Course-Section: THTR 100 0101 University of Maryland Page 1640
Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG (Instr. A) Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Instructor

Rank

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

Enrollment:	9				
Questionnaires:	5	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions

		240201011				_	_		-	_	110011	1101111		110011	110011	iicaii	110011	
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1670	4.87	4.64	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	259/1666	4.77	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.80
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	261/1406	4.74	4.58	4.32	4.31	4.80
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	245/1615	4.60	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.80
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	187/1566	4.37	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.80
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1528	4.43	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.80
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	429/1650	4.67	4.31	4.22	4.28	4.60
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	4.91	4.63	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	728/1626	4.41	4.39	4.11	4.07	4.13
		Lectur																
		ctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	435/1559	4.88	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.90
		n the subject	0	0 0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	4.95		4.72	4.68	5.00		
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clear							0	0	1	4			4.72		4.31	4.32	4.65
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	1	2	2		1032/1546	4.36	4.52	4.32	4.32	3.85
5. Did aud	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand:							0	0	0	4	4.20	590/1323	4.27	4.43	4.00	3.91	3.60
		Discus									_							****
				what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1384				3.92	****
		_	_	d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1			4.50		4.29	4.09	****
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1378	4.83	4.38	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssiul		4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	4.75	4.65	4.03	3.94	***
				Freq		. Dia	+ m i b		<b>5</b>									
				rredi	iency	DIS	CLID	ucio.	11									
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Тур	e			Majors	\$		
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 2						Red	auir	ed f	or M	ajors	 s	1	Graduate		0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3											-	) 0		-
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 0						Gei	nera	1				0	Under-gr	ad	5	Non-	major	5
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0												-			-		5	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - N	leans t	here a	re not	enouc	ıh
				P 0									response				_	•
	I O		Otl	her					3	-								

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

Page 1641 AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Enrollment:	9	
Questionnaires:	5	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ρ

I

0

0

0

Questions								_	ncies				tructor		Dept			
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,skil		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1670	4.87	4.64	4.31	4.23	5.00
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80			4.56	4.27	4.30	4.80
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	261/1406	4.74	4.58	4.32	4.31	4.80
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	245/1615	4.60	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.80
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	te to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	187/1566	4.37	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.80
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1528	4.43	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.80
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	429/1650	4.67	4.31	4.22	4.28	4.60
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	lled		0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	4.91	4.63	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How wou	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivened						0	0	0	2	0	4.00	953/1626	4.41	4.39	4.11	4.07	4.13
		Lecture																
1 Were th	ne instru	ictor's lectures		nrenared	3	0	0	0	0	Λ	2	5.00	1/1559	4.88	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.90
		tor seem intere			3	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1560		4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00
				xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	1		,		4.50	4.31	4.32	4.65
		es contribute to			3	0	0	0	1	1	0		1379/1546		4.52	4.32		3.85
				our understanding	3	0	1	0	0	0	1		1179/1323		4.43	4.00	3.91	
		-	-	5														
		Discuss																
				what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1384				3.92	****
		_	_	d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1378		4.45	4.29	4.09	****
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1378		4.38	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	sful		4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	4.75	4.65	4.03	3.94	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	; 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	;
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 2				Rec	quire	ed f	or Ma	jors	5	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 0					Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	5	
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0																		
Grad.							ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh

Other

3

Course-Section: THTR 100 0102 University of Maryland Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP Baltimore County Spring 2008

Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 1642

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

		Question		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u qain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1670	4.87	4.64	4.31	4.23	4.83
		tor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	233/1666	4.77	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.83
		estions reflect	_	_	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	4.74	4.58	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	379/1615	4.60	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.67
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	491/1566	4.37	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.40
6. Did wri	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	560/1528	4.43	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.40
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y explai	ned	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	570/1650	4.67	4.31	4.22	4.28	4.50
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	4.91	4.63	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	403/1626	4.41	4.39	4.11	4.07	4.50
1 Were th	he instru	Lecture	_	repared	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1559	4.88	4.58	4.46	4.47	5.00
	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	4.95	4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00
		plained clearly	2 2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1549	4.72	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.80		
		ou learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	345/1546	4.36	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.80		
			_	ur understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1323	4.27		4.00	3.91	
J. Dia aac	alovibaai	ccciniiqueb em	nance ye	ar anacrocanaring	-	Ü	Ü	J	Ü	Ü	,	3.00	1,1323	1.2,	1.15	1.00	3.71	3.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	4.50	4.54	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were al	ll studen	ts actively en	couraged	to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	4.50	4.45	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage :	fair and	open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	4.83	4.38	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	4.75	4.65	4.03	3.94	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	ution	n									
a 1'. =	,	Cum. GPA						_					_					
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	5 			Тур	e 			Majors				
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 4						Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduate	<u> </u>	0	Majo	r	1
28-55																		
56-83						Ger	nera:	L				2	Under-gr	ad	7	Non-	major	6
84-150																		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ectiv	res				0	#### - M				_	h
	P 0						her						response	s to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
	I 0											3						

?

1

Course-Section: THTR 100 0103 University of Maryland Page 1643 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

SCHRAVEN, GREGG

Instructor: Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 8

### 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	0	1	2	5	4.50	665/1670	4.87	4.64	4.31	4.23	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	312/1666	4.77	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	318/1406	4.74	4.58	4.32	4.31	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	724/1615	4.60	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1285/1566	4.37	4.39	4.07	4.03	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	823/1528	4.43	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	406/1650	4.67	4.31	4.22	4.28	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	730/1667	4.91	4.63	4.67	4.61	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	693/1626	4.41	4.39	4.11	4.07	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	739/1559	4.88	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	948/1560	4.95	4.91	4.72	4.68	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	683/1549	4.72	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	570/1546	4.36	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	641/1323	4.27	4.43	4.00	3.91	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	608/1384	4.50	4.54	4.10	3.92	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	481/1378	4.50	4.45	4.29	4.09	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	531/1378	4.83	4.38	4.31	4.08	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	243/ 904		4.65	4.03	3.94	4.50
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •														

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

Course-Section: THTR 100 0104

INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP

Instructor: Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 3

Title

SCHRAVEN, GREGG

AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 1644

# Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1670		4.64	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1666		4.56	4.27	4.30	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	799/1406		4.58	4.32	4.31	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	775/1615		4.46	4.24	4.17	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	559/1566		4.39	4.07	4.03	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	899/1528		4.35	4.12	4.00	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1650		4.31	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2		1022/1667		4.63	4.67	4.61	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1626	4.41	4.39	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	4.88	4.58	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560		4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1549	4.72	4.50	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	520/1546		4.52	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1323		4.43	4.00	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1384		4.54	4.10	3.92	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	797/1378		4.45	4.29	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	4.83	4.38	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 904	4.75	4.65	4.03	3.94	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	5.00	4.19	4.25	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 239	5.00	5.00	4.21	4.35	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 230	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.58	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	159/ 231	4.00	4.00	4.31	4.45	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 218	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.47	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.67	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.72	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	58/ 75		4.00	4.57	4.46	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.59	5.00
1. Dia piosendatione conciliade to made for realmed	_	ŭ	ŭ	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	_, ,,	3.00	3.00	1.15	1.00	3.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	34/ 41	4.00	4.00	4.50	3.91	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	19/ 38	4.50	4.50	4.19	4.07	4.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	25/ 38	4.50	4.50	4.62	4.63	4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.42	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.28	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.59	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	26/ 27	3.00	3.00	4.54	4.46	3.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 6					5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	U	J	J	U	U	Т	5.00	1/ 0	5.00	5.00	7.24	T.03	5.00

Course-Section: THTR 100 0104 Title

INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP

Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1644 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	Credits Earned			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	3	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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 104 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO COSTUME Baltimore County Spring 2008

Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1645

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies I				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	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	665/1670	4.77	4.64	4.31	4.23	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	4.71	4.56	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1406	4.85	4.58	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	290/1615	4.56	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	389/1566	4.43	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	706/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1650	4.66	4.31	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.15	4.63	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.33	4.39	4.11	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	521/1559	4.83	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	683/1549	4.66	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546	4.93	4.52	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1323	4.93	4.43	4.00	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	434/1384	4.58	4.54	4.10	3.92	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	603/1378	4.05	4.45	4.29	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	977/1378	3.90	4.38	4.31	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	4.89	4.65	4.03	3.94	5.00
Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0101 University of Maryland INTRO TO COSTUME Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 1646

Title Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY (Instr. B) Spring 2008

Enrollment:	5			
0	4	Q+	<b>a</b>	T

Questionnaires: 4 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	2	2	4.50	665/1670	4.77	4.64	4.31	4.23	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	4.71	4.56	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1406	4.85	4.58	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	290/1615	4.56	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	389/1566	4.43	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	706/1528		4.35	4.12	4.00	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1650		4.31	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	0		1524/1667		4.63	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.33	4.39	4.11	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	4.83	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1549	4.66	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	4.93	4.52	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	4.93	4.43	4.00	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	434/1384	4.58	4.54	4.10	3.92	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	603/1378	4.05	4.45	4.29	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	977/1378	3.90	4.38	4.31	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	4.89	4.65	4.03	3.94	5.00

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0102 University of Maryland Page 1647 Title INTRO TO COSTUME Baltimore County Spring 2008

JOYCE, SHELLEY (Instr. A) Instructor:

Enrollment:

5 Questionnaires: 5 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Deadcire	COULDC	DValaacion	Queberonnarie

	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	1	4	4.80	300/1670	4.77	4.64	4.31	4.23	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	259/1666	4.71	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	261/1406	4.85	4.58	4.32	4.31	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	446/1615	4.56	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	706/1566	4.43	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	560/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	720/1650	4.66	4.31	4.22	4.28	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1409/1667	4.15	4.63	4.67	4.61	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	563/1626	4.33	4.39	4.11	4.07	4.45
T. a. selection														
Lecture	٥	0	0	0	1	1	2	4 40	1022/1559	4.83	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.70
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	<i>5</i>	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.58	4.46	4.47	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	562/1549	4.66	4.50	4.72	4.00	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	595/1546	4.00	4.52	4.31	4.32	4.80
<del>_</del>	0	0	0	0		2	3	4.60	273/1323	4.93	4.43	4.00	3.91	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U	U	U	U	4	3	4.00	2/3/1323	4.93	4.43	4.00	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	4.58	4.54	4.10	3.92	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	970/1378	4.05	4.45	4.29	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	977/1378	3.90	4.38	4.31	4.08	4.00
Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	ıt i or	า									
11040														

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0102 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO COSTUME Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1648

			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	Ω	Λ	1	4	4.80	300/1670	4.77	4.64	4 31	4.23	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	259/1666	4.71	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	261/1406		4.58	4.32	4.31	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	446/1615	4.56	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	706/1566		4.39	4.07	4.03	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	560/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	720/1650		4.31	4.22	4.28	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1409/1667	4.15	4.63	4.67	4.61	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626		4.39	4.11	4.07	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	4.83	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	4.66	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1546	4.93	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1323	4.93	4.43	4.00	3.91	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384		4.54	4.10	3.92	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	970/1378	4.05	4.45	4.29	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	977/1378	3.90	4.38	4.31	4.08	4.00
From	onat	Dia	- r i bı	1+ i 01	2									

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1649 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	3	
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: THTR 104 0103

INTRO TO COSTUME

JOYCE, SHELLEY

Title

Instructor:

							Fre	_	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	4.77	4.64	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	622/1666	4.71	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	4.85	4.58	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	552/1615	4.56	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.50
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	4.43	4.39	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did wri	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1650	4.66	4.31	4.22	4.28	4.50
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.15	4.63	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	4.33	4.39	4.11	4.07	5.00
	Lecture																	
	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	4.83	4.58	4.46	4.47	5.00
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1549	4.66	4.50	4.31	4.32	5.00
		s contribute t		•	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1546	4.93	4.52	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1323	4.93	4.43	4.00	3.91	5.00
		Discus						_	•	_	_	4 = 0	404/4004					
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	Ţ	Ι	4.50	434/1384		4.54	4.10	3.92	4.50
				d to participate	0	0	0	1	0	0	1		1193/1378		4.45	4.29	4.09	3.50
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	taır an	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	977/1378	3.90	4.38	4.31	4.08	4.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2						quire	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	0
28-55							_			-						,		
56-83	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0					Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									,				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					2						

Baltimore County Spring 2008

University of Maryland Page 1650 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

1

### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: THTR 104 0104

7

Title Instructor:

Grad.

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

INTRO TO COSTUME

3.50-4.00

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

JOYCE, SHELLEY

		Ouestion		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
			- 															
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1670	4.77	4.64	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1070/1666	4.71	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.17
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	597/1406	4.85	4.58	4.32	4.31	4.50
		ations reflect		1 5	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	972/1615	4.56	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.17
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	734/1566	4.43	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.17
		_		o what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	787/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.17
		g system clearly		ined	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	361/1650		4.31	4.22	4.28	4.67
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	3	3		1157/1667	4.15	4.63	4.67	4.61	4.50
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1347/1626	4.33	4.39	4.11	4.07	3.60
1 Were th	ne instri	Lectur	prepared	1	Λ	Λ	0	0	1	5	4.83	387/1559	4.83	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.83	
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560		4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00
				xplained clearly	1 1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	266/1549	4.66	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.83
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1546		4.52	4.32	4.32	5.00
				our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1323		4.43	4.00	3.91	5.00
		1																
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	820/1384	4.58	4.54	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1092/1378	4.05	4.45	4.29	4.09	3.80
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1230/1378	3.90	4.38	4.31	4.08	3.40
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		2	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	179/ 904	4.89	4.65	4.03	3.94	4.67
				Frequ	ency	niet	-rih	utio	า									
				riequ	cricy	DISC		acio	.1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Rec	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			-			_						3 -		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				3	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0															

Electives

Other

Course-Section: THTR 110 0101 University of Maryland Page 1651 Title INTRODUCTION TO ACTING Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

YATES, PEGGY Instructor:

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 13

# Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	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	2	2	9	4.54	632/1670	4.54	4.64	4.31	4.23	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	808/1666		4.56	4.27	4.30	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	1	0	0	0	2		****/1406	***	4.58	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	6	6	4.23	898/1615	4.23	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	743/1566	4.15	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0 £	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	796/1528	4.15	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	744/1650	4.38	4.31	4.22	4.28	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	909/1667	4.77	4.63	4.67	4.61	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	s 1	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	728/1626	4.25	4.39	4.11	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	1205/1559	4.18	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	864/1549	4.36	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	595/1546	4.60	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	545/1323	4.25	4.43	4.00	3.91	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	579/1384	4.36	4.54	4.10	3.92	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1378	4.91	4.45	4.29	4.09	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	470/1378	4.73	4.38	4.31	4.08	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	202/ 904	4.60	4.65	4.03	3.94	4.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.72	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.00	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Free	quency	/ Di	strib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	3			Re	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 12		 R	 eauir	ed f	or M	 aior		 7	 Graduat	 e	0	 Maic	 or	1

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	12	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: THTR 202 0101

INTRO DRAMA LITERATURE

Title

SEARLS, COLETTE Instructor:

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 26

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1652 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eaue	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	_	0	_	1.0	0	2 00	1210/1670	2 00	1 61	4 21	4 20	2 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	5	10	9		1318/1670	3.92	4.64	4.31	4.32	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	6	13		1114/1666	4.12	4.56	4.27	4.27	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	1	6	5	9		1194/1406	3.78	4.58	4.32	4.39	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	2	2	7	11		1158/1615		4.46	4.24	4.29	3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	-	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62		4.62	4.39	4.07	4.00	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1 1	1 1	3 2	2	9 7	10	3.96	955/1528		4.35	4.12	4.11	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0			2	13 23		1008/1650	4.16	4.31	4.22		4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	1	0	0 1	0 2	10	23		540/1667 1162/1626		4.63 4.39	4.67 4.11	4.64 4.06	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	Τ	U	Τ	2	10	2	3.87	1102/1020	3.87	4.39	4.11	4.06	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	4	6	12	4.26	1150/1559	4.26	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	0	21	4.83	803/1560	4.83	4.91	4.72	4.73	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	2	6	13	4.30	936/1549	4.30	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	3	3	14	4.13	1079/1546	4.13	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	2	3	6	6	3.63	975/1323	3.63	4.43	4.00	4.08	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	2	2	15	4.43	519/1384	4.43	4.54	4.10	4.07	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	0	5	14	4.43	637/1378	4.48	4.45	4.10	4.07	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	0	2	1	15	4.35	795/1378		4.38	4.31	4.26	4.35
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	413/ 904		4.65	4.03	4.01	4.18
4. Were special techniques successivi	U	5		U	2	U	0	4.10	413/ 904	4.10	4.05	1.05	4.01	4.10
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.00	4.31	4.52	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 75	****	4.00	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 80	****	****	3.97	4.30	****
•• ·· • J ·······									,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 41	****	4.00	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 38	****	4.50	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.00	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	3.00	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****
1 Suddji prodoti ror arr one seadches		•	•	٠	_	Ū	Ü	5.00	, 0		3.00			

Course-Section: THTR 202 0101 Title

INTRO DRAMA LITERATURE

Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1652 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	3	Under-grad	26	Non-major	22
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: THTR 211 0101 University of Maryland Title HISTORY OF THEATRE II Baltimore County

Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL Enrollment:

26 Ouestionnaires: 22

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1653 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 3 3 16 4.59 567/1670 4.59 4.64 4.31 4.32 4.59 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 5 15 4.59 503/1666 4.59 4.56 4.27 4.27 4.59 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 0 5 16 4.64 459/1406 4.64 4.58 4.32 4.39 4.64 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 1 2 4 2 11 4.00 1083/1615 4.00 4.46 4.24 4.29 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 3 6 12 4.32 579/1566 4.32 4.39 4.07 4.00 4.32 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4 00 3 5 10 4.39 580/1528 4.39 4.35 4.12 4.11 4.39 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 4 4 12 4.18 985/1650 4.18 4.31 4.22 4.20 4.18 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 14 7 4.33 1310/1667 4.33 4.63 4.67 4.64 4.33 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 2 7 11 4.45 499/1626 4.45 4.39 4.11 4.06 4.45 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 1 3 16 4.75 521/1559 4.75 4.58 4.46 4.40 4.75 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 1 1 18 4.85 725/1560 4.85 4.91 4.72 4.73 4.85 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 1 7 11 4.53 658/1549 4.53 4.50 4.31 4.25 4.53 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 0 0 5 14 4.55 655/1546 4.55 4.52 4.32 4.30 4.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 5 0 1 2 3 9 4.33 481/1323 4.33 4.43 4.00 4.08 4.33 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 2 7 4.09 798/1384 4.09 4.54 4.10 4.07 4.09 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 1 0 8 4.09 935/1378 4.09 4.45 4.29 4.25 4.09 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 1 0 2 4 3 3.80 1086/1378 3.80 4.38 4.31 4.26 3.80 4. Were special techniques successful 12 4 1 0 0 1 4 4.17 417/904 4.17 4.65 4.03 4.01 4.17 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 87 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.65 5.00 \*\*\*\* 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 79 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.64 4.75 \*\*\*\* 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 75 \*\*\*\* 4.00 4.57 4.25 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 79 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.45 3.95 \*\*\*\* 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 21 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 80 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 3.97 4.30 \*\*\*\*

Credits Earned 00-27	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	-		-	
					0						

University of Maryland Course-Section: THTR 221 0101 Title CRAFT OF ACTING II MEHTA, XERXES J Instructor:

Questions

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	14

84-150

Grad.

1

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

3

D

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

0

Page 1654 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

C+1120x+	00,,,,,,,,,,	Erroluntion	Ouestionnaire
Structent.	Course	Evaluation.	Questionnaire

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Instructor

Rank

		2	_				_	_	_	_	-							
		General	 1															,
1. Did	you gain n	new insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.64	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did	the instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.56	4.27	4.27	5.00
3. Did	the exam o	questions reflect	t the e	expected goals	2	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.39	5.00
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did	assigned r	eadings contribu	ute to	what you learned	3	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.00	****
6. Did	written as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	361/1528	4.59	4.35	4.12	4.11	4.58
7. Was	the gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ined	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	457/1650	4.75	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.58
8. How	many times	was class cance	elled		2	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1368/1667	4.31	4.63	4.67	4.64	4.25
9. How	would you	grade the overal	ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.39	4.11	4.06	5.00
_		Lecture	_	_		_	_		_									
	the instr		13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1559	****	1.00		4.40	****		
		ctor seem intere			13	0	0	0	0	0			****/1560	****	4.91	4.72	4.73	****
				explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	0			****/1549	****	4.50		4.25	****
		es contribute to		-	13	0	0	0	0	0			****/1546	****	4.52		4.30	
5. Dia	audiovisua	il techniques eni	nance y	our understanding	12	0	1	0	0	0	Τ	3.00	****/1323	****	4.43	4.00	4.08	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc			what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	152/1384	4.96	4.54	4.10	4.07	4.92
				ed to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	- ,	5.00	4.45	4.29	4.25	5.00
		_	_	nd open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00		5.00	4.38	4.31	4.26	5.00
		echniques succes			2	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91		4.95	4.65	4.03	4.01	4.91
				Frequ	lency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Тур	oe .			Majors	;
00-27		0.00-0.99	 0	 А 9					or Ma			0	Graduate		0	Majo		4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		Red	quit	eu I	OT M	ajor	D	U	Graduate	=	U	Majc	,T	4
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-gr	rad 1	4	Non-	major	10
30-03	_	2.00 2.99	-	C 0		061	шста	-				0	onaci gi			14011	בטן בייי	10

Electives

10

Other

Course-Section: THTR 221 0201 Title CRAFT OF ACTING II Instructor: MEHTA, XERXES J

Enrollment:

12

University of Maryland AUG 6, 2008 Baltimore County Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 1655

Ouestionnaires:	11	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Questionnailes.	<u></u>	Student	Course	Evaluation	Quescionnaire

			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	11	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.64	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.56	4.27	4.27	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.00	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	346/1528	4.59	4.35	4.12	4.11	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	159/1650	4.75	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1287/1667	4.31	4.63	4.67	4.64	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.39	4.11	4.06	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1384	4.96	4.54	4.10	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.38	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 904	4.95	4.65	4.03	4.01	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: THTR 223 0101 University of Maryland Page 1656
Title VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Spring 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: WATSON, LYNN

Enrollment: 11

Questionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	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	1	10	4.91	206/1670	4.18	4.64	4.31	4.32	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	344/1666	4.05	4.56	4.27	4.27	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1406	3.00	4.58	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	412/1615	3.88	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	851/1566	3.67	4.39	4.07	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	560/1528	3.53	4.35	4.12	4.11	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1084/1650	3.60	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	4.72	4.63	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	670/1626	3.71	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	896/1559	3.55	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	596/1560	4.65	4.91	4.72	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	451/1549	3.65	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	345/1546	3.80	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	857/1323	3.86	4.43	4.00	4.08	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1384	4.00	4.54	4.10	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1378	4.00	4.45	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1378	3.86	4.38	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	194/ 904	4.53	4.65	4.03	4.01	4.63
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	 7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: THTR 223 0201 University of Maryland Page 1657 Title VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: FORTE, ELIZABET Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 10

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

								-	ncies	;			tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 L															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	1554/1670	4.18	4.64	4.31	4.32	3.44
		ctor make clear			2	0	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1552/1666	4.05	4.56	4.27	4.27	3.38
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	the e	xpected goals	1	3	3	0	0	0	3	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	4.58	4.32	4.39	3.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	1557/1615	3.88	4.46	4.24	4.29	3.13
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ite to	what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	1373/1566	3.67	4.39	4.07	4.00	3.33
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	2	3	1	2	1	2.67	1502/1528	3.53	4.35	4.12	4.11	2.67
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	3	0	1	3	2	3.11	1566/1650	3.60	4.31	4.22	4.20	3.11
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1216/1667	4.72	4.63	4.67	4.64	4.44
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	2	0	3	3	1	3.11	1527/1626	3.71	4.39	4.11	4.06	3.11
		Lectur	2															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	5	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1537/1559	3.55	4.58	4.46	4.40	2.60
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1326/1560	4.65	4.91	4.72	4.73	4.40
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	5	0	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	1522/1549	3.65	4.50	4.31	4.25	2.60
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	what	you learned	5	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1507/1546	3.80	4.52	4.32	4.30	2.80
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ite to	what you learned	3	0	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	1260/1384	4.00	4.54	4.10	4.07	3.00
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	3	0	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1297/1378	4.00	4.45	4.29	4.25	3.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	3	0	3	0	1	2	1	2.71	1336/1378	3.86	4.38	4.31	4.26	2.71
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	279/ 904	4.53	4.65	4.03	4.01	4.43
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00 07														_ 				1
00-27	Τ	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quir	ea I	or Ma	ljors		0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or.	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		<b>a</b>		1				1	TTm day		0	Marr		0
56-83 84-150	1	2.00-2.99	0 2	C 0		Gei	nera	T				1	Under-g	rad l	.0	Non-	-major	9
84-150 Grad.	1 0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	2 1	D 0 F 0		ות	ecti					0	#### - 1	Maana +	homo o		- 020110	·h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	Т	P 0		FT6	ECLI	ves				U	respons				_	111
				I 0		O+1	her					7	respons	es to L	e sign	itttcal	16	
				Ι 0		ULI	ner.					/						

Course-Section: THTR 231 0101 University of Maryland Page 1658 Title DRAFTING FOR THE THEAT Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 9

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.64	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	291/1666	4.78	4.56	4.27	4.27	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	****	4.58	4.32	4.39	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	224/1615	4.83	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1029/1566	3.89	4.39	4.07	4.00	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1528	****	4.35	4.12	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	938/1650	4.22	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1310/1667	4.33	4.63	4.67	4.64	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	207/1626	4.75	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	673/1560	4.88	4.91	4.72	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	366/1549	4.75	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	288/1323	4.57	4.43	4.00	4.08	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	608/1384	4.33	4.54	4.10	4.07	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	481/1378	4.67	4.45	4.29	4.25	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	813/1378	4.33	4.38	4.31	4.26	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.65	4.03	4.01	****
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3			Туј	pe			Majors	

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

Course-Section: THTR 233 0101 University of Maryland Page 1659
Title COSTUME DESIGN Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 9

Ouestionnaires:	8	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Ι

0

0

							Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did voi	ı gain ne	w insights,skil	_	m this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.64	4.31	4.32	5.00
		tor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	,		4.56	4.27	4.27	4.43
		ations reflect			1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	477/1615		4.46	4.24	4.29	4.57
				what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	295/1566		4.39	4.07	4.00	4.67
	_	_		o what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	0	0		****/1528	****	4.35	4.12	4.11	****
		system clearly		-	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.00
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.63	4.67	4.64	5.00
				hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	278/1626	4.67	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.67
		Lecture	-															
		ctor's lectures			5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559		4.58	4.46	4.40	5.00
		tor seem intere		_	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560		4.91	4.72	4.73	5.00
				xplained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	,		4.50	4.31	4.25	4.33
		es contribute to		-	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546		4.52	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	. techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	4.43	4.00	4.08	****
		Discuss	ni on															
1 Did als	acc dican			what you learned	5	0	0	Λ	1	Λ	2	4.33	608/1384	4.33	4 54	4.10	4.07	4.33
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	797/1378		4.45	4.29	4.25	4.33
		_	_	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	813/1378	4.33	4.38	4.31	4.26	4.33
		chniques succes		d open discussion	5	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 904		4.65	4.03	4.01	****
i. Were br	ecciai cc	cinitqueb buccei	DEUL		,	-	Ü	o	O	Ü	_	3.00	, , , , ,		1.05	1.05	1.01	
				Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ty	ne			Majors	
										. – – – -								
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
												_						

Other

6

Course-Section: THTR 234 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title MAKE-UP FOR THE STAGE Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA Spring 2008

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

Enrollment:	14			
Questionnaires:	11	Student Cour	se Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	a	4.64	518/1670	4.64	4.64	4.31	4.32	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	943/1666	4.27	4.56	4.27	4.27	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1406	4.75	4.58	4.32	4.39	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	0	1	5		1083/1615	4.00	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	491/1566	4.40	4.39	4.07	4.00	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.35	4.12	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	471/1650	4.57	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	675/1667	4.90	4.63	4.67	4.64	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	670/1626	4.30	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	852/1549	4.38	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	403/1323	4.43	4.43	4.00	4.08	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.54	4.10	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378	4.83	4.45	4.29	4.25	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	915/1378	4.17	4.38	4.31	4.26	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	146/ 904	4.75	4.65	4.03	4.01	4.75
Frequ	ıency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
	-													
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 1 A 7		Rec	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	;	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	3
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1												_		
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 1		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	major	8
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0														

Electives

Other

2

6

### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Page 1660

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

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

Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 1661 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG

Enrollment: 11
Ouestionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 780/1670 4.64 4.64 4.31 4.32 4.43 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 355/1666 4.71 4.56 4.27 4.27 4.71 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 3 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 876/1406 3.88 4.58 4.32 4.39 4.25 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 4 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 379/1615 4.33 4.46 4.24 4.29 4.67 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1566 5.00 4.39 4.07 4.00 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5 00 0 0 2 5.00 1/1528 5.00 4.35 4.12 4.11 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 471/1650 4.50 4.31 4.22 4.20 4.57 0 0 0 6 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 1/1667 4.86 4.63 4.67 4.64 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 167/1626 4.83 4.39 4.11 4.06 4.80 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 896/1559 4.63 4.58 4.46 4.40 4.50 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 948/1560 4.88 4.91 4.72 4.73 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 366/1549 4.63 4.50 4.31 4.25 4.75 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 3 4.50 715/1546 4.50 4.52 4.32 4.30 4.50 3 0 0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 2 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1323 5.00 4.43 4.00 4.08 5.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 2 0 2 4.00 820/1384 4.10 4.54 4.10 4.07 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 970/1378 4.25 4.45 4.29 4.25 4.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 1 0 0 1 2 3.75 1110/1378 4.38 4.38 4.31 4.26 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 3 2 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 904 5.00 4.65 4.03 4.01 5.00 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 232 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.19 4.35 \*\*\*\* 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 239 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.21 4.33 \*\*\*\* 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 230 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.44 4.61 \*\*\*\* 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0 0 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 6 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 231 \*\*\*\* 4.00 4.31 4.52 \*\*\*\* Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 41 \*\*\*\* 4.00 4.50 2.00 \*\*\*\* 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 6 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 38 \*\*\*\* 4.50 4.19 2.50 \*\*\*\*

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	4	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: THTR 250 0201 University of Maryland Page 1662 Title INTRO PRODUCTION TECH Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 7

Grad.

3.50-4.00

F

Ρ

I

0

0

0

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	equei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did v	vou gain r	new insights,skil		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	253/1670	4.64	4.64	4.31	4.32	4.86
_		actor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	,		4.56	4.27	4.27	4.71
		questions reflect		1 5	0	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1275/1406	3.88	4.58	4.32	4.39	3.50
		luations reflect			0	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1083/1615	4.33	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.00
				what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1566	5.00	4.39	4.07	4.00	****
6. Did w	written as	ssignments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1528	5.00	4.35	4.12	4.11	****
7. Was t	the gradir	ng system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	690/1650	4.50	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.43
8. How n	many times	s was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	970/1667	4.86	4.63	4.67	4.64	4.71
9. How w	would you	grade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	141/1626	4.83	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.86
		Lecture	<u>.</u>															
1. Were	the instr	ructor's lectures	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	521/1559	4.63	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.75
		actor seem intere			2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	4.88	4.91	4.72	4.73	5.00
				explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	683/1549	4.63	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.50
4. Did t	the lectur	res contribute to	what	you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	715/1546	4.50	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.50
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did o	class disc	cussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	712/1384	4.10	4.54	4.10	4.07	4.20
				ed to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	603/1378	4.25	4.45	4.29	4.25	4.50
3. Did t	the instru	uctor encourage f	air an	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	4.38	4.38	4.31	4.26	5.00
		Field V	Jork															
1. Did f	field expe	erience contribut	e to w	hat vou learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.00	4.50	2.00	****
	_	Ly understand you		_	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.19	2.50	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
a 1''	- 1	a ana						_					_					
Credits	 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3 -			Ту 	pe 			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 1														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														

Electives

Other

0

7

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: THTR 252 0101 University of Maryland
Title THEATRE LAB Baltimore County
Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG Spring 2008

Page 1663 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	2	
Questionnaires:	2	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	0	0	1	1	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.64	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.56	4.27	4.27	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.39	4.07	4.00	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.35	4.12	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.31	4.22	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.63	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.39	4.11	4.06	5.00
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.43	4.00	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.54	4.10	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.38	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.65	4.03	4.01	5.00

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

University of Maryland Page 1664
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: THTR 321 0101

16

SCRIPT ANALYSIS

MCCULLY, SUSAN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

Questions				Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
General															
insights, skills f:	rom this course	1	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	1128/1670	4.13	4.64	4.31	4.24	4.13
r make clear the	expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	6	3	3.73	1419/1666	3.73	4.56	4.27	4.18	3.73
tions reflect the	expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	****	4.58	4.32	4.22	****
ions reflect the	expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	4	8	4.20	944/1615	4.20	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.20
ings contribute to	o what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	295/1566	4.67	4.39	4.07	4.04	4.67
nments contribute	to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	611/1528	4.36	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.36
ystem clearly exp	lained	1	0	4	2	6	1	2	2.67	1615/1650	2.67	4.31	4.22	4.12	2.67
s class cancelled		2	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	1347/1667	4.29	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.29
de the overall tea	aching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1354/1626	3.58	4.39	4.11	4.06	3.58
Lecture															
or's lectures well	l prepared	5	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	722/1559	4.64	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.64
r seem interested	in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	596/1560	4.91	4.91	4.72	4.67	4.91
ial presented and	explained clearly	5	0	0	1	5	2	3	3.64	1355/1549	3.64	4.50	4.31	4.25	3.64
contribute to what	t you learned	5	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1040/1546	4.18	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.18
echniques enhance	your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	217/1323	4.70	4.43	4.00	3.99	4.70
Discussion															
ions contribute to	o what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	221/1384	4.80	4.54	4.10	4.12	4.80
		6	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.50
r encourage fair	and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	281/1378	4.90	4.38	4.31	4.33	4.90
niques successful	-	6	4	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	594/ 904	3.83	4.65	4.03	4.03	3.83
Seminar															
	he announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	***
		15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	***
		15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.00	4.57	4.50	***
	_	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.68	***
	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97		***
	Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	5
	General insights, skills for make clear the oftions reflect the innex contribute to ments contribute ystem clearly exps class cancelled de the overall teach to be contribute to what echniques enhance  Discussion ions contribute to what echniques enhance rencourage fair aniques successful  Seminar ics relevant to the contribute to what echniques enhance resourage fair aniques successful  Seminar ics relevant to the contribute to what echniques enhance resourage fair aniques successful  Seminar ics relevant to the contribute to what echniques enhance resourage fair aniques successful	General insights, skills from this course r make clear the expected goals tions reflect the expected goals ions contribute to what you learned nments contribute to what you learned ystem clearly explained s class cancelled de the overall teaching effectiveness  Lecture or's lectures well prepared r seem interested in the subject ial presented and explained clearly contribute to what you learned echniques enhance your understanding  Discussion ions contribute to what you learned actively encouraged to participate r encourage fair and open discussion niques successful  Seminar ics relevant to the announced theme r available for individual attention ects contribute to what you learned contribute to what you learned grading made clear  Frequence	General insights,skills from this course 1 r make clear the expected goals 1 tions reflect the expected goals 1 ions reflect the expected goals 1 ions reflect the expected goals 1 ings contribute to what you learned 1 nments contribute to what you learned 2 ystem clearly explained 1 s class cancelled 2 de the overall teaching effectiveness 4  Lecture or's lectures well prepared 5 r seem interested in the subject 5 ial presented and explained clearly 5 contribute to what you learned 5 echniques enhance your understanding 6  Discussion ions contribute to what you learned 6 actively encouraged to participate 7 r encourage fair and open discussion 6 niques successful 6  Seminar ics relevant to the announced theme 15 r available for individual attention 15 ects contribute to what you learned 15 grading made clear 15  Frequency	General insights,skills from this course 1 0 r make clear the expected goals 1 0 tions reflect the expected goals 1 13 ions reflect the expected goals 1 0 ings contribute to what you learned 1 0 nments contribute to what you learned 2 0 ystem clearly explained 1 0 s class cancelled 2 0 de the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  Lecture or's lectures well prepared 5 0 r seem interested in the subject 5 0 ial presented and explained clearly 5 0 contribute to what you learned 5 0 echniques enhance your understanding 6 0  Discussion ions contribute to what you learned 6 0 actively encouraged to participate 6 0 r encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 niques successful 6 4  Seminar ics relevant to the announced theme 15 0 r available for individual attention 15 0 ects contribute to what you learned 15 0 contribute to what you learned 15 0 grading made clear 15 0  Frequency Disc	General insights,skills from this course 1 0 0 r make clear the expected goals 1 13 0 ions reflect the expected goals 1 13 0 ions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 ings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 mments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 ystem clearly explained 1 0 4 s class cancelled 2 0 0 de the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0  Lecture or's lectures well prepared 5 0 0 r seem interested in the subject 5 0 0 ial presented and explained clearly 5 0 0 contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 echniques enhance your understanding 6 0 0  Discussion ions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 r encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 niques successful 6 4 0  Seminar ics relevant to the announced theme 15 0 0 contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 grading made clear 15 0 0 Frequency Distribute to what you learned 15 0 0 grading made clear 15 0 0	Questions NR NA 1 2  General  insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 1  r make clear the expected goals 1 13 0 0  ions reflect the expected goals 1 13 0 0  ions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 2  ings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0  nments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1  ystem clearly explained 2 0 0 0  de the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 1  Lecture  or's lectures well prepared 5 0 0 0  r seem interested in the subject 5 0 0 0  ial presented and explained clearly 5 0 0 1  contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0  echniques enhance your understanding 6 0 0 0  Discussion  ions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0  actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 1  r encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0  niques successful 6 4 0 0  Seminar  ics relevant to the announced theme 15 0 0 0  r available for individual attention 15 0 0 0  ects contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0  grading made clear 15 0 0 0  Frequency Distribution	Questions	General insights,skills from this course	Questions    NR   NA   1   2   3   4   5   6   8   8   8   8   8   8   8   8   8						

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	12
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	-			
				?	2						

Course-Section: THTR 325 0101 University of Maryland Page 1665 Title VOCAL TRAINING ACTOR I Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: WATSON, LYNN

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 10

# Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

	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	1	3	6	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.64	4.31	4.24	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	490/1666	4.60	4.56	4.27	4.18	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	****	4.58	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	944/1615	4.20	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1246/1566	3.57	4.39	4.07	4.04	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1368/1528	3.33	4.35	4.12	4.07	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	973/1650	4.20	4.31	4.22	4.12	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.63	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	355/1559	4.86	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	1023/1560	4.71	4.91	4.72	4.67	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	266/1549	4.83	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	1071/1546	4.14	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	894/1323	3.80	4.43	4.00	3.99	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	257/1384	4.75	4.54	4.10	4.12	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	653/1378	4.50	4.38	4.31	4.33	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.65	4.03	4.03	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10	
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	9	_				
				2	Λ							

#### Course-Section: THTR 335 0101 University of Maryland Page 1666 AUG 6, 2008 Title ADVANCED LIGHTING DESI Baltimore County Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: COBB, MILTON T.

Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 6

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Deddelle	COULDC	n varaacron	Queberonnarie

		Ouestion	~		Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5					ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect			
		Question	5 		NK	NA				4		Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1670	4.83	4.64	4.31	4.24	4.83
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1070/1666	4.17	4.56	4.27	4.18	4.17
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.33
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ate to v	what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1078/1566	3.83	4.39	4.07	4.04	3.83
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.50
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla:	ned	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1521/1650	3.33	4.31	4.22	4.12	3.33
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1310/1667	4.33	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.33
9. How wor	uld you 🤉	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.33
		Lectur	_															
		ctor's lecture	-	-	1	0	0	0	1	3	1		1280/1559		4.58	4.46	4.40	4.00
		tor seem inter		_	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	855/1560		4.91	4.72	4.67	4.80
		-		plained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	562/1549	4.60	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.60
		es contribute t	-		1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	345/1546		4.52	4.32	4.24	4.80
5. Did aud	diovisual	. techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	2	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	960/1323	3.67	4.43	4.00	3.99	3.67
		Discus																
				what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384		4.54	4.10	4.12	5.00
		-	_	l to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1378		4.45	4.29	4.30	5.00
		_		l open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378		4.38	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.65	4.03	4.03	4.00
				Frequ	lency	Dis	tribu	ution	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4								_	_	_	_			_
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge:	nera	L				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1					ıh
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ıficar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot.	her					5						
				? 0														

Course-Section: THTR 339 0101 University of Maryland Page 1667 Title ADV PRODUCTION TECHNQU Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG

Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 7

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Ex	201101	ncies	,		Tnat	tructor	Course	Dont	TIMDC	Level	Sect
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2 2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 1		General			0	0	0	•	0	-	_	1 06	050/1650	1 06	4 6 4	4 21	4 0 4	4 06
_	-	ew insights, skil			0	0	0	0	0	Ţ	6	4.86	253/1670		4.64	4.31	4.24	4.86
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1666		4.56	4.27	4.18	5.00 ***
		uations reflect			0	6	0	0	0	0	Τ		****/1615	****	4.46	4.24	4.18	
	_	_		what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	0	0		****/1566		4.39	4.07	4.04	****
	-	g system clearly	_	ined	0	5	0	0	0	1	Ţ	4.50	570/1650		4.31	4.22	4.12	4.50
	-	was class cance			0	Ţ	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	,	4.83	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How wou	.ld you	grade the overal	1 teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	151/1626	4.83	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.83
		Lecture																
1. Were the	e instr	uctor's lectures	well	prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.50
2. Did the	instru	ctor seem intere	sted i	n the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1560	****	4.91	4.72	4.67	****
3. Was lec	ture ma	terial presented	and e	xplained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the	lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1546	****	4.52	4.32	4.24	****
5. Did aud	iovisua	l techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1323	****	4.43	4.00	3.99	****
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did cla	ss disc	ussions contribu	te to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1384	****	4.54	4.10	4.12	****
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1378	****	4.45	4.29	4.30	****
		_	_	d open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1378	****	4.38	4.31	4.33	****
		echniques succes			6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	4.65	4.03	4.03	***
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
				- 1														
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	auir	ed fo	or Ma	aiors	 3	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			1				-	-		-	-	5	_	_

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

Course-Section: THTR 347 0101 University of Maryland AUG 6, 2008 Title CHARACTER/SCENE STUDY Job IRBR3029

Baltimore County Spring 2008 Instructor: MEHTA, XERXES J

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 16

Student Cou	rse Evaluation	Questionnaire
-------------	----------------	---------------

Page 1668

Questions			NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Ins <sup>*</sup> Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean		
1 1		Genera	_	. 1 . 1	0	•	_	_	•	0	- 4	4 00	024/1650	4 00	4 6 4	4 21	4 0 4	4 00
_	-	ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	0	14 16	4.88	234/1670 1/1666		4.64 4.56	4.31		4.88 5.00
		ctor make clear uestions reflec			0 1	7	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1606		4.58	4.27	4.18	5.00
	_	uestions reflect uations reflect		_	0	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	203/1615		4.46	4.24	4.22	4.87
				what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	210/1566		4.39	4.24	4.10	4.78
	-	-		o what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	560/1528		4.35	4.12	4.04	4.40
		g system clearl		_	0	1	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	229/1650		4.31	4.22	4.12	4.80
		was class canc		illed	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	. ,	4.94	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.94
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1626		4.39	4.11		
	200	5											_,					
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1559	****	4.58	4.46	4.40	****
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1560	****	4.91	4.72	4.67	****
3. Was le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1549	****	4.50	4.31	4.25	****
4. Did the	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1546	****	4.52	4.32	4.24	****
		Discus																
				what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1384		4.54	4.10	4.12	5.00
		_	_	d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.29	4.30	5.00
		_		d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	-,		4.38	4.31	4.33	4.92
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		3	1	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.65	4.03	4.03	5.00
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
														- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 13		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge:	nera	1			1	.1	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1					ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					5						

? 1

Course-Section: THTR 361 0101 University of Maryland Page 1669
Title MODERN THEATRE II Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: MCCULLY, SUSAN Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 11

	uestionnaires:	9	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
_	ucotiniaii co.	2	bludelli	COULDE	E valuation	Juescionnaire

56-83

Grad.

84-150

0

5

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

3

C

D

F

Ρ

I

?

1

0

0

0

0

0

				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	6	4.56	611/1670	4.56	4.64	4.31	4.24	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1003/1666	4.22	4.56	4.27	4.18	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	948/1406	4.17	4.58	4.32	4.22	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	143/1566	4.89	4.39	4.07	4.04	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	504/1528	4.44	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	1521/1650	3.33	4.31	4.22	4.12	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1465/1667	4.11	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	728/1626	4.25	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	1280/1559	4.00	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560		4.91	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1087/1549	4.13	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1139/1546	4.00	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	260/1323	4.63	4.43	4.00	3.99	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	205/1384	4.83	4.54	4.10	4.12	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	4		481/1378		4.45	4.29	4.30	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	4		813/1378		4.38	4.31	4.33	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 904			4.03	4.03	***
Frequ	encv	nist	rib	ntio	า									
11040	CIIC	DID		ac101	-									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6		Red	uir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	3
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2			-			-						3 -		

General

Other

Electives

0

9

Under-grad

9

responses to be significant

### - Means there are not enough

Non-major 6

Course-Section	: THTR 390 0101		University of Maryland	Page 1670
Title	THEATRE IN PROD	UCTION	Baltimore County	AUG 6, 2008
Instructor:	WATSON, LYNN	(Instr. A)	Spring 2008	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 11

Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1139/1670	4.13	4.64	4.31	4.24	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.56	4.27	4.18	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1615	****	4.46	4.24	4.18	***
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.39	4.07	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1528	****	4.35	4.12	4.07	***
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.31	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.63	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	877/1626	4.06	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.06

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	7	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	8	Non-major	7	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	6					
				2	0							

Course-Section	: THTR 390 0101		University of Maryland	Page 1671
Title	THEATRE IN PROD	DUCTION	Baltimore County	AUG 6, 2008
Instructor:	WATSON, LYNN	(Instr. B)	Spring 2008	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies				Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1139/1670	4.13	4.64	4.31	4.24	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.56	4.27	4.18	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1615	****	4.46	4.24	4.18	***
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.39	4.07	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1528	****	4.35	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.31	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.63	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	953/1626	4.06	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.06

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1			
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0									
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	8	Non-major	7			
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	### - Means there are not enough					
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant				
				I	0	Other	6							
				?	0									

Course-Section: THTR 490 0101 University of Maryland Page 1672 Title PRODUCTION WORKSHOP Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

SEARLS, COLETTE Instructor:

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 14

#### 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	1	0	1	1	0	0	11	4.46	722/1670	4.46	4.64	4.31	4.45	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	516/1666	4.58	4.56	4.27	4.35	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1406	****	4.58	4.32	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.46	4.24	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	226/1566	4.75	4.39	4.07	4.17	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	842/1528	4.10	4.35	4.12	4.26	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	2	0	2	2	5	3.73	1376/1650	3.73	4.31	4.22	4.28	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	992/1667	4.69	4.63	4.67	4.73	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	0	3	8	4.31	670/1626	4.31	4.39	4.11	4.28	4.31

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	2						