Course-Section: THTR 100 01

Intro Theatre Scenogrp

Title

Instructor:

Schraven, Greggo Spring 2010

Page 1415 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	25
Ouestionnaires:	11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		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	1	0	2	6	2	3.73	1269/1447	3.41	4.52	4.31	4.18	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	604/1447	4.46	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	658/1241	4.31	4.62	4.33	4.25	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	916/1402	3.94	4.46	4.24	4.15	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	2	3.82	980/1358	3.79	4.49	4.11	4.03	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	6	3	3.91	910/1316	3.39	4.25	4.14	3.99	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	850/1427	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	485/1447	4.82	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	540/1434	4.20	4.40	4.10	4.10	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	_	1 20	941/1387	4.34	4.59	4.46	4.46	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	-	0	0	0	2 0	2	9	4.36		4.34	4.59	4.46	4.46	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0 1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.82	607/1386	4.87	4.88	4.73	4.71	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	868/1380	3.98	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	612/1193	3.90	4.10	4.02	3.99	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	1	U	U	۷	5	3	4.10	012/1193	3.01	4.10	4.02	3.99	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	1090/1172	3.00	4.37	4.15	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	856/1182	4.13	4.61	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	864/1170	3.88	4.63	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	612/ 800	3.22	4.47	4.06	3.95	3.67
- 1														
Laboratory				•	_	_								****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	Ţ	0	0		****/ 189	3.00	3.75	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 192		3.75	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	Ţ		****/ 186	4.00	4.31	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	4.00	4.25	4.33	4.37	***

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

Course-Section: THTR 100 02 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County Intro Theatre Scenogrp Spring 2010

Instructor: Schraven, Greggo

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1416

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1411/1447	3.41	4.52	4.31	4.18	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.46	4.52	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	541/1241	4.31	4.62	4.33	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	494/1402	3.94	4.46	4.24	4.15	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1358	3.79	4.49	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	392/1316	3.39	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	971/1427	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.82	4.75	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	341/1434	4.20	4.40	4.10	4.10	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.34	4.59	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.87	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	4.13	4.52	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	3.98	4.50	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	652/1193	3.61	4.10	4.02	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1090/1172	3.00	4.37	4.15	3.95	3.00
. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned . Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	856/1182	4.13	4.61	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	864/1170	3.88	4.63	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	423/ 800	3.22	4.47	4.06	3.95	4.00

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

Course-Section: THTR 100 03

Title Intro Theatre Scenogrp

Instructor: Schraven, Greggo

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 2 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1417 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	_	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	_	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	0	0	3.00	1411/1447	3.41	4.52	4.31	4.18	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1053/1447	4.46	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	923/1241	4.31	4.62	4.33	4.25	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1264/1402	3.94	4.46	4.24	4.15	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1291/1358	3.79	4.49	4.11	4.03	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1299/1316	3.39	4.25	4.14	3.99	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	971/1427	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1447	4.82	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1238/1434	4.20	4.40	4.10	4.10	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1176/1387	4.34	4.59	4.46	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.87	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1328/1386	4.13	4.52	4.32	4.32	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1317/1380	3.98	4.50	4.32	4.31	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1177/1193	3.61	4.10	4.02	3.99	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1090/1172	3.00	4.37	4.15	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00			4.61	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	864/1170	3.88	4.63	4.38	4.17	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	189/ 189	3.00	3.75	4.34	4.18	2.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	183/ 192	4.00	3.75	4.34	4.31	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	181/ 186	4.00	4.31	4.48	4.46	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	176/ 187	4.00	4.25	4.33	4.37	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	167/ 168		3.83	4.20	4.29	3.00
_		<u> </u>	,											

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_	-		
				2	0						

Course-Section: THTR 100 04

Title Intro Theatre Scenogrp

Instructor: Schraven, Greggo

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1418 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluati	on Questi	lonnai	ire
---------	--------	----------	-----------	--------	-----

				_	ncies	3			ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1369/1447	3.41	4.52	4.31	4.18	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	766/1447	4.46	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	717/1241	4.31	4.62	4.33	4.25	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1203/1402	3.94	4.46	4.24	4.15	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1231/1358	3.79	4.49	4.11	4.03	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1288/1316	3.39	4.25	4.14	3.99	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	680/1427	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	958/1447	4.82	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	230/1434	4.20	4.40	4.10	4.10	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1176/1387	4.34	4.59	4.46	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	982/1387	4.87	4.88	4.73	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1047/1386	4.13	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1198/1380	3.98	4.50	4.32	4.31	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	420/1193	3.61	4.10	4.02	3.99	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1090/1172	3.00	4.37	4.15	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	553/1182	4.13	4.61	4.35	4.18	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1070/1170	3.88	4.63	4.38	4.17	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	795/ 800	3.22	4.47	4.06	3.95	2.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	184/ 189	3.00	3.75	4.34	4.18	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	147/ 192	4.00	3.75	4.34	4.31	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	160/ 186	4.00	4.31	4.48	4.46	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	141/ 187	4.00	4.25	4.33	4.37	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	_		
				6	0						

Course-Section	: THTR 100 05	University of Maryland	Page 1419
Title	Intro Theatre Scenogrp	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:	Schraven, Greggo	Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Schraven, Greggo

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1058/1447	3.41	4.52	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	532/1447	4.46	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1427	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.82	4.75	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	849/1434	4.20	4.40	4.10	4.10	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	140/ 189	3.00	3.75	4.34	4.18	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 192	4.00	3.75	4.34	4.31	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 186	4.00	4.31	4.48	4.46	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 187	4.00	4.25	4.33	4.37	5.00

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 01 Title

Intro To Costume

Ranney-Howes,M. Instructor:

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1420 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Eva.	luation	Question	naire
---------	--------	------	---------	----------	-------

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	0	3	12	4.35	771/1447	4.74	4.52	4.31	4.18	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	6	8	4.06	1023/1447	4.63	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	782/1241	4.58	4.62	4.33	4.25	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	766/1402	4.57	4.46	4.24	4.15	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1125/1358	4.32	4.49	4.11	4.03	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	2	2	8	3.69	1038/1316	4.34	4.25	4.14	3.99	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	4	6	3.76	1160/1427	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	339/1447	4.80	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	540/1434	4.63	4.40	4.10	4.10	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	1	3	10	4.19	1092/1387	4.76	4.59	4.46	4.46	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	758/1387	4.83	4.88	4.73	4.71	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	3	8	4.06	1022/1386	4.59	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	3	10	4.19	946/1380	4.48	4.50	4.32	4.31	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	4	1	9	4.13	583/1193				3.99	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	,			4.15	3.95	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42			4.61	4.35	4.18	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	4		4.67			4.63	4.38	4.17	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 800	4.67	4.47	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 189	4.63	3.75	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 192	3.88	3.75	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 186	4.50	4.31	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 187	4.50	4.25	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 168	4.25	3.83	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 66	2 00	2 00	/ E0	2 05	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16 16	0	0	0	1	0	0		,	2.00	2.00	4.58	3.95	****
	16	0	0	1	0		-	3.00	,	3.00	3.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0 1	0		****/ 58 ****/ 65	2.00	2.00	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 64	1.00	1.00	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	U	U	1	U	U	U	2.00	***/ 64	2.00	2.00	4.09	3.75	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	2.00	2.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 28	2.00	2.00	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	2.00	2.00	4.30	3.64	****
Self Paced			•				•		,			4 ===		
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.72	4.50	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 21	2.00	2.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	4.00	4.00	4.60	4.49	****

Course-Section: THTR 104 01 Title

Intro To Costume

Instructor: Enrollment:

Ranney-Howes,M. 27 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1420 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 104 02

Intro To Costume

Title Instructor: Ranney-Howes,M.

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1421 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	585/1447	4.74	4.52	4.31	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	766/1447	4.63	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	4.58	4.62	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1402	4.57	4.46	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	529/1358	4.32	4.49	4.11	4.03	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	4.34	4.25	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1201/1427	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	4.80	4.75	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	230/1434	4.63	4.40	4.10	4.10	4.67
<u>.</u> .														
Lecture	^	0	^	^	^	1	_	4 02	207/1207	4 76	4 50	1 16	1 10	4 02
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	307/1387	4.76	4.59	4.46	4.46	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	4.83	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0		4.67	431/1386	4.59	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	659/1380	4.48	4.50	4.32	4.31	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	186/1193	4.49	4.10	4.02	3.99	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	282/1172	4.71	4.37	4.15	3.95	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	4.73	4.61	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	864/1170	4.73	4.63	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	0	0	0		3.67	612/ 800		4.47		3.95	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 189	4.63	3.75	4.34	4.18	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 192	3.88	3.75	4.34	4.31	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	0	0	1		177/ 186	4.50	4.31	4.48	4.46	3.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	1		98/ 187	4.50	4.25	4.33	4.37	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 168	4.25	3.83	4.20	4.29	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 66	2.00	2.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	3.00	3.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	2.00	2.00	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	1.00	1.00	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 64	2.00	2.00	4.09	3.75	****
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·									, , ,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	2.00	2.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	2.00	2.00	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	2.00	2.00	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	3.00	3.00	4.43	3.73	***
Self Paced	_	^		0	_	_	-	F 00	**** / ^ -	2 00	2 00	4 50	4 50	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	2.00	2.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 20	4.00	4.00	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	U	U	U	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	4.00	4.00	4.61	4.31	^^^

Course-Section: THTR 104 02
Title Intro To Costu

Intro To Costume Ranney-Howes, M.

Instructor: Rann Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1421 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 3 Title Intro To Costume Instructor:

Ranney-Howes,M.

Enrollment:

7

Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1422 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

		Frequencies Instructor Course Dept				Dept	t UMBC Level		Sect					
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.74	4.52	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1447	4.63	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	380/1241	4.58	4.62	4.33	4.25	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33			4.46	4.24	4.15	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	0			1084/1358	4.32	4.49	4.11	4.03	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	812/1316		4.25	4.14	3.99	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	3		775/1427		4.18	4.19	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	3		1252/1447		4.75	4.69	4.68	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434		4.40	4.10	4.10	5.00
7. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	U	U	U	U	U	_	5.00	1/1434	4.03	4.40	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	г оо	1 /1207	176	4 50	1 10	1 10	г оо
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387		4.59	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	2		1229/1387	4.83	4.88	4.73	4.71	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1386	4.59	4.52	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2		463/1380	4.48	4.50	4.32	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	186/1193	4.49	4.10	4.02	3.99	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1172	4.71	4.37	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	4.73	4.61	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	4.73	4.63	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 800	4.67	4.47	4.06	3.95	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	173/ 189	4.63	3.75	4.34	4.18	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	178/ 192	3.88	3.75	4.34	4.31	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	_	4.50	104/ 186	4.50	4.31	4.48	4.46	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	0	0		3.50	166/ 187	4.50	4.25	4.33	4.37	3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	0	0		3.50	150/ 168	4.25	3.83	4.20	4.29	3.50
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	2	U	U	1	U	U		3.30	130/ 108	4.23	3.03	4.20	4.43	3.30
Seminar														
	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	66/ 66	2 00	2 00	4 50	3.95	2.00
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme		-	•			-	-			2.00	2.00	4.58		
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	58/ 62	3.00	3.00	4.56	4.08	3.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	58/ 58	2.00	2.00	4.41	3.88	2.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	65/ 65	1.00	1.00	4.42	3.78	1.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	63/ 64	2.00	2.00	4.09	3.75	2.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	38/ 38	2.00	2.00	4.49	3.83	2.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	24/ 36	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.26	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	27/ 28	2.00	2.00	4.52	3.84	2.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	30/ 30	2.00	2.00	4.30	3.64	2.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	26/ 27	3.00	3.00	4.43	3.73	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	30/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.72	4.50	3.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	21/ 21	2.00	2.00	4.57	4.38	2.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	28/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.64	4.65	3.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	17/ 20	4.00	4.00	4.60	4.49	4.00
	3	0	0	0	0		-		,					
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	U	U	U	U	1	0	4.00	13/ 15	4.00	4.00	4.61	4.31	4.00

Course-Section: THTR 104 3
Title Intro To Costs

Intro To Costume Ranney-Howes, M.

Instructor: Rann
Enrollment: 7
Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1422 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	2
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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other		-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 104 4 University of Maryland
Title Intro To Costume Baltimore County
Instructor: Ranney-Howes, M. Spring 2010

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1423

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Questions			NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		General																
		w insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.74	4.52	4.31	4.18	5.00
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.63	4.52	4.27	4.30	5.00
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1241	4.58	4.62	4.33	4.25	4.75
		ations reflect			0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	314/1402	4.57	4.46	4.24	4.15	4.67
				hat you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	4.32	4.49	4.11	4.03	5.00
				what you learned	0	1 0	0	0	1	1	1		812/1316	4.34	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.00
		system clearly		nea	0	0	0	1	0	0	3		775/1427	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.25
		was class cance			0 1	0	0	0	0	0 1	4	5.00	1/1447	4.80	4.75	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How wor	ula you g	rade the overa.	II teacn	ing effectiveness	1	U	U	U	0	Τ	2	4.67	230/1434	4.63	4.40	4.10	4.10	4.67
		Lecture	e															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	s well p	repared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	4.76	4.59	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	4.83	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was led	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1386	4.59	4.52	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	463/1380	4.48	4.50	4.32	4.31	4.67
5. Did aud	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandin					1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1193	4.49	4.10	4.02	3.99	5.00
		Discus																
ו הגם ו				hat you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	377/1172	4.71	4.37	4.15	3.95	4.50
				to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	553/1182	4.71	4.61	4.15	4.18	4.50
				open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	4.73	4.63	4.38	4.10	5.00
		chniques succes		open discussion	2	1	0	0	0	0	1		1/11/0	4.73	4.63		3.95	5.00
4. Wele S	peciai te	ciniiques succes	SSLUI		2		U	U	U	U		5.00	1/ 800	4.07	4.4/	4.00	3.93	3.00
		Laborat	tory															
1. Did the	e lab inc	rease understar	nding of	the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 189	4.63	3.75	4.34	4.18	5.00
2. Were yo	ou provid	ed with adequat	te backg	round information	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	189/ 192	3.88	3.75	4.34	4.31	2.00
3. Were no	ecessary	materials avail	lable fo	r lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 186	4.50	4.31	4.48	4.46	5.00
4. Did the	e lab ins	tructor provide	e assist	ance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 187	4.50	4.25	4.33	4.37	5.00
				Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	ıt.i.oı	n									
				1-					-									
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 2					Red	guire	ed fo	or Ma	ijors	 3	2	Graduate	 е	0	Majo	r or	2
28-55					-			-						3 -				
56-83				Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	2		
84-150												_				-		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0			Electives 0					0	#### - Means there are not enough									
	P 0			responses to be si				e sign										
I 0				Oth	ner					0								
? 0																		

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1424 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	9	
Questionnaires:	6	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: THTR 104 5

Intro To Costume

Ranney-Howes,M.

Title

Instructor:

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	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 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 4	0 0 2 1 3 3 0 1 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0	1 0 3 0 0 0 0 1 1	5 6 1 4 2 2 5 4 1	4.83 5.00 4.25 4.60 5.00 5.00 4.67 4.80 4.50	754/1447 341/1434 353/1387	4.76	4.52 4.52 4.62 4.46 4.49 4.25 4.18 4.75 4.40	4.31 4.27 4.33 4.24 4.11 4.14 4.19 4.69 4.10	4.18 4.30 4.25 4.15 4.03 3.99 4.24 4.68 4.10	4.83 5.00 4.25 4.60 5.00 5.00 4.67 4.80 4.50
 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 	1 1 1 1	0 0 0 1	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 2 1 2	0 0 1 0	5 3 3 2	5.00 4.20 4.40 4.00	1/1387 927/1386 759/1380 652/1193	4.83 4.59 4.48 4.49	4.88 4.52 4.50 4.10	4.73 4.32 4.32 4.02	4.71 4.32 4.31 3.99	5.00 4.20 4.40 4.00
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful Laboratory	2 2 2 2	0 0 0 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 1 0 0	4 3 4 2	5.00 4.75 5.00 5.00	1/1172 347/1182 1/1170 1/ 800	4.71 4.73 4.73 4.67	4.37 4.61 4.63 4.47	4.15 4.35 4.38 4.06	3.95 4.18 4.17 3.95	5.00 4.75 5.00 5.00
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified Seminar	4 4 4 4	0 0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	2 2 2 2 1		1/ 189 1/ 192 1/ 186 1/ 187 ****/ 168	4.63 3.88 4.50 4.50 4.25	3.75 3.75 4.31 4.25 3.83	4.34 4.34 4.48 4.33 4.20	4.18 4.31 4.46 4.37 4.29	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention Frequ	5 iencv	0 Dist	0 ribi	0 1tion	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	3.00	3.00	4.56	4.08	***
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	ciicy	DID	2112		asons				Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27		Ger	- nera:	1	or Ma	 jors		2 1 1	Graduate Under-g: #### - I response	rad Means t		re not	major enoug	1 5

Course-Section: THTR 110 01 University of Maryland Page 1425 Title Introduction To Acting Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Yates,Peggy

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 17

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	_															
_	_	ew insights,ski			0	0	1	1	1	2	12	4.35	771/1447		4.52	4.31	4.18	4.35
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	376/1447		4.52	4.27	4.30	4.65
	_	uestions reflec		_	0	13	0	0	1	0	3		****/1241	****	4.62	4.33	4.25	****
		uations reflect		_	0	1	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	358/1402		4.46	4.24	4.15	4.63
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	-/	6	3.88	931/1358		4.49	4.11	4.03	3.88
				o what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	7	5		880/1316		4.25	4.14	3.99	3.94
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	2	2	2	11	4.29	727/1427		4.18	4.19	4.24	4.29
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	3	8	6		1296/1447		4.75	4.69	4.68	4.18
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	540/1434	4.33	4.40	4.10	4.10	4.33
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instru	prepared	3	0	1	0	2	1	10	4.36	951/1387	4.36	4.59	4.46	4.46	4.36		
2. Did th	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was le	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear						0	0	1	3	10	4.64	457/1386	4.64	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.64
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	299/1380	4.79	4.50	4.32	4.31	4.79
				our understanding	4	9	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1193	****	4.10	4.02	3.99	****
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al	lace died			what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	339/1172	4.57	4.37	4.15	3.95	4.57
				d to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	250/1182		4.61	4.35	4.18	4.86
				d open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	538/1170		4.63	4.38	4.17	4.57
		echniques succe		d open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	114/ 800			4.06	3.95	4.71
T. WEIE S	special co	sciniiques succe	BBLUI		10	U	U	U	U	4	J	4.71	114/ 000	4.71	1.1/	1.00	3.93	4.71
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 13		Re	anir		or Ma	ior		4	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		110	7u11	Ju I	J_ 1/1C	בט כ	_	•	Graduat	_	0	1.10.10	/ <u>_</u>	5
56-83	_		0			Ge.	nera:	1				6	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	14
84-150							a.	_				-	011001 9			2.011		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		E1.	ectiv	ves				4	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
oraa.	J	3.30 1.00	J	P 0								-	respons				_	
				I O		O+	her					2	10050110		51			
				? 1		00.						-						

Course-Section: THTR 202 01 University of Maryland Page 1426 Title Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Intro Drama Literature

Instructor: Kaleba,Casey

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 22

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.52	4.31	4.31	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	9	4.14	965/1447	4.14	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	646/1241	4.41	4.62	4.33	4.35	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	616/1402	4.40	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	194/1358	4.73	4.49	4.11	4.12	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	549/1316	4.33	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	5	6	8	3.95	1024/1427	3.95	4.18	4.19	4.14	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	16	5	4.18	1291/1447	4.18	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	3	10	6	4.16	744/1434	4.16	4.40	4.10	3.97	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	414/1387	4.76	4.59	4.46	4.42	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	264/1387	4.95	4.88	4.73	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	719/1386	4.43	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	477/1380	4.65	4.50	4.32	4.30	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	526/1193	4.20	4.10	4.02	4.04	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	648/1172	4.14	4.37	4.15	4.12	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	480/1182	4.62	4.61	4.35	4.30	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	352/1170	4.79	4.63	4.38	4.32	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	9	12	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 800	****	4.47	4.06	4.01	****

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Course-Section: THTR 221 01 Title Craft Of Acting II Baltimore County

Muson, Eve B Spring 2010 Instructor:

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 12

Student	Course	Fwaluation	Ouestionnaire

Page 1427

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera																
1 Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	148/1447	4.79	4.52	4.31	4.31	4.91
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1447	4.83	4.52	4.27	4.23	5.00
		uestions reflec			0	8	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	541/1241	4.38	4.62	4.33	4.35	4.50
	_	uations reflect		1 3	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	217/1402		4.46	4.24	4.24	4.75
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	87/1358	4.84	4.49	4.11	4.12	4.91
	-	-		to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	76/1316	4.68	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.91
		g system clearl		-	1	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	716/1427	4.32	4.18	4.19	4.14	4.30
	_	was class canc		ilica	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	727/1447	4.69	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.82
				hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	206/1434			4.10		4.70
J. 110W WO	outa you	ming circultychess		O	O	O	O	5	,	1.70	200/1131	1.11	1.10	1.10	3.57	1.70		
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	566/1387	4.65	4.59	4.46	4.42	4.67		
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	159/1386	4.82	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.89
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	312/1380	4.70	4.50	4.32	4.30	4.78
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	****	4.10	4.02	4.04	****
		Discus																
1 Did al	222 4422			what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	141/1172	4.94	4.37	4.15	4.12	4.88
					4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1182		4.37	4.15	4.12	5.00
				ed to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	254/1170		4.61	4.35	4.30	4.88
		ctor encourage echniques succe		nd open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	, 8	5.00	1/ 800		4.63		4.32	
T. WELE S	peciai c	eciniiques succe	BBLUI		-	U	U	U	U	U	O	3.00	1/ 000	3.00	1.1/	1.00	T.01	3.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	asons	3			Ту	ne			Majors	!
										<i>-</i> 								,
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	9	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	7
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	в 3														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	_J h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
												_						

Other

0

0

0

I ?

Course-Section: THTR 221 02 Title Craft Of Acting II Instructor: Searls,Colette

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

11

University of Maryland Page 1428 Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

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

Frequencies

							L T	-quc.		3		TILD	Luccor	COULDC	. DCpc	OLIDC	TICACT	DCCC
	Questions					NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did you	u qain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	408/1447	4.79	4.52	4.31	4.31	4.67
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	352/1447	4.83	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.67
		uestions reflec			0	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	782/1241	4.38	4.62	4.33	4.35	4.25
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	437/1402	4.65	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.56
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	158/1358	4.84	4.49	4.11	4.12	4.78
6. Did wri	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	455/1316	4.68	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.44
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	680/1427	4.32	4.18	4.19	4.14	4.33
	_	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1048/1447	4.69	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.56
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	775/1434	4.41	4.40	4.10	3.97	4.13
		Lectur	۵															
1 Were th	he instr		_	nrenared	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	626/1387	4 65	4.59	4.46	4.42	4.63
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subjec						0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387		4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
							0	0	0	2	6	4.75	316/1386		4.52	4.32	4.24	4.75
	Was lecture material presented and explained clea:						0	0	0	3	5	4.63	520/1380		4.50	4.32	4.30	4.63
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					0 5	0	0	0	0	2		****/1193			4.02		****
J. DIG GG	alovibua	r cccinitques en	marice y	our unactificanting	2	3	O	O	O	O		3.00	/11/3		1.10	1.02	1.01	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1172	4.94	4.37	4.15	4.12	5.00
2. Were al	ll stude:	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.61	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	440/1170	4.79	4.63	4.38	4.32	4.71
4. Were sp	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		2	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.47	4.06	4.01	5.00
				Frequ	encs	z Dis	trib	ut i o	n									
				11040	.0110	210	0112	u010.										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	 3	8	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r or	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в б			-			,						3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		El	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									response	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					0						
				2 0														

Course-Section: THTR 223 01 University of Maryland Vocal Trng For Actor I Baltimore County

Title

4. Were special techniques successful

Instructor: Watson, Janet L Enrollment: 14

Ouestionnaires: 8

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1429

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions 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 0 7 4.75 309/1447 4.88 4.52 4.31 4.31 4.75 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 0 6 4.50 532/1447 4.75 4.52 4.27 4.23 4.50 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 2 2 3 4.14 855/1241 4.45 4.62 4.33 4.35 4.14 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 0 1 6 4.50 494/1402 4.50 4.46 4.24 4.24 4.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 4.38 485/1358 4.47 4.49 4.11 4.12 4.38 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 2 4 4.13 738/1316 4.49 4.25 4.14 4.08 4.137. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 0 1 2 4 4.00 971/1427 4.25 4.18 4.19 4.14 4.00 0 0 0 8 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 1/1447 5.00 4.75 4.69 4.70 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 1 0 6 1 3.88 1003/1434 4.35 4.40 4.10 3.97 3.88 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 698/1387 4.79 4.59 4.46 4.42 4.57 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 1 0 0 6 4.57 1081/1387 4.79 4.88 4.73 4.71 4.57 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 1 1 4 4.14 971/1386 4.57 4.52 4.32 4.24 4.14 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 582/1380 4.39 4.50 4.32 4.30 4.57 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 1 1 0 1 1 3.00 1087/1193 3.00 4.10 4.02 4.04 3.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 5 4.83 163/1172 4.92 4.37 4.15 4.12 4.83 0 5 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 1/1182 5.00 4.61 4.35 4.30 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 576/1170 4.75 4.63 4.38 4.32 4.50

Frequency Distribution

2 1 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/800 5.00 4.47 4.06 4.01 5.00

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

Course-Section: THTR 223 02 University of Maryland

Title Vocal Trng For Actor I Baltimore County Spring 2010 Instructor: Staley,Natasha

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

S±11	dent	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Page 1430

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

								_	ncies	5	_		ructor		Dept		Level	Sect
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	4.88	4.52	4.31	4.31	5.00
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	4.75	4.52	4.27	4.23	5.00
		estions reflec			2	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1241	4.45	4.62	4.33	4.35	4.75
		ations reflect			1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.50
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	299/1358	4.47	4.49	4.11	4.12	4.57
				o what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	102/1316	4.49	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.86
		g system clearl			3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	459/1427	4.25	4.18	4.19	4.14	4.50
		was class canc			2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.70	5.00
				hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	108/1434	4.35	4.40	4.10	3.97	4.83
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	4.79	4.59	4.46	4.42	5.00
2. Did th	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	4.79	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clear:					0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1386	4.57	4.52	4.32	4.24	5.00
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	940/1380	4.39	4.50	4.32	4.30	4.20
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	4	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1193	3.00	4.10	4.02	4.04	****
		Discus																
				what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1172		4.37	4.15	4.12	5.00
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182		4.61	4.35	4.30	5.00
		_		d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170		4.63	4.38	4.32	5.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		4	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.47	4.06	4.01	5.00
				Frequ	lency	[,] Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	quire	ed f	or Ma	aior	 3	5	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			= .			J ·						5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ge	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				2	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enou	ıh
				P 0									respons				_	
				I O		Ot	her					0	-		5			
				? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: THTR 230 01 Drawing For Theatre Title Instructor: Zlotescu, Elena Spring 2010

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 9 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							P L	eque.	TICTES	>		TIID	LIUCLUI	Course	: Debr	ONIDC	телет	Sect
			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1058/1447	4.00	4.52	4.31	4.31	4.00
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1154/1447	3.89	4.52	4.27	4.23	3.89
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	4.62	4.33	4.35	****
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1358	****	4.49	4.11	4.12	****
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	***	4.25	4.14	4.08	****
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	5	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1378/1427	2.75	4.18	4.19	4.14	2.75
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	538/1447	4.89	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.89
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.40	4.10	3.97	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	prepared	3	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	1282/1387	3.67	4.59	4.46	4.42	3.67		
						0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387		4.88	4.73	4.71	
	d the instructor seem interested in the subject as lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	0		1			1160/1386		4.52	4.32		3.83
		es contribute t			3	0	0	0	3	1			1138/1380			4.32		3.83
				our understanding	3	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	652/1193	4.00	4.10	4.02	4.04	4.00
		-	-	3														
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	999/1172	3.50	4.37	4.15	4.12	3.50
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	347/1182	4.75	4.61	4.35	4.30	4.75
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	390/1170	4.75	4.63	4.38	4.32	4.75
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		5	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.47	4.06	4.01	****
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				D.O.	asons				Ту	20			Majors	,
										· - – –								
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ijors	3	7	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2				_				_			_			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0								_						,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0		0.	,					0	respons	es to b	e sign	uiicar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot	her					0						

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 1431

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Course-Section: THTR 234 01 University of Maryland Title Make-Up For The Stage

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1432

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Zlotescu,Elena

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.52	4.31	4.31	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.52	4.27	4.23	5.00
		uestions reflec		1 3	0	7	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.62	4.33	4.35	5.00
		uations reflect			1	3	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.24	5.00
				what you learned	1	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.49	4.11	4.12	5.00
	_	-		o what you learned	2	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.25	4.14	4.08	5.00
		g system clearl		-	1	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	154/1427	4.80	4.18	4.19	4.14	4.80
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	141/1434	4.78	4.40	4.10	3.97	4.78
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.42	5.00		
	ere the instructor's lectures well prepared .d the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.52	4.32	4.24	5.00
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	3	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	131/1193	4.75	4.10	4.02	4.04	4.75
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1172	****	4.37	4.15	4.12	***
2. Were a	ill stude:	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1182	****	4.61	4.35	4.30	***
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1170	****	4.63	4.38	4.32	****
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.47	4.06	4.01	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	\$
														- 				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 12		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 1	.1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		~		,				0	77			37		11
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	L2	Non-	-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0								0			.1			1.
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		E⊥€	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	111
				P 0 I 0		∩ +1	her					0	respons	es to t	e sign	ıııcar	11	
				5 0		ULI	TICT					U						

Course-Section: THTR 239 01 University of Maryland Page 1433 JUN 28, 2010

Title Baltimore County Movemt II:Alexander Te Instructor: Salkind, Wendy Spring 2010

I

0

0

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 14

C+11don+	Comman	Erroluntion	Oncationnoino
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Job IRBR3029

		Ouestion	~		MD	NA	Fr	_	ncies	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean			
		Question	S 		NK	NA				- 4		Mean	Rank	mean	mean	Mean	mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	118/1447	4.93	4.52	4.31	4.31	4.92
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	315/1447	4.74	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.69
		uestions reflec			1	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75		4.63	4.62	4.33	4.35	4.75
		uations reflect			1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	281/1402	4.60	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.69
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	117/1358	4.82	4.49	4.11	4.12	4.85
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	312/1316	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.58
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1117/1427	4.03	4.18	4.19	4.14	3.85
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	836/1447	4.84	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.75
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	158/1434	4.74	4.40	4.10	3.97	4.75
		Lectur	۵															
1 Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	_	prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	611/1387	4.68	4.59	4.46	4.42	4.64
		ctor seem inter			3	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
				xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73			4.52	4.32	4.24	4.73
		es contribute t			3	0	0	0	1	0	10		,		4.50	4.32	4.30	4.82
				our understanding	5	7	0	1	0	0	1		****/1193			4.02		****
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	acc dica			what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	Λ	8	5.00	1/1172	5 00	4.37	4.15	4.12	5.00
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	7		347/1182		4.61	4.35	4.30	4.75
				d open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	440/1170		4.63	4.38		4.71
		echniques succe		d open discussion	7	-	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	- ,	4.94				5.00
				E		- Di	i lo -		_									
				Frequ	iency	DIS	LLID	ucio.	[1									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	 ajor	s 1	.0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 5			-			,						3 -		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	nt	
													-		_			

Other

1

Course-Section: THTR 239 02

Movemt II:Alexander Te

Title Instructor: Salkind, Wendy

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1434 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eguer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General	0	0	•	•	0	-	1.0	4 00	110/1445	4 00	4 50	4 21	4 21	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.93			4.52	4.31	4.31	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	-	3	11 9	4.79	217/1447	4.74	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0 2	0	0	0	2 1	3 4	9 7	4.50 4.50	541/1241	4.63	4.62	4.33 4.24	4.35	4.50 4.50
 Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	494/1402 151/1358	4.60 4.82	$4.46 \\ 4.49$	4.24	4.24	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.79	653/1316	4.62	4.49	4.11	4.12	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	823/1427	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	388/1447	4.03	4.16	4.19	4.70	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	182/1434	4.74	4.40	4.10		4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	U	U	U	U	3	0	4.73	102/1434	4./4	4.40	4.10	3.31	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	475/1387	4.68	4.59	4.46	4.42	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	353/1386	4.73	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	159/1380	4.86	4.50	4.32	4.30	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	186/1193	4.67	4.10	4.02	4.04	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.37	4.15	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	198/1182	4.82	4.61	4.35	4.30	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1170	4.86	4.63	4.38		5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	81/ 800	4.94	4.47	4.06	4.01	4.89
T -1														
Laboratory	1.0	0	^	0	0	0	1	F 00	+ +++/ 100		2 75	4 2 4	4 47	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 189	****	3.75	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192 ****/ 186	****	3.75	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13 13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 187	****	4.31 4.25	4.48	4.57 4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 10/		4.25	4.33	4.40	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	2.00	4.58	4.43	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.42	4.36	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	2.00	4.09	3.70	****
· · ·														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	2.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	2.00	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	2.00	4.30	****	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	3.00	4.43	****	***
Calf Darad														
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 31	****	3.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 21	****	2.00	4.72	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.00	4.57	***	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 20	****	4.00	4.60	****	****
1. has the recapach/tutoring by proceeds herpful	13	U	U	U	U	_	U	1.00	, 20		1.00	1.00		

Course-Section: THTR 239 02

Title Movemt II:Alexander Te

Instructor: Salkind, Wendy

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1434 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Į
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 244 01
Title Script Analysis
Instructor: McCully,Susan

28

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1435 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	Ω	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	5.00	1/1447	4.98	4.52	4.31	4.31	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1053/1447	4.42	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.96	4.46	4.24	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358		4.49	4.11	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316		4.25	4.14	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.80	4.18	4.19	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.96	4.75	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	849/1434		4.40	4.10	3.97	4.00
y. non would jou grade one everall bedoming effectiveness	Ü	Ü	Ū	Ū	Ü	_	Ū	1.00	01371101	1.50	1.10	1.10	J.,	1.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.91	4.59	4.46	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.98	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.82	4.52	4.32	4.24	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	4.98	4.50	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	4.79	4.10	4.02	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	710/1172	4.43	4.37	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	4.93	4.61	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	4.97	4.63	4.38	4.32	5.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	1									

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

Spring 2010

Course-Section: THTR 244 01

28

Script Analysis

Questions

3.50-4.00 7

F 0

0

P 0

I 0

McCully,Susan

Title

Grad.

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Page 1436 Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

0

0

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

- · ·			
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

		Genera	1															
		w insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	59/1447		4.52	4.31	4.31	4.96
2. Did th	ne instruc	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	162/1447	4.42	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.84
3. Did th	ne exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	20	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1241	****	4.62	4.33	4.35	****
		ations reflect		1 5	0	1	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	83/1402	4.96	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.92
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	44/1358	4.98	4.49	4.11	4.12	4.96
		_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	61/1316	4.96	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.92
7. Was th	ne grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	10	15	4.60	337/1427	4.80	4.18	4.19	4.14	4.60
	-	was class canc			0	1	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	436/1447	4.96	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.92
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	2	21	4.75	158/1434	4.38	4.40	4.10	3.97	4.75
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	322/1387	4.91	4.59	4.46	4.42	4.83
2. Did th	ne instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	264/1387	4.98	4.88	4.73	4.71	4.96
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	470/1386	4.82	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.64
4. Did th	ne lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	80/1380	4.98	4.50	4.32	4.30	4.96
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	4	2	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	243/1193	4.79	4.10	4.02	4.04	4.58
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	146/1172	4.43	4.37	4.15	4.12	4.87
2. Were a	all studen	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	240/1182	4.93	4.61	4.35	4.30	4.87
3. Did th	ne instruc	tor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	156/1170	4.97	4.63	4.38	4.32	4.93
4. Were s	special te	chniques succe	ssful		10	2	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	184/ 800	4.54	4.47	4.06	4.01	4.54
				Frequ	iency	, Dist	trib	utior	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Тур	e			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 14		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 2	4	Graduate	:	0	Majo	r	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 7														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 3		Gei	nera:	l				0	Under-gr	ad 2	5	Non-	major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														

Electives

Other

Course-Section: THTR 250 01	University of Maryland	Page 1437
Title Intro Production Tech	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Instructor: Murphy, Karen E	Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029

2 Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1411/1447	4.33	4.52	4.31	4.31	3.00
0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1323/1447	4.26	4.52	4.27	4.23	3.50
0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.13	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.00
0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1349/1434	4.17	4.40	4.10	3.97	3.00
0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	188/ 189	2.50	3.75	4.34	4.47	2.50
0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	188/ 192	2.50	3.75	4.34	4.38	2.50
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	104/ 186	4.50	4.31	4.48	4.57	4.50
0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	141/ 187	4.00	4.25	4.33	4.46	4.00
uency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	ı									
	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1 2	NR NA 1 2 3	0 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 0 0 0 0 2 0 3.00 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 uency Distribution	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 1411/1447 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 1323/1447 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 1361/1447 0 0 0 0 2 0 3.00 1349/1434 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 188/ 189 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 188/ 192 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 104/ 186 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 4.50 104/ 187 uency Distribution	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 1411/1447 4.33 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 1323/1447 4.26 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 1361/1447 4.13 0 0 0 0 2 0 3.00 1349/1434 4.17 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 188/ 189 2.50 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 188/ 192 2.50 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 4.50 104/ 186 4.50 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 141/ 187 4.00 uency Distribution	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 1411/1447 4.33 4.52 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 1323/1447 4.26 4.52 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 1361/1447 4.13 4.75 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 3.00 1349/1434 4.17 4.40 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 188/189 2.50 3.75 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 188/192 2.50 3.75 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 4.50 104/186 4.50 4.31 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 141/187 4.00 4.25 uency Distribution	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 1411/1447 4.33 4.52 4.31 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 1323/1447 4.26 4.52 4.27 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 1361/1447 4.13 4.75 4.69 0 0 0 0 2 0 3.00 1349/1434 4.17 4.40 4.10 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 188/189 2.50 3.75 4.34 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 188/192 2.50 3.75 4.34 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 104/186 4.50 4.31 4.48 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 141/187 4.00 4.25 4.33 uency Distribution	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 1411/1447 4.33 4.52 4.31 4.31 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 1323/1447 4.26 4.52 4.27 4.23 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 1361/1447 4.13 4.75 4.69 4.70 0 0 0 0 2 0 3.00 1349/1434 4.17 4.40 4.10 3.97 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 188/189 2.50 3.75 4.34 4.47 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 188/192 2.50 3.75 4.34 4.38 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 104/186 4.50 4.31 4.48 4.57 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 141/187 4.00 4.25 4.33 4.46 uency Distribution

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

Course-Section	n: THTR 250 02	University of Maryland	Page 1438
Title	Intro Production Tech	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:	Schraven, Greggo	Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029

Spring 2010 Instructor: Schraven, Greggo
Enrollment: 3

Enrollment:	3			
Questionnaires:	3	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

		Frequencies			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	3	5.00	1/1447	4.33	4.52	4.31	4.31	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	352/1447	4.26	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.13	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	341/1434	4.17	4.40	4.10	3.97	4.50

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	2
84-150	0	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 250 3

Intro Production Tech

Title Instructor: Schraven, Greggo

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 5 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1439 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies			Instructor		Course Dept				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	Λ	0	Λ	0	Λ	0	5	5.00	1/1447	4.33	4.52	4.31	4.31	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	٥	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	426/1447	4.26	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/1402	****	4.46	4.24	4.24	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2		1155/1447	4.13	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	n	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1434	4.17	4.40	4.10	3.97	5.00
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	_	O	O	U	U	U	-	3.00	1/1151	1.1/	1.10	1.10	3.71	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	316/1386	4.75	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	****	4.10	4.02	4.04	****
100000000000000000000000000000000000000														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	4.37	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	****	4.61	4.35	4.30	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	4.63	4.38	4.32	***
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	2.50	3.75	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	2.50	3.75	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	4.50	4.31	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	4.00	4.25	4.33	4.46	****
-														

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

Course-Section: THTR 311 01 University of Maryland Title History Of Theatre II Baltimore County Instructor: Kreizenbeck,Ala

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 11

13

Page 1440 JUN 28, 2010 Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Studont	Courac	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Frequencies

						PIE	equei	пстег	•		Inst	ructor	Course	: рерс	UMBC	телет	Sect		
Questions			1	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
		 Genera	1																
1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski		n this course		1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.52	4.31	4.32	5.00
		ctor make clear				0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	187/1447	4.82		4.27	4.23	4.82
		uestions reflec				0	0	0	0	0	0	11		1/1241			4.33		
		uations reflect				2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	196/1402	4.78		4.24		4.78
		eadings contrib			ed	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.49	4.11	4.10	5.00
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	o what you lear	rned	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	150/1316	4.78	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.78
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla:	ined		1	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	914/1427	4.10	4.18	4.19	4.15	4.10
8. How mar	ny times	was class cand	elled			1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How wou	ıld you 🤉	grade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiver	ness	5	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	454/1434	4.40	4.40	4.10	4.09	4.40
		Lectur	e																
1. Were th	ne instru	uctor's lecture	s well 1	prepared		2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	398/1387	4.78	4.59	4.46	4.44	4.78
		ctor seem inter		· -		2	0	0	0	0	1			579/1387		4.88		4.71	
		terial presente			ly	2	0	0	0					691/1386		4.52			
		es contribute t			-	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	193/1380	4.88	4.50	4.32	4.32	4.88
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understand	ing	2	2	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	786/1193	3.86	4.10	4.02	4.05	3.86
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what vou learne	ed	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	323/1172	4.60	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.60
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participat	te	6	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	767/1182	4.20	4.61	4.35	4.42	4.20
		ctor encourage				6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.49	5.00
		echniques succe		-		6	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	290/ 800	4.33	4.47	4.06	4.12	4.33
				I	Freque	ncy	Dist	tribu	ıtioı	n									
C		G GDA		Description of Green					D -					m				M =	
Credits Ea	arnea 	Cum. GPA	· 	Expected Gra	aaes 				Rea	asons	3 			Туј	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3			Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	9	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В б															
56-83	0	2.00-2.99		C 1			Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	6
	-1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0															
84-150						Electives					#### - Means there are not enough								
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0			Ele	ectiv	res				0					_	jh
			3	P 0					res				0	#### - 1 respons				_	gh
			3					ectiv her	res				0					_	jh

Course-Section: THTR 325 01 University of Maryland Title Vocal Training Actor I Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Watson, Janet L

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1441

			Fre	eanei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	Ο	6	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.52	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.52	4.27	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.62	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	143/1402	4.83	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	452/1358	4.40	4.49	4.11	4.10	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	497/1316	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	200/1427	4.75	4.18	4.19	4.15	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.40	4.10	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.52	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	131/1193	4.75	4.10	4.02	4.05	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	4.37	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	****	4.61	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	4.63	4.38	4.49	***
P					_									
Frequ	iency	וצוע	Lribi	ucloi	11									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor:	 s	5	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	5	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	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	6
84-150	2	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	0	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: THTR 335 01 University of Maryland Page 1442 Title Advanced Lighting Desi Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Cobb,Milton T

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies					Instructor		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	1	2	4.25	869/1447	4.25	4.52	4.31	4.32	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1323/1447	3.50	4.52	4.27	4.23	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.62	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1251/1358	3.25	4.49	4.11	4.10	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1050/1316	3.67	4.25	4.14	4.13	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1388/1427	2.67	4.18	4.19	4.15	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2		1079/1447	4.50	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1088/1434	3.75	4.40	4.10	4.09	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1176/1387	4.00	4.59	4.46	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1220/1386	3.67	4.52	4.32	4.30	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1198/1380	3.67	4.50	4.32	4.32	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	895/1193	3.67	4.10	4.02	4.05	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	Ο	0	1	1	4.50	377/1172	4.50	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	0	1		1140/1182	3.00	4.61	4.35	4.42	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	4.47	4.06	4.12	4.00
	_	_	-	-	-	_	-							

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

Course-Section	: THTR 339 01	University of Maryland	Page 1443
Title	Adv Production Technqu	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:	Schraven, Greggo	Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Schraven, Greggo Spring 2010 Enrollment: 6

Ouestionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnair
Quescionnaires.	±	Scaaenc	COULDE	Evaluacion	Quescionnair

			Frequencies		Instructor		uctor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.52	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.52	4.27	4.23	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.40	4.10	4.09	5.00
Freme	on a	Diat	and by	+ 1 0										

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

Course-Section: THTR 345 01 University of Maryl Title Business Of Acting Baltimore County Instructor: Lancisi, Vincent Spring 2010

Enrollment:

84-150

Grad.

3

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

Questionnaires: 10

10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1444

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Ctudont	Courac	Erraluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	duestionnaire

D 0

0

0

0

Ρ

I

				Frequencies				Inst	Instructor Course Dep		Dept	ot UMBC Level		Sect			
	Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	Genera	 1															
1. Did you gain n		_	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.52	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instru				0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	112/1447	4.90	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.90
3. Did the exam q				0	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.62	4.33	4.33	4.75
4. Did other eval				0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	165/1402	4.80	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.80
5. Did assigned r				0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.49	4.11	4.10	5.00
6. Did written as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	212/1316	4.70	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.70
7. Was the grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	2	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	898/1427	4.13	4.18	4.19	4.15	4.13
8. How many times				0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	230/1434	4.67	4.40	4.10	4.09	4.67
1. Were the instr	prepared	3	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	881/1387	4.43	4.59	4.46	4.44	4.43		
2. Did the instru				3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture ma	terial presented	d and e	explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	366/1386	4.71	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.71
4. Did the lectur	es contribute to	o what	you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1380	4.86	4.50	4.32	4.32	4.86
5. Did audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	4	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1087/1193	3.00	4.10	4.02	4.05	3.00
	Discus	sion															
1. Did class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	181/1172	4.80	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.80
2. Were all stude:	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1182	4.80	4.61	4.35	4.42	4.80
3. Did the instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	327/1170	4.80	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.80
4. Were special t				5	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	133/ 800	4.67	4.47	4.06	4.12	4.67
Fre					Dist	rib	ution	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Por	aana	,			Ту	20			Majors	
credits Earlied	Cuill. GPA		Expected Grades	es Reasons						ту.	 he			ма JOI S			
00-27 0 28-55 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 8 B 0		Require		ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	9	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
56-83 0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General				0 Und		Under-grad 10		Non-	-major	10			
				General						0 011401					-		

Electives

0

Other

Course-Section: THTR 390 01 University of Maryland Title Theatre In Production Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Searls,Colette

Instructor: 10

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 9

56-83

Grad.

84-150

0

2

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

1

C

D

F

Ρ

I

0

0

0

0

0

0

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1445

Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 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	0	1	8	4.89	169/1447	4.94	4.52	4.31	4.32	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	479/1447	4.71	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	5.00	4.62	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	314/1402	4.67	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	173/1358	4.88	4.49	4.11	4.10	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	617/1316	4.25	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	568/1427	4.21	4.18	4.19	4.15	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	,	4.94	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	668/1434	4.47	4.40	4.10	4.09	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	Ο	1	3	4 20	1085/1387	4.60	4.59	4.46	4.44	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	431/1386	4.83	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	238/1380	4.92	4.50	4.32	4.32	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	420/1193	4.33	4.10	4.02	4.05	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	282/1172	4.83	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1182	4.92	4.61	4.35	4.42	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.47	4.06	4.12	5.00
Frequ	iencv	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 8	Required for Majors 4 Gradua						Graduat	 uate 0		Majo	r r	4		
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1			-									3 -		

General

Other

Electives

0

1

3

Under-grad

9

responses to be significant

- Means there are not enough

Non-major 5

Course-Section: THTR 390 02 University of Maryland Baltimore County Theatre In Production

? 0

Page 1446 Title JUN 28, 2010 Spring 2010 Instructor: Kreizenbeck,Ala Job IRBR3029

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	8	
Questionnaires:	7	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							L T	-quc.	11016	,		1110	LIUCCOI	COULDC	. DCpc	OLIDC	псист	DCCC
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	4.94	4.52	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	154/1447	4.71	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.86
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.62	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1402	4.67	4.46	4.24	4.24	****
5. Did ass	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1358	4.88	4.49	4.11	4.10	5.00
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	4.25	4.25	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	971/1427	4.21	4.18	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	4.94	4.75	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	190/1434	4.47	4.40	4.10	4.09	4.71
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.60	4.59	4.46	4.44	5.00
		ctor seem inter			6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	****
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	4.83	4.52	4.32	4.30	5.00
		es contribute t		1	5 5	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1380		4.50	4.32	4.32	5.00
				our understanding	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	4.33	4.10	4.02	4.05	****
				_														
		Discus																
				what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1172			4.15	4.24	5.00
		-	_	d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1182		4.61	4.35	4.42	5.00
				d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1170		4.63	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	5.00	4.47	4.06	4.12	****
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туу	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors					2	Graduate	е	0	Majo	r	2		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		~		,				0	1	,	-			-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General					0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	5					
84-150							,			,								
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0			Electives 1			Τ	<pre>#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant</pre>					ın						
	P 0							4	response	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt					
I 0 Other 4																		

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Course-Section: THTR 411 01 University of Maryland Page 1447 Title Modern Theatre II JUN 28, 2010 Instructor: McCully,Susan Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires:	12	Student	Course	Fyzaluation	Questionnaire
Questionnaires.	13	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Enrollment:

16

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fr	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	
! .		Genera	_		_		•	_	•	_					4 = 0		4 40	
		ew insights,ski			1	0	0	0	0	Τ	11	4.92	133/1447	4.92	4.52	4.31	4.43	4.92
		ctor make clear		1 3	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.52	4.27	4.31	4.67
	_	uestions reflec		1 3	0	7	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.62	4.33	4.41	4.67
		uations reflect			0	2	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	157/1402	4.82	4.46	4.24	4.34	4.82
	-	-		what you learned	0	•	•	•	•	0	13	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.49	4.11	4.15	5.00
		_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	61/1316	4.92	4.25	4.14	4.27	4.92
	_	g system clearl		ined	0	0	•	0	2	4	7	4.38		4.38	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.38
	-	was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	thing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	114/1434	4.82	4.40	4.10	4.17	4.82
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	307/1387	4.83	4.59	4.46	4.48	4.83
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	1	11	4.92	122/1386	4.92	4.52	4.32	4.34	4.92
4. Did the	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	238/1380	4.83	4.50	4.32	4.34	4.83
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	58/1193	4.92	4.10	4.02	4.00	4.92
		Discus	gion															
1 Did cl	agg digg			what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4 37	4.15	4.25	5.00
				ed to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	8		1/1182	5.00	4.61	4.35	4.49	5.00
				d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	8		1/1170	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.51	5.00
		echniques succe		d open dibodblen	5	1	0	0	0	0	7		1/ 800		4.47		4.19	5.00
				Frequ		- Di	lo.		_									
				Frequ	iency	DIS	CLID	utioi	1									
Credits E	arned				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	3			
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5					Red	auir	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s 1	.3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5			1			. ,	-	-		-	-	5		_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99					nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	0							3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	_i h
				P 0												significant		•
				I 0		Ot1	her					0	-		3			

Course-Section: THTR 432 01
Title Design Seminar
Instructor: Joyce, Shelley
Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1448 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies					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	8	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.52	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.52	4.27	4.31	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.62	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.34	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	****	4.25	4.14	4.27	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	836/1447	4.75	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.40	4.10	4.17	5.00
Lecture														
 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.52	4.32	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.34	5.00

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

Course-Section: THTR 490 01 University of Maryland Page 1449 Title Production Workshop Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Muson, Eve B Spring 2010 Instructor:

11 Enrollment: Questionnaire

ces:	11	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	§ 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General						0	•	•	•	0		F 00	1 /1 4 4 17	F 00	4 50	4 21	4 42	F 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	0	0	0	0	11 11	5.00	1/1447 1/1447	5.00	4.52 4.52	4.31 4.27	4.43	5.00 5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						9	0	0	0	0	TT		****/1241	****	4.52	4.27	4.31	****
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							0	0	1	0	8	4.78	196/1402		4.46	4.33	4.34	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						2	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	132/1358	4.82	4.49	4.11	4.15	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						2	0	0	1	2		4.56	342/1316	4.56	4.25	4.14	4.27	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained						4	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	739/1427	4.29	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	885/1447	4.73	4.75	4.69		4.73
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1434		4.40	4.10		5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1434 5.00 4.40 4.10 4.17 5.												3.00						
		Lectur	e															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	307/1387	4.83	4.59	4.46	4.48	4.83
		ctor seem inter			6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	217/1386	4.83	4.52	4.32	4.34	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	238/1380	4.83	4.50	4.32	4.34	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	224/1193	4.60	4.10	4.02	4.00	4.60	
Discussion																		
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					4	0	0	0	0	0	7		1/1172	5.00	4.37	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate					4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1182		4.61	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful					4	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.47	4.06	4.19	5.00
Frequency Distribution																		
				Frequ	lency	r Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Reasons							Type			Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Required for Majors					5	Graduat	 duate 0		Majo	r	2	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0	Reguired for Majorb										5			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General					0	Under-g	grad 11		Non-major		9		
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0								J				-		
Grad.					Electives						4	#### - 1	Means there are not enough					
	P 0												respons	ses to be significant				
				I 0		Other					0							
				? 0														