3.00	3.45	3.68	3.59	4.00
					Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades				Rea	asons	3			T	ype			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3		Red	 guire	ed f	or Ma	iors	- – – – 3	0	 Gradua	 te	 0	Majo	 or	 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						_						3 -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0		Ger	nera	l				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		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means	here a	are not	enoug	дh
				P	0									respon	ses to 1	oe sign	nificar	ıt	
				I	0		O+1	her					3						
				_	•		001						9						

Course-Section:	THTR 252 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1636
Title	THEATRE LAB	Baltimore County	FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:	COBB, MILTON T.	Fall 2008	Job IRBR3029

COBB, MILTON T. Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

			Fre	equer	ncies	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Ω						

Course-Section: THTR 254 0101 TECHINCAL PRODUCTION SCHRAVEN, GREGG Instructor:

Title

University of Maryland Page 1637 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	10	
Questionnaires:	8	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did vo	u gain ne	Genera w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	328/1649	4.75	4.69	4.28	4.29	4.75
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	897/1648	4.25	4.46	4.23	4.25	4.25
		estions reflec			0	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	855/1375	4.20	4.56	4.27	4.37	4.20
		ations reflect			0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	608/1595	4.43	4.48	4.20	4.22	4.43
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	272/1533	4.63	4.44	4.04	4.04	4.63
	_	_		o what you learned	0	3	1	0	1	1	-		1202/1512		4.19	4.10	4.14	3.60
		system clearl			0	0	0	1	1	5			1270/1623	3.75	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.75
		was class canc	_		0	0	0	0	0	0	8		1/1646		4.67	4.69	4.63	5.00
				hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	547/1621		4.31		4.01	4.38
		Lectur	9															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s 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 th	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	765/1572	4.83	4.89	4.70	4.73	4.83
				explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1028/1564	4.17	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.17
		es contribute t			2	0	0	0	0	1		4.83	284/1559	4.83	4.63	4.29	4.33	4.83
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	2	1	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	879/1352	3.80	4.41	3.98	4.07	3.80
		Discus																
				what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	247/1384		4.57	4.08	3.99	4.75
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	394/1382	4.75	4.74	4.29	4.19	4.75
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1368	5.00		4.30	4.21	5.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		4	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	152/ 948	4.67	4.56	3.95	3.89	4.67
		Field																
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.45	3.68	3.59	****
		Self																
5. Were t	here enou	agh proctors for	r all t	he students	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.72	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	utior	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	1
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А 3		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors		0	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 r	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3			_			-								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera.	L				1	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1					h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	.t	
				I 0		Otł	ner					7						

2

Course-Section: THTR 315 0101 University of Maryland ALEXANDER TECHNIQUE Baltimore County

Page 1638 Title FEB 11, 2009 Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	14				
Questionnaires:	12	Student Co	ourse	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	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	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1	Other					

Course-Section: THTR 324 0101 University of Maryl Title CRAFT OF ACTING III Baltimore County Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY Fall 2008

Enrollment:

14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1639

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaires:	es: 11	Student Course Evaluation (Duestionnaire
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------------------	---------------

		Ouestions		NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncies 3	3	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
		w insights,skills		0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.69	4.28	4.27	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear th	e expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	209/1648	4.82	4.46	4.23	4.18	4.82
		estions reflect t		1	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.56	4.27	4.22	4.67
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect th	e 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 as:	signed re	adings 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 wr	itten ass	signments contribu	te 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
		g system clearly e		0	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1180/1623	3.90	4.02	4.16	4.08	3.90
8. How man	ny times	was class cancell	ed	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	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 t	he instru	actor's lectures w	ell 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	e instruc	tor seem interest	ed 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 le	cture mat	erial presented a	nd 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	e lecture	nat 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 au	diovisual	ce your understanding	6	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	3.97	****	
		n															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions 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
			raged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.74	4.29	4.37	5.00
			r and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1368		4.32	4.30	4.39	5.00
		chniques successf		1	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	122/ 948		4.56	3.95	4.00	4.75
		Laborator	7														
5. Were re	equiremen		s clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	***	3.83	4.29	4.22	****
		Field Wor	<														
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carry o	at field activities	8	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	239/ 312	3.33	3.45	3.68	3.60	3.33
			Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	atio:	n									
			_	_													
Credits E	arned 	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	В 3				_										
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Gei	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1					ſh
			Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
			I 0		Other					1	. 0						
			3 0														

Course-Section: THTR 332 0101

Title ADV SCENE/COSTUME DESI

Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA

Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 4

0

Grad.

3.50-4.00 1

F

I 0

0

0

0

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1640 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

					Frequencies							ructor	Course	_				
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	328/1649	4.75	4.69	4.28	4.27	4.75
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	0	2	1		1347/1648		4.46	4.23	4.18	3.75
		uations reflect			0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.48	4.20	4.21	4.67
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contribu	ate 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 th	ne grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	720/1623	4.33	4.02	4.16	4.08	4.33
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.31	4.06	4.02	5.00
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lectures	s 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 th	ne instru	ctor seem intere	ested i	n 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 le	ecture mat	xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.54	4.28	4.25	4.00		
4. Did th	ne lecture	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 cl	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learne						0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1254/1384	3.00	4.57	4.08	4.11	3.00
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.74	4.29	4.37	5.00
		_		d 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 s	special to	echniques succes	ssful		3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.56	3.95	4.00	4.00
		Laborat	cory															
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	522/ 555	2.00	3.83	4.29	4.22	2.00
		Field V	Work															
5. Did co	onference	s help you carry	y out f	ield activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.45	3.68	3.60	4.00
		Self I	Paced															
5. Were t	here eno	ugh proctors for	r all t	he students	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	4.00	3.99	4.05	4.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Re:	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	.			
		Cum. GPA																
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 3	Required for Majors						3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0							0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	General													

Electives

Other

0

4

Course-Section: THTR 360 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County MODERN THEATRE I Fall 2008

Title Instructor: KALEBA, CASEY

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 20

4. Were special techniques successful

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1641

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did 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	Ω	Λ	0	0	Λ	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		4.74	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	4.74	4.30	4.39	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage rair and open discussion	2	U	U	U	U		Τ0	4 . JI	204/1300	4.71	4.32	Ŧ.30	4.33	ユ・ フエ

Frequency Distribution

9 8 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 ****/ 948 **** 4.56 3.95 4.00 ****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	3						

University of Maryland Page 1642 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: THTR 371 0101

11

PLAYWRITING

MCCULLY, SUSAN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

				Frequencies					5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
		 General															
1 Did v	ou gain n		ls from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	550/1649	4.57	4.69	4.28	4.27	4.57
			the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	862/1648	4.29	4.46	4.23	4.18	4.29
			the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1		****/1375	****	4.56	4.27	4.22	****
			the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	383/1595	4.60	4.48	4.20	4.21	4.60
			te 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
			bute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1512		4.19	4.10	4.11	5.00
		g system clearly		0	2	1	0	1	1	2		1347/1623	3.60	4.02	4.16	4.08	3.60
		was class cancel		0	0	0	0	0	5	_		1377/1646		4.67	4.69		4.29
			l teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	2		812/1621					4.14
		Lecture															
1 Were	the instr	uctor'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
			sted in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	1		1241/1572		4.89	4.70	4.64	4.50
			and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1564		4.54	4.28	4.25	****
		what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	1	-		****/1559		4.63	4.29	4.23	****	
		-															
		ion	2	0	0	_	•	•	_			- 00		4 00			
	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384		4.57	4.08	4.11	5.00
				2					1	4	4.80	342/1382		4.74	4.29	4.37	4.80
			air and open discussion						1 1	3	4.40	752/1368		4.32	4.30	4.39	4.40
4. Were	special t	echniques success	SIUI	2	2 2 0 0 0					2	4.67	152/ 948	4.67	4.56	3.95	4.00	4.67
		Field Wo															
	_		e to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52		****	4.06	3.59	****
_		. .	r evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****
		ctor available fo		6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****
			ss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did c	5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities						0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	3.45	3.68	3.60	****
			Frequ	uency	/ Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Tv	pe			Majors	\$
00-27 28-55	0 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 A 5 0 B 1	Required for Majo				ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1 C 0	General						4	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	7	
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1 D 0	General						-	onder g	144	,	14011		,	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2 F 0	Electives							0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enono	rh

Credits E	Credits Earned			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				2	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

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			NR	NA	Fro	equei 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		General															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew 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 th	e instru	ctor make clear th	e 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 ot	her eval	uations reflect th	e expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1595	****	4.48	4.20	4.21	****
5. Did as	signed r	eadings 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 wr	itten as	signments contribu	te to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1512	****	4.19	4.10	4.11	****
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearly e	xplained	0	5	0	0	2	0	0		1533/1623	3.00	4.02	4.16	4.08	3.00
	_	was class cancell		0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646		4.67	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	uld 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 t	he instr	uctor's lectures w	ell prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.75
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem interest	ed 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 le	cture ma	terial presented a	nd 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 th	e lectur	es contribute to w	hat 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 au	diovisua	l techniques enhan	ce your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.97	5.00
		Discussio	n														
1. Did cl	ass disc		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
	Were all students actively encouraged to particip Did the instructor encourage fair and open discus					0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.74	4.29	4.37	5.00
		_		3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	426/1368	4.75	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.75
4. Were s	pecial t	ul	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.56	3.95	4.00	5.00	
	Laboratory																
2. Were v	Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background informa						0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.25	4.12	3.89	****
_	4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance					0	0	0	0	1		****/ 209		4.92	4.35	4.12	****
	s clearly specified	6 5	0 1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 555		3.83	4.29		****		
4. Did pr	esentati	Seminar ons contribute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.46	****
	Field Work																
1. Did fi	eld expe		to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
	_		evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****
_		ctor available for		6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****
4. To wha	t degree	could you discuss	your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did co	nference	s help you carry o	ut field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	3.45	3.68	3.60	****
		Self Pac	ed														
1. Did se	1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
	Fi				/ Dis	trib	utio	า									
						~											
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad						Rea	asons	5 			Ту	ре 			Majors	
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7					quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0															
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	5
84-150	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0										_						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0		El	ecti [.]	ves				3	#### -			re not	_	h

Other

3

Ρ

Ι

0

0

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Page 1644 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	5	Student Course	e Evaluation Questionnaire
			F

Course-Section: THTR 450 0101

6

SENIOR PROJECT

SEARLS, COLETTE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

						Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	776/1649	4.40	4.69	4.28	4.50	4.40
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1448/1648	3.60	4.46	4.23	4.36	3.60
		uestions reflec			0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.56	4.27	4.48	4.67
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	192/1595	4.80	4.48	4.20	4.36	4.80
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o 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	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1347/1623	3.60	4.02	4.16	4.27	3.60
8. How max	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.31	4.06	4.24	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.57	4.08	4.35	****
2. Were a	Were all students actively encouraged to participate Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussions.					0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	****	4.74	4.29	4.56	****
3. Did th	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss						0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	****	4.32	4.30	4.58	****
4. Were s	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion. Were special techniques successful					0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.56	3.95	4.31	****
	Self Paced																	
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	***	****	4.30	4.64	****
2. Did st	udy quest	tions make clea	r the e	xpected goal	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	***	****	4.16	4.24	****
3. Were y	our conta	acts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	***	****	4.43	4.84	****
4. Was th	e feedba	ck/tutoring by	proctor	s helpful	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****
5. Were t	here enou	ugh proctors fo	r all t	he students	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	4.22	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Тъ	ре			Majors	
					Reasons													
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors					3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1	
28-55 56-83	0	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0	В 0 С 0	Conoral						0	Under-9	rad	5	Non	madom	1	
84-150	1	3.00-2.99		D 0	General						U	onder-9	ıau	S	NOII-	-major	4	
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-3.49	1 1	D 0 F 0	Floativos							0	#### -	Moona t	homo -	no+		.h
GLau.	U	3.30-4.00	Τ	Р 0	Electives					U	#### - respons				_	111		
	P 0				O+1	hor					4	respons	es to t	e sign	ıııcan	16		
				1 0	Other							4						

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

8

Page 1645

Enrollment:	10		
Questionnaires:	10	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

I 0

0

Questions				NR	NA	Fr 1	equei 2	ncies	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
× 400 010110																	
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	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	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					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					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					0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1572		4.89	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	524/1564		4.54	4.28	4.40	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	561/1559	4.63	4.63	4.29		4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	0	0	1	2	-	4.43	379/1352		4.41	3.98		4.43
5. Did dadiovibual teelmiques elmanee your understanding					O	Ü	O	_	2	•	1.15	313/1332	1.15	1.11	3.70	1.07	1.15
Discussion																	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					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					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					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					1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.56	3.95	4.31	5.00
		Laborato	orv														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified					0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	***	3.83	4.29	4.41	***
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear						0	0	0	4	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.25	3.68	3.71	4.00
		55		_			-	-	_								
			Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades					Reasons							Type			Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0 A 10		Required for Majors					 5	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 0		regarred for hajord					-	-	or adda c	-	-		_	-
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		CONCLAI						_	011401 9		-	2.011		-
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						Electives					0	#### - 1	#### - Means there are not enough				
P 0													onses to be significant				

Other