Course-Section: THTR 100  $\,$  1 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Title Intro Theatre Scenogrp Instructor: Schraven, Greggo

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 15

Page 1482 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	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	1	1	4	9	4.40	724/1509	4.40	4.67	4.31	4.18	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	699/1509	4.40	4.48	4.26	4.25	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	5	2	6	4.08	894/1287	4.08	4.56	4.30	4.24	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	619/1459	4.40	4.57	4.22	4.11	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	4	5	3.60	1140/1406	3.60	4.47	4.09	4.02	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	4	5	3	3.64	1120/1384	3.64	4.37	4.11	3.98	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	885/1489	4.13	4.18	4.17	4.20	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1108/1506	4.47	4.60	4.67	4.66	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	467/1463	4.40	4.34	4.09	4.02	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	1032/1438	4.31	4.62	4.46	4.44	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	691/1421	4.85	4.92	4.73	4.66	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	758/1411	4.38	4.63	4.31	4.27	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	4	7	4.23	911/1405	4.23	4.65	4.32	4.27	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	0	3	8	4.23	504/1236	4.23	4.05	4.00	3.87	4.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	936/1260	3.75	4.56	4.14	3.95	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	904/1255	4.00	4.73	4.33	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	818/1258	4.25	4.71	4.38	4.18	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 873	***	4.42	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	28/ 184	4.75	4.56	4.16	4.06	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	79/ 198	4.38	4.22	4.22	4.14	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	31/ 184		4.37	4.48	4.48	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	46/ 177	4.75	4.89	4.36	4.29	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 165	***	5.00	4.18	4.15	****
_		- D.J4	.,											

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	 А	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	1	General	3	Under-grad	15	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	=			
				2	0						

University of Maryland Course-Section: THTR 104 1 Title Intro To Costume Instructor: Ranney-Howes, M.

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Instructor:	Ranney-Howes,M.	
Enrollment:	19	

Questionnaires: 18

Page 1483 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

O +	a	Evaluation	0	
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestion	патге

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
a1														
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	363/1509	4.82	4.67	4.31	4.18	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	817/1509	4.79	4.48	4.26	4.25	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	519/1287	4.80	4.56	4.30	4.24	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	602/1459	4.68	4.57	4.22	4.11	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	746/1406	4.30	4.47	4.09	4.02	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	886/1384	4.44	4.37	4.11	3.98	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	652/1489	4.67	4.18	4.17	4.20	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	957/1506	4.71	4.60	4.67	4.66	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	8	1	3.91	983/1463	4.17	4.34	4.09	4.02	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	775/1438	4.77	4.62	4.46	4.44	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1		10	4.53	592/1411	4.81	4.63	4.31	4.27	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	486/1405	4.76	4.65	4.32	4.27	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	441/1236	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.87	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	1	9	4.21	653/1260	4.64	4.56	4.14	3.95	4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	6	1	5		1110/1255	4.48	4.73	4.33	4.15	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4 4	7	1	1 1	3 1	4 2	6 2	4.07	910/1258	4.60	4.71	4.38	4.18	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	4	,	Τ	Т	1	۷	۷	3.43	731/ 873	4.14	4.42	4.03	3.89	3.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	47/ 184	4.50	4.56	4.16	4.06	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	123/ 198	4.17	4.22	4.22	4.14	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	97/ 184	4.20	4.37	4.48	4.48	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	35/ 177		4.89	4.36	4.29	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 165	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar						_		4 = 0					4 04	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	2	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	2	0	2		****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	$\frac{14}{14}$	0	0	0	0	2	4		****/ 90 ****/ 92	****	****	4.50 4.38	4.21 4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 93	***	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	14	1	U	U	1	U	2	4.33	/ 93			4.00	3.94	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 48	****	5.00	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 48	****	5.00	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	****	5.00	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	****	5.00	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 49	****	5.00	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: THTR 104 1 Title

Intro To Costume

Instructor: Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 18

Ranney-Howes,M.

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1483 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2009

Page 1484 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

				-	ncies		_		ructor		-		Level	
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	4	4.67	410/1509	4.82	4.67	4.31	4.18	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	356/1509	4.79	4.48	4.26	4.25	4.67

2	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	Λ	Λ	Λ	0	2	4	4.67	356/1509	4 79	4 48	4 26	4.25	4 67
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0	0	0	0	•	_	-		,					
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	U	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	519/1287	4.80	4.56	4.30	4.24	4.50
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	454/1459	4.68	4.57	4.22	4.11	4.50
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1045/1406	4.30	4.47	4.09	4.02	3.75
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1050/1384	4.44	4.37	4.11	3.98	3.75
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	986/1489	4.67	4.18	4.17	4.20	4.00
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1315/1506	4.71	4.60	4.67	4.66	4.17
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	853/1463	4.17	4.34	4.09	4.02	4.00
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1001/1438	4.77	4.62	4.46	4.44	4.33
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.66	5.00
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	617/1411	4.81	4.63	4.31	4.27	4.50
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	459/1405	4.76	4.65	4.32	4.27	4.67
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	664/1236	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.87	4.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	558/1260	4.64	4.56	4.14	3.95	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	723/1255	4.48	4.73	4.33	4.15	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	770/1258	4.60	4.71	4.38	4.18	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	442/ 873	4.14	4.42	4.03	3.89	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Course-Section: THTR 104 2

Intro To Costume

Ranney-Howes,M.

6

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

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

University of Maryland Page 1485 Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

0

0

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Enrollment:	5				
Questionnaires:	5	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Course-Section: THTR 104 3

Intro To Costume

Ranney-Howes, M.

Title

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

0

F

P

Ι

0

0

0

0

Instructor:

			Fre	miler	ncies			Tnat	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	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	Ο	0	Ω	5	5.00	1/1509	4.82	4.67	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1509	4.79	4.48	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1287	4.80	4.56	4.30	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	454/1459	4.68	4.57	4.22	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1105/1406	4.30	4.47	4.09	4.02	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	349/1384	4.44	4.37	4.11	3.98	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	4.67	4.18	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	4.71	4.60	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	209/1463	4.17	4.34	4.09	4.02	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1438	4.77	4.62	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1411	4.81	4.63	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1405	4.76	4.65	4.32	4.27	5.00
Discussion														
	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1260	4.64	4.56	4.14	3.95	5.00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1250	4.48	4.73	4.14	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	4.60	4.71	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 873	4.14	4.42	4.03	3.89	****
•														
Frequ	iency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Туј	рe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1								2	Graduat		0	 Majo		1
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 2	Required for Majors 3					٥	Graduat	E	U	Ma JC	)T	Τ		
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0	General 1						1		_			4		
30 03 0 2.00 2.99 0 0			1era					1	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	-major	

Electives

Other

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: THTR 104 4 Title Intro To Costume Instructor: Ranney-Howes, M. Fall 2009 Enrollment: 5

Grad.

3.50-4.00

Page 1486 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

	_				
Ouestionnaires:	4	Student Co	ourse E	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

0

0

0

0

Ρ

I

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did you	ı dəin ne	Genera ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	303/1509	4.82	4.67	4.31	4.18	4.75
-	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1509	4.79	4.48	4.26	4.25	5.00
		uestions reflec			0	2	0	0	0	0	2		1/1287	4.80	4.56	4.30	4.24	5.00
	_	uations reflect			0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	4.68	4.57	4.22	4.11	5.00
				what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	4.30	4.47	4.09	4.02	5.00
				o what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	4.44	4.37	4.11	3.98	5.00
7. Was the	grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	4.67	4.18	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	845/1506	4.71	4.60	4.67	4.66	4.75
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	628/1463	4.17	4.34	4.09	4.02	4.25
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	ne instru	uctor's lecture		prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438	4.77	4.62	4.46	4.44	5.00
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.66	5.00
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	4.81	4.63	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	634/1405	4.76	4.65	4.32	4.27	4.50
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	664/1236	3.83	4.05	4.00	3.87	4.00
		Labora	tory															
1 Did the	lah ind	crease understa	-	f the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	106/ 184	4.50	4.56	4.16	4.06	4.00
			_	ground information	3	0	0	0	0	1	0		123/ 198	4.17	4.22	4.22	4.14	4.00
-	-	-		or lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	180/ 184	4.20	4.37	4.48	4.48	3.00
	_	structor provid			3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 177	4.93	4.89	4.36	4.29	5.00
				Frequ	enas	ni at	-rih	ut i o	n									
		riequ	iency	ומדמ		ucio	.1											
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	 guir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	 3	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 0						J						5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														

Electives

Other

1

0

### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Intro To Costume Instructor: Ranney-Howes,M. Fall 2009

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 2

Title

Course-Section: THTR 104 5

Page 1487 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

				_	ncies		-		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.82	4.67	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1509	4.79	4.48	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	4.80	4.56	4.30	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.68	4.57	4.22	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	4.30	4.47	4.09	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.44	4.37	4.11	3.98	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.67	4.18	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.71	4.60	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	853/1463	4.17	4.34	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	Λ	1	5.00	1/1438	4.77	4.62	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1411	4.81	4.63	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1405	4.76	4.65	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	0		1131/1236		4.05	4.00	3.87	
• • •														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1260	4.64	4.56	4.14	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1255	4.48	4.73	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1258	4.60	4.71	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	4.14	4.42	4.03	3.89	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 184	4.50	4.56	4.16	4.06	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	59/ 198		4.22	4.22	4.14	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 184		4.37	4.48	4.48	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 177		4.89	4.36	4.29	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 165	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.15	5.00
Frequ	encv	. Die	-rih	ıtio	n									
rrequ	спсу	יבים	J L L J	AC 1 ()1										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	

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

Course-Section: THTR 120 1

Introduction To Theatr

Title Introduction T Instructor: McCully, Susan

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 1488 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	quer	cie	c c		Tnat	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΑ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
׫«»«»»														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	11	16	4.45	673/1509	4.45	4.67	4.31	4.18	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	7	19	4.52	531/1509	4.52	4.48	4.26	4.25	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	20	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	668/1287	4.38	4.56	4.30	4.24	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	0	7	19	4.54	421/1459	4.54	4.57	4.22	4.11	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	7	17	4.48	354/1406	4.48	4.47	4.09	4.02	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	22	4.62	260/1384	4.62	4.37	4.11	3.98	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	8	6	12	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.18	4.17	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	13	15	4.45	1127/1506	4.45	4.60	4.67	4.66	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	14	7	4.27	608/1463	4.27	4.34	4.09	4.02	4.27
Lecture														
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	1	0	0	0	3	13	13	4.34	991/1438	4.34	4.62	4.46	4.44	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	26	4.86	639/1421	4.86	4.92	4.73	4.66	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	11	14	4.31		4.31	4.63		4.27	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	10	16	4.38	788/1405	4.38	4.65	4.32	4.27	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	3	6	17	4.54	255/1236	4.54	4.05	4.00	3.87	4.54
Discussion	1.0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	415/1060	4 50	1 56	1 11	3.95	4.50
<ol> <li>Did class discussions contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Were all students actively encouraged to participate</li> </ol>	18	0	0	0	1	2 2	9		415/1260	4.50	4.56	4.14		4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18 18	0	0	0	3	0	9	4.67 4.50	443/1255 620/1258	4.67 4.50	4.73 4.71	4.33	4.15 4.18	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	0	0	1	3	-	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	4.71		3.89	4.50
4. were special techniques successful	18	2	U	U	Т	3	О	4.50	209/ 8/3	4.50	4.42	4.03	3.89	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.56	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.22	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 184	****	4.37	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 177	****	4.89	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 165	****	5.00	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Dield Meele														
Field Work	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	++++/ 10	****	г оо	4 20	2 75	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28		-	0	1	0	1		****/ 48 ****/ 48	****	5.00	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0 0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48 ****/ 47	****	5.00	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28 28	0	0	0	1 1	0	1	1.00	, .	****	5.00	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 47 ****/ 44	****	5.00	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	U	U	U	Т	U	Т	4.00	44		5.00	4.32	4.12	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	5.00	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
<del>-</del> -														

Course-Section: THTR 120 1

Title Introduction To Theatr

Instructor: McCu Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 30

McCully,Susan

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1488 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	4	 А	20	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	14	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: THTR 202 1 University of Maryland Page 1489 Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Title Intro Drama Literature Fall 2009

Instructor: Kaleba,Casey

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

		Ouestion	s		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera																
		w insights,ski			1	0	0	1	1	6	20	4.61	482/1509		4.67	4.31	4.34	4.61
		tor make clear	_	. 9	0	0	0	1	5	6	17	4.34	763/1509		4.48	4.26	4.32	4.34
		estions reflec			1	0	0	2	5	4	17	4.29	755/1287		4.56	4.30	4.35	4.29
		ations reflect	-	_	0	10	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	378/1459		4.57	4.22	4.30	4.58
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	,		4.47	4.09	4.09	4.86
		_		what you learned	0	11	0	2	1	5	10	4.28	,		4.37	4.11	4.09	4.28
		system clearl		inea	0	0 1	0	0	4	7 23	18	4.48	,		4.18	4.17	4.19	4.48
	-	was class canc			0 4	U T	0	0	∠ 1	23 8	3 16		1371/1506		4.60	4.67	4.61	4.04
9. HOW WOL	uia you g	rade the overa	II teaci	ning effectiveness	4	U	U	U	Т	8	10	4.60	248/1463	4.60	4.34	4.09	4.08	4.60
		Lectur	_															
1 Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	_	repared	3	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	88/1438	4.96	4.62	4.46	4.48	4.96
		tor seem inter	_		2	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	,		4.92	4.73	4.76	4.96
		plained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	159/1411		4.63	4.31	4.37	4.89		
		s contribute t			2	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	194/1405		4.65	4.32	4.39	4.89
		our understanding	5	2	0	1	1	8	12	4.41	354/1236		4.05	4.00	4.11	4.41		
		1000			-	_		_	_	-								
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to v	what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	2	18	4.65	316/1260	4.65	4.56	4.14	4.19	4.65
2. Were al	ll studen	ts actively en	courage	d to participate	7	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	379/1255	4.73	4.73	4.33	4.37	4.73
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	212/1258	4.91	4.71	4.38	4.44	4.91
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		6	11	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	114/ 873	4.75	4.42	4.03	4.04	4.75
		Semina																
1. Were as	ssigned t	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	***
				Frequ	ona	. Dia	+ r i h	ı+i or										
				rrequ	lency	DIS	CLID	10101	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5			Ту	ре			Majors	<b>;</b>		
00-27	00-27 4 0.00-0.99 1 A 9							ed fo	or Ma	ijor	s 1	.5	Graduat	.e	0	Majo	or	16
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 8			-			-						3 -		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 4		Ge:	nera:	1				6	Under-g	rad 2	29	Non-	major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					1						

? 1

Course-Section: THTR 220 1 University of Maryland Page 1490 Title Craft Of Acting I Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Instructor: Kreizenbeck,Ala Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 13

			Fre	eanei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	Ο	0	Ο	1	12	4.92	127/1509	4.83	4.67	4.31	4.34	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	507/1509	4.52	4.48	4.26	4.32	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	2		****/1287	4.33	4.56	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	536/1459	4.48	4.57	4.22	4.30	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	502/1406	4.42	4.47	4.09	4.09	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	807/1384	4.19	4.37	4.11	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	1	2	6	3.92	1094/1489	3.85	4.18	4.17	4.19	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1177/1506	4.41	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	190/1463	4.56	4.34	4.09	4.08	4.70
Lecture				_					0.1.0 / 1.1.0.0	4 ==				
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	Τ	10	4.91	219/1438		4.62	4.46	4.48	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1421	4.92	4.92	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	232/1411	4.76	4.63	4.31	4.37	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1405	4.73	4.65	4.32	4.39	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	./	Τ	0	0	0	3	4.00	664/1236	4.08	4.05	4.00	4.11	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	187/1260	4.82	4.56	4.14	4.19	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1255	4.90	4.73	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1258	4.87	4.71	4.38	4.44	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	74/ 873	4.86	4.42	4.03	4.04	4.90
Frequ	en cr	nia:	-rih	ut i or	2									
riequ	rerrea	ופדת		uclui	.1									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	А	9	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: THTR 220 2 University of Maryland Title Craft Of Acting I Baltimore County Searls,Colette Instructor:

Fall 2009

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 15

Page 1491 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

O +	a	Evaluation	0	
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestion	патге

			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	1	2	12	4.73	327/1509	4.83	4.67	4.31	4.34	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	543/1509	4.52	4.48	4.26	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	708/1287	4.33	4.56	4.30	4.35	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	454/1459	4.48	4.57	4.22	4.30	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	332/1406	4.42	4.47	4.09	4.09	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	466/1384	4.19	4.37	4.11	4.09	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	5	1	6	3.79	1184/1489	3.85	4.18	4.17	4.19	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1146/1506	4.41	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	438/1463	4.56	4.34	4.09	4.08	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	700/1438	4.75	4.62	4.46	4.48	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	691/1421	4.92	4.92	4.73	4.76	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	376/1411	4.76	4.63	4.31	4.37	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	683/1405	4.73	4.65	4.32	4.39	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	563/1236	4.08	4.05	4.00	4.11	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	209/1260	4.82	4.56	4.14	4.19	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	287/1255	4.90	4.73	4.33	4.37	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	444/1258	4.87	4.71	4.38	4.44	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	91/ 873	4.86	4.42	4.03	4.04	4.82

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Ο						

Course-Section: THTR 222 1

Vocal Trng For Actor I

Title Instructor: Watson, Janet L

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 12 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1492 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions		NR	NA	Fro	eque: 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 General															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights, skills fr	om this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	505/150	9 4.48	4.67	4.31	4.34	4.58
		ctor make clear the $\epsilon$		0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	952/150			4.26	4.32	4.17
		uestions reflect the	_	0	0	1	1	0	4	6	4.08				4.30	4.35	4.08
	_	uations reflect the e	_	0	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	924/145	9 4.04	4.57	4.22	4.30	4.08
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contribute to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1067/140	6 3.80	4.47	4.09	4.09	3.73
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contribute	to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	1	5	3.82	1009/138	4 3.61	4.37	4.11	4.09	3.82
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearly expl	ained	1	0	0	2	4	2	3	3.55	1287/148	9 3.74	4.18	4.17	4.19	3.55
8. How ma	any times	was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	762/150	6 4.84	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.82
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	438/146	3 4.02	4.34	4.09	4.08	4.43
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	700/143	8 4.54	4.62	4.46	4.48	4.58
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem interested	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/142	1 5.00	4.92	4.73	4.76	5.00
		terial presented and		0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	416/141	1 4.49	4.63	4.31	4.37	4.67
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute to what	you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	459/140	5 4.49	4.65	4.32	4.39	4.67
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques enhance	your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	664/123	6 3.85	4.05	4.00	4.11	4.00
		Discussion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	415/126	0 4.38	4.56	4.14	4.19	4.50
2. Were a	Were all students actively encouraged to participate					0	0	1	1	10	4.75	344/125	5 4.84	4.73	4.33	4.37	4.75
3. Did th	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion				0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	620/125	8 4.41	4.71	4.38	4.44	4.50
4. Were s	Were special techniques successful				2	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	366/ 87	3 4.14	4.42	4.03	4.04	4.20
1. Did th	Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material				0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	4 ****	4.56	4.16	4.54	****
				11								,					
1. Were a	assigned	Seminar topics relevant to th	ne announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 8	9 ****	****	4.49	5.00	****
	5	-										,					
1 Did fi	eld evne	Field Work rience contribute to	what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 4	Q ****	5.00	4.39	4.79	****
	_	y understand your eva	_	11	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 4		5.00	4.41	4.50	****
		ctor available for co		11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 4	-		4.51		****
		Self Paced															
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contribute to	what vou learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	Ω	4.00	****/ 4	9 ****	5.00	4.26	4.33	****
	_	tions make clear the	_	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 4		****	4.14	****	****
		acts with the instruc	_	11	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 4	_	****	4.31	4.00	***
	Frequ	ıencv	7 Dis	trib	utio	n											
O	3 d	Cum. GPA		-								m				Ma =	
Credits E	Expected Grades				ке:	asons	; 			T;	уре 			Majors 	; 		
00-27						quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	9	Gradua	te	0	Majo	or	8
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 3 C 1					0-		1				0	IIndo	awa d	1 0	Mon	ma i a	1
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 3 C 1 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0					Ge:	nera	Т				U	Under-	yrad	12	Non-	-major	4
84-150 Grad.	F 0		El	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				1	#### -	Means	there a	are not	enoug	jh		
			P 0		O	h ===					1	respon	ses to	be sign	nificar	nt	
	I O					her					1						

Course-Section: THTR 222 2 University of Maryland Page 1493 Title Vocal Trng For Actor I Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Watson, Janet L

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 16

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Fall 2009

						Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			_		Mean	Mean
		 General																
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	ls fro	om this course	0	0	1	0	0	6	9	4.38	756/1509	4.48	4.67	4.31	4.34	4.38
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	652/1509	4.30	4.48	4.26	4.32	4.44
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	898/1287	4.07	4.56	4.30	4.35	4.06
4. Did oth	her evalı	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	979/1459	4.04	4.57	4.22	4.30	4.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	6	4	3.88	956/1406	3.80	4.47	4.09	4.09	3.88
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	1	1	2	6	2	4	3.40	1235/1384	3.61	4.37	4.11	4.09	3.40
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	2	4	3	7	3.94	1070/1489	3.74	4.18	4.17	4.19	3.94
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	lled		1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	662/1506	4.84	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.87
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overal	l teac	ching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	1	9	1	3.62	1200/1463	4.02	4.34	4.09	4.08	3.62
1. Were th	Lecture . Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	1	2	1	12	4.50	800/1438	4.54	4.62	4.46	4.48	4.50
						0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.76	5.00
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Was lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	830/1411	4.49	4.63	4.31	4.37	4.31
		es contribute to		-	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	848/1405	4.49	4.65	4.32	4.39	4.31
				our understanding	0	3	1	2	1	5	4	3.69	888/1236		4.05	4.00	4.11	3.69
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	8	4.25	621/1260	4.38	4.56	4.14	4.19	4.25
				ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	,		4.73	4.33	4.37	4.94
				nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	784/1258		4.71	4.38	4.44	4.31
		echniques succes		a open alboabbien	0	3	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	424/ 873		4.42	4.03	4.04	4.08
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ıtior	1									
O	The same of Consider				Das					m				Ma dana				
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	sons				Ту	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27						Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	4	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	14
28-55													_					
56-83							nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	2
	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0																	
Grad.	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh		

Other

0

Ρ

. !

0

0

0

Course-Section: THTR 229 1 University of Maryland Page 1494 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Movement For The Actor

Instructor: Crocker, Martha

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 14

# Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

																_	_
		0		NTD	377		eque:		S	_		tructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
		Questions		NK	NA	1		3			Mean	Rank	Mean	mean	Mean	Mean	mean
		General															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,skills fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	351/1509	4.75	4.67	4.31	4.34	4.71
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear the $\epsilon$	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	93/1509	4.88	4.48	4.26	4.32	4.93
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflect the	expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1287	4.71	4.56	4.30	4.35	4.88
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect the $\epsilon$	expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	227/1459	4.83	4.57	4.22	4.30	4.71
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	187/1406	4.75	4.47	4.09	4.09	4.71
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contribute	to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	466/1384	4.57	4.37	4.11	4.09	4.38
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly expl	ained	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	652/1489	4.54	4.18	4.17	4.19	4.36
8. How ma	ny times		0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1146/1506	4.44	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.43	
9. How wo	How would you grade the overall teaching effective Lecture					0	0	0	6	4	4.40	467/1463	4.56	4.34	4.09	4.08	4.40
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instr	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	430/1438	4.88	4.62	4.46	4.48	4.77	
		ctor seem interested		1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	429/1421	4.96	4.92	4.73	4.76	4.92
		terial presented and	_	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	211/1411	4.92	4.63	4.31	4.37	4.83
		es contribute to what		1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	333/1405	4.88	4.65	4.32	4.39	4.77
		l techniques enhance		1	6	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	466/1236	4.29	4.05	4.00	4.11	4.29
		Discussion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	187/1260	4.89	4.56	4.14	4.19	4.83
		nts actively encourag	-	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	262/1255		4.73	4.33	4.37	4.83
		ctor encourage fair a		2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	212/1258	4.90	4.71	4.38	4.44	4.92
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques successful	•	2	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	91/ 873	4.91	4.42	4.03	4.04	4.82
			Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3		
00-27						 quir	ed f	or M	 ajor	 s	9	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	9
28-55	3	1 00-1 99 0	B 2														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	А	10	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General 3		Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 229 2 University of Maryland

Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 1495

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Title Movement For The Actor Balt.
Instructor: Crocker, Martha Fa

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	279/1509	4.75	4.67	4.31	4.34	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	175/1509	4.88	4.48	4.26	4.32	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	481/1287	4.71	4.56	4.30	4.35	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	58/1459	4.83	4.57	4.22	4.30	4.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	152/1406	4.75	4.47	4.09	4.09	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	140/1384	4.57	4.37	4.11	4.09	4.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	216/1489	4.54	4.18	4.17	4.19	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	8		1127/1506	4.44	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	177/1463	4.56	4.34	4.09	4.08	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1438	4.88	4.62	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	4.96	4.92	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1411	4.92	4.63	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1405	4.88	4.65	4.32	4.39	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1236	4.29	4.05	4.00	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	82/1260	4.89	4.56	4.14	4.19	4.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.82	270/1255	4.83	4.73	4.33	4.19	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	261/1258	4.03	4.73	4.38	4.44	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/ 873	4.91	4.71	4.03	4.44	5.00
i. Were special techniques successful			J	J	U	U	Τ0	5.00	1/ 6/3	4.JI	7.72	4.03	1.04	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	 А	11	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General 4		Under-grad	18	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 233 1
Title Costume Design
Instructor: Zlotescu, Elena

9

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1496 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Eva	aluation Questionnaire
--------------------	------------------------

					Fre	eque	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	_															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17			4.67	4.31		4.17
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	1	3		1086/1509		4.48	4.26	4.32	4.00
		uations reflect			0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20			4.57	4.22	4.30	4.20
				what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	,		4.47	4.09	4.09	4.00
		g system clearl		ained	1	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1489	****	4.18	4.17	4.19	****
	-	was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	,		4.60	4.67	4.61	4.60
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	726/1463	4.17	4.34	4.09	4.08	4.17
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1116/1438	4.20	4.62	4.46	4.48	4.20
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was led	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clea Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	936/1411	4.20	4.63	4.31	4.37	4.20
4. Did the	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	758/1405	4.40	4.65	4.32	4.39	4.40
5. Did aud	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	274/1236	4.50	4.05	4.00	4.11	4.50
	Discussion																	
1 Did cla	ace dieci			what you learned	3	0	0	0	Ω	2	1	4.33	558/1260	4.33	4.56	4.14	4.19	4.33
				ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255		4.73	4.33	4.37	5.00
				nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1258		4.71	4.38	4.44	4.67
		echniques succe		id Open discussion	3	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 873		4.42	4.03	4.04	
i. Were br	occiai co	confiduct bacce	BBLUI		5	2	O	O	O	O	_	3.00	, 075		1.12	1.05	1.01	
		Semina																
	_	-		announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
_		ons contribute		-	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were ci	riteria f	for grading mad	e clear	<u> </u>	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	atio	n									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	ı			Ту	pe			Majors				
	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad																	
00-27						Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	5	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	2
28-55								_				_			_			
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Gei	nera	L				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	4
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0														_				
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	O			Ele	ecti	ves				3	#### - 1					h
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 P 0											_	respons	es to b	e sign	ıfıcar	ıt	

Other

0

I 0

0

Course-Section: THTR 235 1

Title Lighting Design I

Instructor: Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 9

Cobb,Milton T

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Page 1497 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

acberomiarres.	Deddelle	COULDC	DValuacion	Queberonnari

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	4		1032/1509			4.31	4.34	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	1	1		1492/1509		4.48	4.26	4.32	2.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	3	2		1180/1287		4.56	4.30	4.35	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	2		979/1459		4.57	4.22	4.30	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	2	2		1178/1406		4.47	4.09	4.09	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	1	1	3		1264/1384		4.37	4.11	4.09	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	0	1	2	2		1436/1489		4.18	4.17	4.19	2.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	. ,		4.60	4.67	4.61	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	1	3	1	0	2.43	1448/1463	2.43	4.34	4.09	4.08	2.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	1388/1438	3.33	4.62	4.46	4.48	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1386/1421	3.67	4.92	4.73	4.76	3.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	2	2	1	2.78	1387/1411	2.78	4.63	4.31	4.37	2.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1326/1405	3.22	4.65	4.32	4.39	3.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	1	0	1	2	3.00	1131/1236	3.00	4.05	4.00	4.11	3.00
Discussion														
	1	0	0	0	2	_	1	2 00	1160/1060	2 00	4 56	1 1 1	4 10	2 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2 1	0	3	2	1		1162/1260		4.56	4.14	4.19	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	_	-	2	0	5	4.00	904/1255		4.73	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0 2	1 2	0 1	2	3 2	2 1		1118/1258 839/ 873			4.38	4.44	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	2	Τ	U	2	Τ	2.83	839/ 8/3	2.83	4.42	4.03	4.04	2.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.56	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.22	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.37	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.89	4.36	4.65	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	5.00	4.18	4.56	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	Λ	4 00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 48		5.00	4.41	4.50	****
	8	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 47	****		4.18	4.56	****
To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		U	U	U	U	_	U	4.00	, 47		3.00	4.10	4.50	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	5.00	4.26	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	9	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				2	1						

Course-Section: THTR 250 1 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County Intro Production Tech

Schraven, Greggo Instructor:

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1498

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Instr	uctor	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	1/1509	4.83	4.67	4.31	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.50	4.48	4.26	4.32	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.56	4.30	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.18	4.17	4.19	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.50	4.34	4.09	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.62	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.76	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.65	4.32	4.39	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.39	4.79	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.50	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.83	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.56	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.32	4.67	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	5.00	4.26	4.33	5.00

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	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: THTR 250 3 University of Maryland

Title Intro Production Tech Baltimore County Instructor: Murphy,Karen E Fall 2009

Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1499

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 2 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 1 0 0 0	1 1 0 2 3	2 1 0 3 1	4.00 5.00	410/1509 1086/1509 979/1459 1/1489 1205/1506 853/1463		4.67 4.48 4.57 4.18 4.60 4.34	4.31 4.26 4.22 4.17 4.67 4.09	4.34 4.32 4.30 4.19 4.61 4.08	4.67 4.00 4.00 5.00 4.33 4.00
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	2 1 2 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 2 1 1	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	1/1438 1/1421 1/1411 1/1405	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	4.62 4.92 4.63 4.65	4.46 4.73 4.31 4.32	4.48 4.76 4.37 4.39	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2 2 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 0	0 1 2	4.00 5.00 5.00	746/1260 1/1255 1/1258	4.00 5.00 5.00	4.56 4.73 4.71	4.14 4.33 4.38	4.19 4.37 4.44	4.00 5.00 5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	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	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Frequencies

Instructor

2

0

Course-Section: THTR 252 1 Title Theatre Lab Instructor: Cobb, Milton T Fall 2009 Enrollment: 8

Ouestionnaires: 6

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00 1

F 0

P 0

I 1

? 0

Page 1500 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Frequencies									TIIS	LIUCLOI	Course	: Dept	UMPC	телет	Sect			
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	2	0	0	0	4	3.67	1340/1509	3.67	4.67	4.31	4.34	3.67
2. Did the	instruc	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1372/1509	3.50	4.48	4.26	4.32	3.50
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	t the e	xpected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.56	4.30	4.35	5.00
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.57	4.22	4.30	5.00
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.47	4.09	4.09	5.00
6. Did wri	tten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.11	4.09	5.00
7. Was the	7. Was the grading system clearly explained						0	1	0	0	3	4.25	760/1489	4.25	4.18	4.17	4.19	4.25
	8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How wou	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1392/1463	3.00	4.34	4.09	4.08	3.00
		Discus					0											
	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate							0	0	0	1		****/1260		4.56	4.14	4.19	****
		5 5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1255		4.73	4.33	4.37	****			
3. Did the	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion						0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1258	****	4.71	4.38	4.44	***
		Field N	Mork															
1 Did fic	old owner			hat you learned	_	0	0	0	0	1	Λ	4 00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.39	4.79	****
	_			uation criteria	5	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 48	****	5.00	4.41	4.50	****
_	_	tor available			5	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 47	****	5.00	4.51	4.83	****
		could you disc			5	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 47	****	5.00	4.18	4.56	****
1. 10 Wilde	acgree	courd you arbe	abb jou	i cvaraaciono	5	Ü	J	Ü	_	Ü	Ü	3.00	, 1,		3.00	1.10	1.50	
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	cribu	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arm od	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Do	asons	_			Ty				Majors	
CIEUILS Ed				Expected Grades					a50118	> 			ту.	 he			ма JOIS	,
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 0	<u>.</u>													
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	3			
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														

Electives

Other

Course-Section: THTR 310 1 University of Maryland Title History Of Theatre I Baltimore County Instructor: Messer,Kristen

Page 1501 MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	11	
Questionnaires:	9	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
1 Did voi	u dain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	540/1509	4.56	4.67	4.31	4.32	4.56
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	234/1509	4.78	4.48	4.26	4.25	4.78
		uestions reflect			0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	240/1287	4.78	4.56	4.30	4.33	4.78
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	106/1459	4.89	4.57	4.22	4.26	4.89
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.47	4.09	4.12	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4		531/1384		4.37	4.11	4.15	4.33
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	399/1489	4.56	4.18	4.17	4.14	4.56
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.67	5.00
				ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	500/1463	4.38	4.34	4.09	4.08	4.38
		3									,							
		Lecture	e															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures	s well	orepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.62	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was led	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	0	3	6	4.67	416/1411	4.67	4.63	4.31	4.29	4.67
4. Did the	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.65	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did aud	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						0	0	0	4	5	4.56	242/1236	4.56	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.56
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.56	4.14	4.22	4.50
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	262/1255	4.83	4.73	4.33	4.37	4.83
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage :	fair and	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.71	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	4.42	4.03	4.08	4.50
				Frequ	lency	y Dis	trib	atio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	 3	5	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r )r	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			-			-								
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ge	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 1				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	gh			
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					1	_					
				? 0														

Course-Section: THTR 324 1 University of Maryland Page 1502 Title Craft Of Acting III Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Muson, Eve B

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 7

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	1/1509	5.00	4.67	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	300/1509	4.71	4.48	4.26	4.25	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.56	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.57	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.47	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.11	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	875/1489	4.14	4.18	4.17	4.14	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	682/1506	4.86	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.34	4.09	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.62	4.46	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	617/1411	4.50	4.63	4.31	4.29	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.65	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/1236	****	4.05	4.00	4.07	****
Diamondon														
Discussion	2	0	0	0	•	0		<b>-</b> 00	1 /1060	F 00	4 5 6	4 1 4	4 00	F 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1260	5.00	4.56	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.73	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3 3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.71	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	U	U	Τ	U	Т	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.42	4.03	4.08	4.00
Frequ	ency.	Dist	ribu	utior	1									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	6
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	L
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: THTR 329 1 University of Maryland Page 1503
Title Movement For Actor III Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Title Movement For Actor III Baltimore Count Instructor: Salkind, Wendy Fall 2009

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eaue	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls from	this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.67	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.48	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the ex	spected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	208/1287	4.80	4.56	4.30	4.33	4.8
4. Did oth	ner evalı	uations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	111/1459	4.88	4.57	4.22	4.26	4.8
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.47	4.09	4.12	5.0
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.11	4.15	5.0
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y explai	ned	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1127/1489	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.14	3.8
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1325/1506	4.14	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.1
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.34	4.09	4.08	5.0
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	ne instru	uctor's lecture	s well r	prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1438	****	4.62	4.46	4.43	***
		ctor seem inter			7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.92	4.73	4.73	***
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1411	****	4.63	4.31	4.29	***
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1405	***	4.65	4.32	4.32	***
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to v	hat you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.56	4.14	4.22	5.0
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	couraged	l to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.73	4.33	4.37	5.0
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	dopen discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.71	4.38	4.42	5.0
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.42	4.03	4.08	5.0
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	3
 00-27	 0	0.00-0.99	0		Required for Majors 7 G				Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	 3				
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		1000	-1 WTT ,	- L	C1 110	. ,	•	•	Gradact	_	-	1100	-	3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0			Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	5					
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0					-	1,011		3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	2 0	0 Electives 0 #### - Me			Means t	here a	re not	enouc	тh						
craa.	Ü	3.30 1.00	4	P 0			CCCI			responses to be signi			_	,				
				I 0		O+1	her					0	10000115	-2 CO L	.c bigii			

? 0

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Р

I

?

0

0

0

Course-Section: THTR 331 1

Pattern Drafting

Joyce, Shelley

11

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 11

Page 1504 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

2

	Ouestionnaire

					Frequencies					5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	159/1509	4.91	4.67	4.31	4.32	4.91
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.48	4.26	4.25	5.00
		uestions reflec		_	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1287	****	4.56	4.30	4.33	****
		uations reflect			0	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	247/1459	4.70	4.57	4.22	4.26	4.70
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	225/1384	4.67	4.37	4.11	4.15	4.67
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	1	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	597/1489	4.40	4.18	4.17	4.14	4.40
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	1243/1506	4.27	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.27
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	114/1463	4.82	4.34	4.09	4.08	4.82
1. Were t	prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.62	4.46	4.43	5.00			
		ctor seem inter			4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.73	5.00
				explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	351/1411	4.71	4.63	4.31	4.29	4.71
		es contribute to		1	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	228/1405	4.86	4.65	4.32	4.32	4.86
				your understanding	4	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1236	****	4.05	4.00	4.07	***
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	acc dicc			what you learned	7	0	0	Λ	1	Λ	3	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.56	4.14	4.22	4.50
				ed to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.73	4.33		4.50
		_	_	nd open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	3		421/1258		4.71	4.38	4.42	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ıtioı	n									
				11040	ciic	DID		20101	-									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	\$			Ту	pe			Majors	;			
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 10						Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	5	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			-			_						<b>J</b> -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General							0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0													-	
Grad.	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				3	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh			

Other

Course-Section: THTR 339 1 University of Maryland Page 1505 Title Adv Production Technqu Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Schraven, Greggo

Instructor:

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Fall 2009

Ouestions	NR	NA		reque	ncie:	3 1	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Quescions		IVA						Mean					Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.67	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.48	4.26	4.25	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.47	4.09	4.12	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.18	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivened	ess 0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.34	4.09	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.62	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.63	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.65	4.32	4.32	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1 3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.56	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.73	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	on 3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.71	4.38	4.42	5.00
Fi	equency	y Di	strik	outio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad	les			Re	ason	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4		R	 equi:	ed f	or Ma	ajor:	 s	1	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 r	3

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

Business Of Acting

Course-Section: THTR 345 1 University of Maryland Page 1506 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Instructor: Watson, Janet L Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	3	
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							P L	eque	псте	3		Inst	ructor	Course	: Dept	UMBC	телет	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls from	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.67	4.31	4.32	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.48	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did th	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the ex	spected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.56	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.57	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.47	4.09	4.12	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.11	4.15	5.00
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.18	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1205/1506	4.33	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.33
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.34	4.09	4.08	4.33
		Lectur	e															
1 Were t	he instr	actor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	588/1438	4.67	4 62	4.46	4.43	4.67
					0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1421		4.92	4.73	4.73	5.00
	<ol> <li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li> <li>Was lecture material presented and explained clearl</li> </ol>					0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1411		4.63	4.31	4.29	5.00
	. Was recture material presented and explained creari . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1405		4.65	4.32	4.32	
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2		176/1236			4.00		4.67
		D																
ו הנת ו		Discus		-la-+ la	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	г оо	1 /1060	г оо	4 56	1 11	4 22	г оо
				what you learned d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1260 1/1255			4.14		
					0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1255			4.33	4.37 4.42	
		echniques succe		d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1258					
4. were s	peciai te	echniques succe	SSIUI		U	U	U	U	U	U	3	5.00	1/ 8/3	5.00	4.42	4.03	4.08	5.00
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 2					Re	auir	ed fo	or Ma	aiors	 3	3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55							1			-5	_	-		_	-	5	-	-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									5				3	-
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0					El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	ah	
P 0													respons				_	•
I 0						Ot:	her					0			3			
	? 0																	

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: THTR 349 1 Page 1507 Title Women And Theatre MAR 22, 2010 Instructor: McCully, Susan Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

-	Duestionnaires:	2.4	Ctudont	Course	Errolustion	Ougstionnsino
(	juestionnaires.	24	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

0

0

0

1

Ρ

. .

Enrollment:

Grad.

34

3.50-4.00

			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.67	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	12	4.38	731/1509	4.38	4.48	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	1	14	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.56	4.30	4.33	4.67
4. Did oth	ner evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	432/1459	4.52	4.57	4.22	4.26	4.52
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	16	4.50	332/1406	4.50	4.47	4.09	4.12	4.50
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	10	11	4.29	579/1384	4.29	4.37	4.11	4.15	4.29
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	1	1	6	5	10	3.96	1046/1489	3.96	4.18	4.17	4.14	3.96
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	13	11	4.46	1118/1506	4.46	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.46
9. How wor	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	286/1463	4.55	4.34	4.09	4.08	4.55
		_		•						001/1400	4 40			4 40				
1. Were th		1	0	0	0	Τ	11	11	4.43	891/1438	4.43	4.62	4.46	4.43	4.43			
	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	483/1421	4.91	4.92	4.73	4.73	4.91			
		-		explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	10	13	4.57	544/1411	4.57	4.63	4.31	4.29	4.57
		es contribute t		-	1	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	473/1405	4.65	4.65	4.32	4.32	4.65
5. Did aud	liovisua.	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	1	Т	Τ	U	Τ	9	11	4.32	441/1236	4.32	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.32
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disci			what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	265/1260	4.73	4.56	4.14	4.22	4.73
				ed to participate	2	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	474/1255	4.64	4.73	4.33	4.37	4.64
		_	_	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	363/1258	4.81	4.71	4.38	4.42	4.81
		echniques succe			2	3	0	0	0	11	8	4.42	250/ 873	4.42	4.42	4.03	4.08	4.42
_		-																
	Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	ı												
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Pos	ason	c			Typ				Majors	,			
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								1000		 								, 
00-27						Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	5	Graduate	2	0	Majo	r	1
28-55																		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Gei	nera	1				7	Under-gr	ad 2	4	Non-	major	23
84-150 4 3.00-3.49 4 D 0																		

Electives

Other

10

0

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1508 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	7	
Questionnaires:	6	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: THTR 350 1

Directing I Muson, Eve B

Title

Instructor:

			Fre	eque	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		rom this sourse	0	0	0	Λ	0	Λ	6	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.67	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor	J ,		0	0	0	0	0	1	- E	4.83	175/1509	4.83	4.48	4.26	4.25	4.83
3. Did the exam ques			0	5	0	0	0	0	1		****/1287	****	4.56	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluat		1 3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	131/1459	4.83	4.57	4.22	4.26	4.83
5. Did assigned read			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.47	4.09	4.12	5.00
_	_	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.11	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading s	-	-	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.18	4.17	4.13	4.00
8. How many times wa		Tained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5 6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.10	4.17	4.14	5.00
-		aching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.34	4.09	4.07	5.00
9. HOW WOULD YOU GE	ade the overall tea	acilling effectiveness	4	U	U	U	U	U	4	5.00	1/1403	5.00	4.34	4.09	4.00	5.00
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared				0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1438	4.80	4.62	4.46	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructo			1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture mater			1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.63	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures	-		1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.65	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual t		-	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	176/1236	4.67	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.67
3. Dia addiovidadi (	eccinitydes ciniance	your understanding	_	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	_	1.07	17071230	1.07	1.05	1.00	1.07	1.07
	Discussion															
1. Did class discuss	sions contribute to	o what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.56	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students	s actively encourag	ged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.73	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructo	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion				0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.71	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful				1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	4.42	4.03	4.08	4.50
	Frequ	iencv	, Dist	rib	utio	n										
1101																
Credits Earned				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors			

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

#### Course-Section: THTR 354 1 University of Maryland Page 1509 Title Adv Technical Producti Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Schraven, Greggo

Instructor: Enrollment: 4

Questionnaires: 3

## Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	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														
	•	•					_					4 04	4 00	
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	Ü	0	Ü	3	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.67	4.31	4.32	5.00
<ol><li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li></ol>	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.48	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.56	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.57	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	223/1406	4.67	4.47	4.09	4.12	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	349/1384	4.50	4.37	4.11	4.15	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.18	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	941/1506	4.67	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	209/1463	4.67	4.34	4.09	4.08	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.62	4.46	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.63	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.65	4.32	4.32	4.50

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	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 390 1 University of Maryland Page 1510 Title Theatre In Production Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Muson, Eve B

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 13

# Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

	Frequenc								ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.67	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	447/1509	4.58	4.48	4.26	4.25	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.56	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	121/1459	4.86	4.57	4.22	4.26	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.47	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	107/1384	4.80	4.37	4.11	4.15	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	781/1489	4.23	4.18	4.17	4.14	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	466/1506	4.92	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	73/1463	4.92	4.34	4.09	4.08	4.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.62	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	3.00	1/1411	5.00	4.63	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.65	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1236	****	4.05	4.00	4.07	****
_,														
Discussion	_			_			_			- 00				
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	7		1/1260	5.00	4.56	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.73	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.71	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.42	4.03	4.08	5.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	utio	n									
•	_													
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 12		Red	guire	ed f	or Ma	ajor		8	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r •	5
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 0			_			-						_		
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	8
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 2 D 0									_				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				3	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
I 0		Other					1							
? 1														

Course-Section: THTR 410 1 University of Maryland Modern Theatre I Kaleba, Casey

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 21

21

Questions

Page 1511 MAR 22, 2010 Baltimore County Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Rank

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

Ctudont	Course	Errolustion	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

		Genera	_															
		ew insights,ski			2	0	1	1	3	4	10		1044/1509	4.11	4.67	4.31	4.39	4.11
2. Did the	2	0	3	1	6	7	2		1439/1509	3.21	4.48	4.26	4.26	3.21				
3. Did the	2	16	0	1	0	1	1		****/1287	****	4.56	4.30	4.38	****				
4. Did oth	3	0	3	2	4	5	4		1384/1459	3.28	4.57	4.22	4.32	3.28				
	_	_		what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	3	9	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.47	4.09	4.11	4.00
		_		o what you learned	2	0	4	2	7	4	2		1344/1384	2.89	4.37	4.11	4.23	2.89
		g system clearl		ined	2	1	8	4	3	3	0		1480/1489	2.06	4.18	4.17	4.18	2.06
		was class canc			2	0	0	0	0	16	3	4.16	1320/1506	4.16	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.16
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	6	0	1	4	3	4	3	3.27	1335/1463	3.27	4.34	4.09	4.18	3.27
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well j	prepared	2	0	0	2	5	6	6	3.84	1285/1438	3.84	4.62	4.46	4.50	3.84
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested in	n the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	691/1421	4.84	4.92	4.73	4.76	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	3	4	7	5	3.74	1211/1411	3.74	4.63	4.31	4.35	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							1	1	5	6	6	3.79	1182/1405	3.79	4.65	4.32	4.34	3.79
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	2	0	2	10	3	2	3.29	1070/1236	3.29	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.29
1 Did cla	ass disci	Discus Ussions contrib		what you learned	7	0	1	2	3	1	7	3 79	919/1260	3.79	4.56	4.14	4.25	3.79
				d to participate	7	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43		4.43	4.73	4.33	4.46	4.43
				d open discussion	7	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	. ,	4.00	4.71	4.38	4.51	4.00
		echniques succe		a open arbeabbion	7	10	0	1	1	1	1		****/ 873	****	4.42	4.03	4.26	****
				_														
				Frequ	ency	7 Dis	trıb	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Тур	e			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 0		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	4	Graduate	:	1	Majo	 r	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			-			3								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-gr	ad 2	20	Non-	major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 6 F 0						Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves		1			#### - Means there are not e				enoug	ŗh
				P 0									response	s to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 1		Other						2						

? 15

Course-Section: THTR 470 2 Title Drama Seminar Instructor: Salkind, Wendy
Enrollment: 14

Questionnaires: 12

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1512 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies						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	1	1	3	7	4.33	800/1509	4.33	4.67	4.31	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1027/1509	4.08	4.48	4.26	4.26	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.56	4.30	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	834/1459	4.20	4.57	4.22	4.32	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	4	2	3.33	1258/1406	3.33	4.47	4.09	4.11	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	993/1384	3.83	4.37	4.11	4.23	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	3.50	1303/1489	3.50	4.18	4.17	4.18	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.00	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	608/1463	4.27	4.34	4.09	4.18	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1203/1438	4.00	4.62	4.46	4.50	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1107/1421	4.57	4.92	4.73	4.76	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	713/1411	4.43	4.63	4.31	4.35	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	874/1405	4.29	4.65	4.32	4.34	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	936/1236	3.60	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.56	4.14	4.25	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	443/1255	4.67	4.73	4.33	4.46	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	770/1258	4.33	4.71	4.38	4.51	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	738/ 873	3.40	4.42	4.03	4.26	3.40
Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utio	n									

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

Course-Section: THTR 490 1 University of Maryland Production Workshop Baltimore County

Title Fall 2009 Instructor: Searls,Colette

Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 5 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.67	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	922/1509	4.20	4.48	4.26	4.26	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.57	4.22	4.32	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.47	4.09	4.11	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.11	4.23	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained				1	0	2	2	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.18	4.17	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled			0	0	0	2	3	4.60	990/1506	4.60	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	628/1463	4.25	4.34	4.09	4.18	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1001/1438	4.33	4.62	4.46	4.50	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	810/1411	4.33	4.63	4.31	4.35	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.65	4.32	4.34	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1056/1236	3.33	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	2	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.56	4.14	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.73	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.71	4.38	4.51	5.00
1. 111 the first service service and open dipologram	3	Ü	,	,	,	,	_	2.00	_, 1233	2.00		50		2.30

Page 1513

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				2	Λ						