Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 5   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | 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	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1674	4.53	4.58	4.27	4.07	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	931/1674	4.00	4.25	4.23	4.16	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	575/1423	4.45	4.60	4.27	4.16	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	490/1609	4.20	4.40	4.22	4.05	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1049/1585	3.87	4.22	3.96	3.88	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1147/1535	3.72	4.12	4.08	3.89	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	866/1651	4.06	3.98	4.18	4.10	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1203/1673	4.56	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	615/1656	4.28	4.41	4.07	3.96	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1144/1586	4.44	4.57	4.43	4.37	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1225/1585	4.68	4.80	4.69	4.60	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	935/1582	4.22	4.49	4.26	4.17	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1138/1575	4.19	4.58	4.27	4.17	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	489/1380	3.49	4.08	3.94	3.78	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	572/1520	3.88	4.00	4.01	3.76	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1024/1515	3.65	4.10	4.24	3.97	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	4.10	4.26	4.27	4.00	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	4.00	4.35	3.94	3.73	****

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: THTR 100  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page 1639
Title          INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP             Baltimore County                                    JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    KAPLAN, DAVID   (Instr. B)              Fall   2005                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      6
Questionnaires:  5                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   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   1  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   298/1674  4.53  4.58  4.27 4.07  4.75
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25   931/1674  4.00  4.25  4.23 4.16  4.25
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50   575/1423  4.45  4.60  4.27 4.16  4.50
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50   490/1609  4.20  4.40  4.22 4.05  4.50
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  2  1  1  3.75  1049/1585  3.87  4.22  3.96 3.88  3.75
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0  0  2  1  1  3.75  1147/1535  3.72  4.12  4.08 3.89  3.75
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25   866/1651  4.06  3.98  4.18 4.10  4.25
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  1203/1673  4.56  4.85  4.69 4.67  4.50
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1656  4.28  4.41  4.07 3.96  4.67

                Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1586  4.44  4.57  4.43 4.37  4.63
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1585  4.68  4.80  4.69 4.60  4.75
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1582  4.22  4.49  4.26 4.17  4.63
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   692/1575  4.19  4.58  4.27 4.17  4.25
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0 0  0  1  1  4.50   303/1380  3.49  4.08  3.94 3.78  4.38

                Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33   572/1520  3.88  4.00  4.01 3.76  4.33
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  1024/1515  3.65  4.10  4.24 3.97  4.00
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1511  4.10  4.26  4.27 4.00  5.00
 4. Were special techniques successful                  2  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 994  4.00  4.35  3.94 3.73  ****
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: THTR 100  0201           University of Maryland                        Page 1640
Title          INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP      Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    KAPLAN, DAVID               Fall   2005                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       7
Questionnaires:   7                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                         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  2  4 4.43  735/1674 4.53 4.58 4.27 4.07 4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  1  3  1  2 3.57 1465/1674 4.00 4.25 4.23 4.16 3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  4  1 3.86 1131/1423 4.45 4.60 4.27 4.16 3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  1  1  2  1  2 3.29 1511/1609 4.20 4.40 4.22 4.05 3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  2  2  2 3.71 1084/1585 3.87 4.22 3.96 3.88 3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 2  2  3  0 3.14 1419/1535 3.72 4.12 4.08 3.89 3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  1  4  2 4.14  988/1651 4.06 3.98 4.18 4.10 4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  1  6 4.86  796/1673 4.56 4.85 4.69 4.67 4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0  2  2  2 4.00  955/1656 4.28 4.41 4.07 3.96 4.00

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  2  2  3 4.14 1224/1586 4.44 4.57 4.43 4.37 4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  1  0  2  4 4.29 1383/1585 4.68 4.80 4.69 4.60 4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  1  2  3  1 3.57 1381/1582 4.22 4.49 4.26 4.17 3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  4  2  1 3.57 1355/1575 4.19 4.58 4.27 4.17 3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 1  1  1  0  0 2.00 1359/1380 3.49 4.08 3.94 3.78 2.00

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  1  0  0  1 3.50 1169/1520 3.88 4.00 4.01 3.76 3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  1  0  1  0 3.00 1420/1515 3.65 4.10 4.24 3.97 3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 1  0  1  0 3.00 1420/1511 4.10 4.26 4.27 4.00 3.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   5  1  0  1  0  0  0 2.00 ****/ 994 4.00 4.35 3.94 3.73 ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   5  0  0  0  0  2  0 4.00  178/ 265 4.17 4.38 4.23 3.97 4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 1  1  0  0 2.50  276/ 278 4.17 4.38 4.19 3.97 2.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0 0 0  0  2  0 4.00  215/ 260 4.44 4.58 4.46 4.41 4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            6  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/ 259 4.58 4.72 4.33 4.19 ****

            Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 0 0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/ 101 **** **** 4.48 4.18 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 6  0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  97 **** **** 4.14 3.69 ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  6  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  76 **** 5.00 3.98 3.32 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  6  0  0  1  0  0  0 2.00 ****/  77 **** 4.50 3.93 3.42 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        6  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  53 **** 5.00 4.45 4.34 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    6  0  0  1  0  0  0 2.00 ****/  48 **** 4.00 4.12 4.00 ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  6  0  0  1  0  0  0 2.00 ****/  49 **** 4.75 4.27 4.30 ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  61 **** **** 4.09 3.87 ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       6  0  0  1  0  0  0 2.00 ****/  50 **** **** 4.44 4.39 ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        6  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  35 **** **** 4.36 3.92 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      6  0  0  1  0  0  0 2.00 ****/  31 **** **** 4.34 3.88 ****
```

```
Course-Section: THTR 100  0201                University of Maryland                        Page 1640
Title          INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP             Baltimore County                        JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    KAPLAN, DAVID                         Fall   2005                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:        7
Questionnaires:    7                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: THTR 100  0301          University of Maryland                           Page 1641
Title       INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP       Baltimore County                                JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  KAPLAN, DAVID                     Fall  2005                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     7
Questionnaires:  3                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        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  0  2  4.33   854/1674  4.53 4.58  4.27 4.07 4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33   830/1674  4.00 4.25  4.23 4.16 4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1423  4.45 4.60  4.27 4.16 5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   490/1609  4.20 4.40  4.22 4.05 4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33   482/1585  3.87 4.22  3.96 3.88 4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  0  2  1  4.33   578/1535  3.72 4.12  4.08 3.89 4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67  1377/1651  4.06 3.98  4.18 4.10 3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  1361/1673  4.56 4.85  4.69 4.67 4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0  0  2  1  4.33   615/1656  4.28 4.41  4.07 3.96 4.33

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1586  4.44 4.57  4.43 4.37 5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1585  4.68 4.80  4.69 4.60 5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   438/1582  4.22 4.49  4.26 4.17 4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   495/1575  4.19 4.58  4.27 4.17 4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0  0  1  1  0  3.50  1036/1380  3.49 4.08  3.94 3.78 3.50

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00   810/1520  3.88 4.00  4.01 3.76 4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  1024/1515  3.65 4.10  4.24 3.97 4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00  1050/1511  4.10 4.26  4.27 4.00 4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  2  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00   474/ 994  4.00 4.35  3.94 3.73 4.00

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  1  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50   229/ 265  4.17 4.38  4.23 3.97 3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/ 278  4.17 4.38  4.19 3.97 5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/ 260  4.44 4.58  4.46 4.41 5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           1  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   115/ 259  4.58 4.72  4.33 4.19 4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/ 233  5.00 5.00  4.20 4.00 5.00

                                        Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: THTR 100  0401            University of Maryland                              Page 1642
Title       INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP         Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    KAPLAN, DAVID               Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     7
Questionnaires:  5                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                    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  0  3  2  4.40  768/1674  4.53  4.58  4.27  4.07  4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  3  1  1  3.60 1451/1674  4.00  4.25  4.23  4.16  3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  697/1423  4.45  4.60  4.27  4.16  4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20  930/1609  4.20  4.40  4.22  4.05  4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0 3 1  3.80 1006/1585  3.87  4.22  3.96  3.88  3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 2 1 3.60 1240/1535  3.72  4.12  4.08  3.89  3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  2  1  2  4.00 1097/1651  4.06  3.98  4.18  4.10  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60 1135/1673  4.56  4.85  4.69  4.67  4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 1 3 0 3.75 1237/1656  4.28  4.41  4.07  3.96  3.75


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  2  2  1  3.80 1400/1586  4.44  4.57  4.43  4.37  3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60 1142/1585  4.68  4.80  4.69  4.60  4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 0 0 3 1  3.60 1371/1582  4.22  4.49  4.26  4.17  3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  1  0  1  3  4.20 1010/1575  4.19  4.58  4.27  4.17  4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 1 2 2 0 3.20 1178/1380  3.49  4.08  3.94  3.78  3.20


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 1 1 1 3.25 1284/1520  3.88  4.00  4.01  3.76  3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 1 0 1 1 1 3.25 1381/1515  3.65  4.10  4.24  3.97  3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 1 1 1 1 3.50 1308/1511  4.10  4.26  4.27  4.00  3.50
4. Were special techniques successful                 1  3  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 994  4.00  4.35  3.94  3.73  ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/ 265  4.17  4.38  4.23  3.97  5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00    1/ 278  4.17  4.38  4.19  3.97  5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 2 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33  175/ 260  4.44  4.58  4.46  4.41  4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          2  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   89/ 259  4.58  4.72  4.33  4.19  4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 2 2 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 233  5.00  5.00  4.20  4.00  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50   89/ 103  3.50  3.50  4.41  4.33  3.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 101 ****  ****  4.48  4.18  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/  95 ****  ****  4.31  3.99  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   3  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  99 ****  ****  4.39  4.10  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               3  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  97 ****  ****  4.14  3.69  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  76 ****  5.00  3.98  3.32  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 4 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  77 ****  4.50  3.93  3.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      4  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53 ****  5.00  4.45  4.34  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  4  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  48 ****  4.00  4.12  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 4 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  49 ****  4.75  4.27  4.30  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  61 ****  ****  4.09  3.87  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   4  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52 ****  ****  4.26  3.91  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     4  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  50 ****  ****  4.44  4.39  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      4  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  35 ****  ****  4.36  3.92  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    4  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31 ****  ****  4.34  3.88  ****
```

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   1   0.00-0.99   0   A   1   Required for Majors   2   Graduate   0   Major   1
 28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   4
 56-83   0   2.00-2.99   0   C   0   General   2   Under-grad   5   Non-major   4
 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
                                          P   0   responses to be significant
                                          I   0   Other   1
                                          ?   0

```
Course-Section: THTR 104  0101               University of Maryland                            Page 1643
Title         INTRO TO COSTUME                  Baltimore County                             JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   JOYCE, SHELLEY  (Instr. A)          Fall   2005                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      5
Questionnaires:  5                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          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  0  0  5  5.00    1/1674   4.74  4.58  4.27  4.07  5.00
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1674   4.76  4.25  4.23  4.16  5.00
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  203/1423   4.75  4.60  4.27  4.16  4.80
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  173/1609   4.75  4.40  4.22  4.05  4.80
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  2  0  3  4.20  612/1585   4.24  4.22  3.96  3.88  4.20
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 131/1535   4.49  4.12  4.08  3.89  4.80
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1651   4.80  3.98  4.18  4.10  5.00
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1673   5.00  4.85  4.69  4.67  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1656   4.70  4.41  4.07  3.96  5.00

              Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  389/1586   4.68  4.57  4.43  4.37  4.65
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1585   4.91  4.80  4.69  4.60  5.00
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  246/1582   4.73  4.49  4.26  4.17  4.65
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1575   4.95  4.58  4.27  4.17  5.00
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1380   4.88  4.08  3.94  3.78  5.00

              Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  397/1520   3.80  4.00  4.01  3.76  4.50
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  1  0  0  3  4.25  898/1515   3.65  4.10  4.24  3.97  4.25
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 414/1511   3.95  4.26  4.27  4.00  4.75
 4. Were special techniques successful                  1  0  1  0  0  0  3  4.00  474/ 994   4.00  4.35  3.94  3.73  4.00

              Laboratory
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 278   5.00  4.38  4.19  3.97  ****

              Field Work
 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/  76   5.00  5.00  3.98  3.32  5.00
 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  3  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/  77   5.00  4.50  3.93  3.42  5.00
 3. Was the instructor available for consultation        3  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  53   ****  5.00  4.45  4.34  ****
 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    3  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   19/  48   4.50  4.00  4.12  4.00  4.50
 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  3  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/  49   5.00  4.75  4.27  4.30  5.00
```

                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: THTR 104  0101             University of Maryland                         Page 1644
Title      INTRO TO COSTUME                   Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY  (Instr. B)         Fall   2005                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     5
Questionnaires: 5                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          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  0  0  5 5.00    1/1674    4.74  4.58   4.27  4.07  5.00
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  0  5 5.00    1/1674    4.76  4.25   4.23  4.16  5.00
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  1  4 4.80  203/1423    4.75  4.60   4.27  4.16  4.80
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  1  4 4.80  173/1609    4.75  4.40   4.22  4.05  4.80
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  2  0  3 4.20  612/1585    4.24  4.22   3.96  3.88  4.20
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  1  4 4.80  131/1535    4.49  4.12   4.08  3.89  4.80
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  0  0  5 5.00    1/1651    4.80  3.98   4.18  4.10  5.00
 8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0  5 5.00    1/1673    5.00  4.85   4.69  4.67  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1656    4.70  4.41   4.07  3.96  5.00

            Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3  0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50  858/1586    4.68  4.57   4.43  4.37  4.65
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3  0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1585    4.91  4.80   4.69  4.60  5.00
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50  632/1582    4.73  4.49   4.26  4.17  4.65
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3  0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1575    4.95  4.58   4.27  4.17  5.00
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/1380    4.88  4.08   3.94  3.78  5.00

            Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  1  0  3 4.50  397/1520    3.80  4.00   4.01  3.76  4.50
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  1  0  0  3 4.25  898/1515    3.65  4.10   4.24  3.97  4.25
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  414/1511    3.95  4.26   4.27  4.00  4.75
 4. Were special techniques successful                   1  0  1  0  0  0  3 4.00  474/ 994    4.00  4.35   3.94  3.73  4.00

            Laboratory
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 278    5.00  4.38   4.19  3.97  ****

            Field Work
 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  3  0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/  76    5.00  5.00   3.98  3.32  5.00
 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria   3  0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/  77    5.00  4.50   3.93  3.42  5.00
 3. Was the instructor available for consultation         3  1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  53    ****  5.00   4.45  4.34  ****
 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations     3  0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50   19/  48    4.50  4.00   4.12  4.00  4.50
 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities   3  0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/  49    5.00  4.75   4.27  4.30  5.00
```

```
                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: THTR 104  0102            University of Maryland                          Page 1645
Title       INTRO TO COSTUME               Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  JOYCE, SHELLEY                     Fall   2005                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      6
Questionnaires:  6                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  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    1   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   243/1674   4.74  4.58   4.27 4.07  4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40   737/1674   4.76  4.25   4.23 4.16  4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1423   4.75  4.60   4.27 4.16  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   173/1609   4.75  4.40   4.22 4.05  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  1  4  0  3.80  1006/1585   4.24  4.22   3.96 3.88  3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20   737/1535   4.49  4.12   4.08 3.89  4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60   393/1651   4.80  3.98   4.18 4.10  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1673   5.00  4.85   4.69 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   381/1656   4.70  4.41   4.07 3.96  4.50

                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60   753/1586   4.68  4.57   4.43 4.37  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   811/1585   4.91  4.80   4.69 4.60  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60   525/1582   4.73  4.49   4.26 4.17  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1575   4.95  4.58   4.27 4.17  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   143/1380   4.88  4.08   3.94 3.78  4.75

                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50   397/1520   3.80  4.00   4.01 3.76  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   384/1515   3.65  4.10   4.24 3.97  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   414/1511   3.95  4.26   4.27 4.00  4.75


                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      3      0.00-0.99   0        A    2        Required for Majors   0    Graduate      0      Major        1
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0        B    3
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99   0        C    0        General               0    Under-grad    6      Non-major    5
 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 be significant
                                        I    0        Other                 3
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: THTR 104  0104            University of Maryland                              Page 1646
Title       INTRO TO COSTUME               Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY                 Fall  2005                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    4
Questionnaires:  4                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          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  954/1674  4.74  4.58  4.27  4.07  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0  0  0  1  3  4.75  270/1674  4.76  4.25  4.23  4.16  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0  0  0  2  2  4.50  575/1423  4.75  4.60  4.27  4.16  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1   0  0  0  2  1  4.33  743/1609  4.75  4.40  4.22  4.05  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1   0  0  0  2  1  4.33  482/1585  4.24  4.22  3.96  3.88  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  0  3  0  4.00  870/1535  4.49  4.12  4.08  3.89  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0  0  0  1  3  4.75  231/1651  4.80  3.98  4.18  4.10  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.85  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0  0  2  2  4.50  381/1656  4.70  4.41  4.07  3.96  4.50


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0  0  0  2  2  4.50  858/1586  4.68  4.57  4.43  4.37  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0  0  0  1  3  4.75  917/1585  4.91  4.80  4.69  4.60  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0   0  0  0  1  3  4.75  313/1582  4.73  4.49  4.26  4.17  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0  0  0  1  3  4.75  359/1575  4.95  4.58  4.27  4.17  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0  0  0  1  3  4.75  143/1380  4.88  4.08  3.94  3.78  4.75


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 1515/1520  3.80  4.00  4.01  3.76  1.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 1513/1515  3.65  4.10  4.24  3.97  1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 1511/1511  3.95  4.26  4.27  4.00  1.00


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 265  5.00  4.38  4.23  3.97  5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/ 278  5.00  4.38  4.19  3.97  5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 260  5.00  4.58  4.46  4.41  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          3   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 259  5.00  4.72  4.33  4.19  5.00


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: THTR 104  0105             University of Maryland                                   Page 1647
Title        INTRO TO COSTUME               Baltimore County                                       JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  JOYCE, SHELLEY                 Fall   2005                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      6
Questionnaires:  6                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                             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   3   0  0  0  0  1  2 4.67  406/1674  4.74  4.58  4.27 4.07  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    3   0  0  0  0  1  2 4.67  379/1674  4.76  4.25  4.23 4.16  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   3   0  0  0  0  1  2 4.67  376/1423  4.75  4.60  4.27 4.16  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    3   0  0  0  0  0  3 5.00    1/1609  4.75  4.40  4.22 4.05  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  0  1  2 4.67  224/1585  4.24  4.22  3.96 3.88  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 0  0  0  1  2 4.67  238/1535  4.49  4.12  4.08 3.89  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   0  0  0  0  1  2 4.67  330/1651  4.80  3.98  4.18 4.10  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3   0  0  0  0  0  3 5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.85  4.69 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0  0  1  1 4.50  381/1656  4.70  4.41  4.07 3.96  4.50

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  0  0  0  0  3 5.00    1/1586  4.68  4.57  4.43 4.37  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  0  0  0  3 5.00    1/1585  4.91  4.80  4.69 4.60  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  0  0  3 5.00    1/1582  4.73  4.49  4.26 4.17  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  0  0  0  0  3 5.00    1/1575  4.95  4.58  4.27 4.17  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0  0  0  0  3 5.00    1/1380  4.88  4.08  3.94 3.78  5.00

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50  397/1520  3.80  4.00  4.01 3.76  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 1024/1515  3.65  4.10  4.24 3.97  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0  0  1  1 4.50  642/1511  3.95  4.26  4.27 4.00  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 994  4.00  4.35  3.94 3.73  ****

             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  76  5.00  5.00  3.98 3.32  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5   0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  77  5.00  4.50  3.93 3.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       5   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  53  ****  5.00  4.45 4.34  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   5   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  48  4.50  4.00  4.12 4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 5   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  49  5.00  4.75  4.27 4.30  ****

                                       Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: THTR 120  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1648
Title      INTRODUCTION TO THEATR            Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    McCULLY, SUSAN                Fall   2005                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    32
Questionnaires: 32                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 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    12  0  0  0  3  4 13  4.50  607/1674   4.50  4.58  4.27 4.07  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     12  0  0  0  5  3 12  4.35  803/1674   4.35  4.25  4.23 4.16  4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    12 10  0  1  1  0  8  4.50  575/1423   4.50  4.60  4.27 4.16  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     12  1  0  1  3  4 11  4.32  771/1609   4.32  4.40  4.22 4.05  4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 12  1  1  1  3  2 12  4.21  593/1585   4.21  4.22  3.96 3.88  4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0  3  4 13  4.50  373/1535   4.50  4.12  4.08 3.89  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             12  0  0  1  5  2 12  4.25  866/1651   4.25  3.98  4.18 4.10  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                   13  0  0  1  0  3 15  4.68 1051/1673   4.68  4.85  4.69 4.67  4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 18 1 0 0  0  7  6  4.46  437/1656   4.46  4.41  4.07 3.96  4.46

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         14  0  0  0  0  4 14  4.78  453/1586   4.78  4.57  4.43 4.37  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    14  0  0  0  0  1 17  4.94  340/1585   4.94  4.80  4.69 4.60  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14  0  0  0  3  2 13  4.56  578/1582   4.56  4.49  4.26 4.17  4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      14  0  0  0  0  3 15  4.83  246/1575   4.83  4.58  4.27 4.17  4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 2  0  1  4  3  8  4.13  603/1380   4.13  4.08  3.94 3.78  4.13

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15  0  0  0  2  2 13  4.65  309/1520   4.65  4.00  4.01 3.76  4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15  0  0  0  2  2 13  4.65  503/1515   4.65  4.10  4.24 3.97  4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 0 0  1  3 13  4.71  470/1511   4.71  4.26  4.27 4.00  4.71
4. Were special techniques successful                   16  1  0  1  1  4  9  4.40  287/ 994   4.40  4.35  3.94 3.73  4.40

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   29  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 265   ****  4.38  4.23 3.97  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 29 0 0 0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 278   ****  4.38  4.19 3.97  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 29 0 0 0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 260   ****  4.58  4.46 4.41  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            29  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/ 259   ****  4.72  4.33 4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  29  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 233   ****  5.00  4.20 4.00  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 29  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 103   ****  3.50  4.41 4.33  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 29 0 0 0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 101   ****  ****  4.48 4.18  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 29  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  95   ****  ****  4.31 3.99  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     29  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  99   ****  ****  4.39 4.10  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 29  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  97   ****  ****  4.14 3.69  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  29  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  76   ****  5.00  3.98 3.32  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  29  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/  77   ****  4.50  3.93 3.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        29  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  53   ****  5.00  4.45 4.34  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    29  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  48   ****  4.00  4.12 4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  29  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  49   ****  4.75  4.27 4.30  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 29  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  61   ****  ****  4.09 3.87  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     29  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  52   ****  ****  4.26 3.91  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       29  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  50   ****  ****  4.44 4.39  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        29  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  35   ****  ****  4.36 3.92  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      29  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  31   ****  ****  4.34 3.88  ****
```

                                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   5   0.00-0.99   3   A   11   Required for Majors 9   Graduate   0   Major   0
28-55   2   1.00-1.99   0   B   7
56-83   2   2.00-2.99   3   C   0   General   5   Under-grad 32   Non-major   32
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
                                         P   0   responses to be significant
                                         I   0   Other   2
                                         ?   0

```
Course-Section: THTR 202  0101                 University of Maryland                                    Page 1649
Title       INTRO DRAMA LITERATURE             Baltimore County                                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE                        Fall   2005                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    28
Questionnaires:  28                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                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    4   0   0   0   0   9  15  4.63   458/1674  4.63  4.58  4.27  4.32  4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     4   0   0   0   4  10  10  4.25   931/1674  4.25  4.25  4.23  4.26  4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    5   1   0   0   0   9  13  4.59   470/1423  4.59  4.60  4.27  4.36  4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     4   0   0   0   1  13  10  4.38   687/1609  4.38  4.40  4.22  4.23  4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4   0   0   0   0   2  22  4.92    77/1585  4.92  4.22  3.96  3.91  4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 0   1   2   6   4  11  3.92  1006/1535  3.92  4.12  4.08  4.03  3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             4   0   0   0   3   4  17  4.58   419/1651  4.58  3.98  4.18  4.20  4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled                   4   0   0   0   0   0  24  5.00     1/1673  5.00  4.85  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0   0   0   2   7  15  4.54   352/1656  4.54  4.41  4.07  4.10  4.54

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         8   0   0   0   1   5  14  4.65   678/1586  4.65  4.57  4.43  4.48  4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    7   0   0   0   0   0  21  5.00     1/1585  5.00  4.80  4.69  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8   0   0   0   0   5  15  4.75   313/1582  4.75  4.49  4.26  4.35  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      7   0   0   0   1   3  17  4.76   343/1575  4.76  4.58  4.27  4.39  4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7  2   0   0   6   4   9  4.16   576/1380  4.16  4.08  3.94  4.03  4.16

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0   0   0   1   4  18  4.74   244/1520  4.74  4.00  4.01  4.03  4.74
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0   0   0   0   3  20  4.87   254/1515  4.87  4.10  4.24  4.28  4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0   0   0   2   2  19  4.74   436/1511  4.74  4.26  4.27  4.28  4.74
4. Were special techniques successful                   5   1   0   0   3   8  11  4.36   307/ 994  4.36  4.35  3.94  3.98  4.36
```

```
                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      5        0.00-0.99    0       A   13      Required for Majors   5    Graduate       0     Major      12
 28-55      4        1.00-1.99    0       B    8
 56-83      2        2.00-2.99    0       C    0      General               3    Under-grad    28     Non-major  16
 84-150     0        3.00-3.49    3       D    0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    2       F    0      Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                responses to be significant
                                          I    0      Other                15
                                          ?    2
```

Questionnaires: 28   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | 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	5	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	320/1674	4.74	4.58	4.27	4.32	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	2	4	16	4.52	554/1674	4.52	4.25	4.23	4.26	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	505/1423	4.57	4.60	4.27	4.36	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	374/1609	4.61	4.40	4.22	4.23	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	422/1585	4.39	4.22	3.96	3.91	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	355/1535	4.52	4.12	4.08	4.03	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	0	3	0	19	4.57	445/1651	4.57	3.98	4.18	4.20	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	18	5	4.22	1449/1673	4.22	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	283/1656	4.63	4.41	4.07	4.10	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	431/1586	4.78	4.57	4.43	4.48	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	762/1585	4.83	4.80	4.69	4.76	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	5	3	15	4.43	733/1582	4.43	4.49	4.26	4.35	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	311/1575	4.78	4.58	4.27	4.39	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	2	0	1	4	13	4.30	447/1380	4.30	4.08	3.94	4.03	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	1141/1520	3.57	4.00	4.01	4.03	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	568/1515	4.57	4.10	4.24	4.28	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	586/1511	4.57	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	21	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 994	****	4.35	3.94	3.98	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: THTR 220  0101           University of Maryland                                    Page 1651
Title        CRAFT OF ACTING I             Baltimore County                                        JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  KREIZENBECK, AL                  Fall   2005                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      11
Questionnaires:  11                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          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   1   0   0   1   0   0   9   4.70   367/1674   4.79  4.58  4.27  4.32  4.70
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   1   0   0   4   5   4.20  1001/1674   4.54  4.25  4.23  4.26  4.20
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   8   0   0   0   0   1   5.00  ****/1423   ****  4.60  4.27  4.36  ****
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   1   1   3   5   4.20   930/1609   4.54  4.40  4.22  4.23  4.20
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  5   1   0   0   2   2   3.80  1006/1585   4.23  4.22  3.96  3.91  3.80
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  2   0   2   6   0   3.20  1406/1535   3.99  4.12  4.08  4.03  3.20
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   3   1   0   1   3   2   3.71  1352/1651   4.07  3.98  4.18  4.20  3.71
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   1   9   4.90   706/1673   4.95  4.85  4.69  4.67  4.90
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1  0   0   0   1   7   4.88   118/1656   4.83  4.41  4.07  4.10  4.88


             Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        8   0   0   0   0   0   3   5.00     1/1586   5.00  4.57  4.43  4.48  5.00
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   7   0   0   0   0   1   3   4.75   917/1585   4.88  4.80  4.69  4.76  4.75
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8  0   0   0   0   1   2   4.67   438/1582   4.83  4.49  4.26  4.35  4.67
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     8   0   0   0   1   1   1   4.00  1138/1575   4.50  4.58  4.27  4.39  4.00
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 2  0   0   0   0   1   5.00  ****/1380   ****  4.08  3.94  4.03  ****


             Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0   0   0   0   1   4   4.80   191/1520   4.90  4.00  4.01  4.03  4.80
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0   0   0   0   0   5   5.00     1/1515   5.00  4.10  4.24  4.28  5.00
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  0   0   0   0   5   5.00     1/1511   5.00  4.26  4.27  4.28  5.00
 4. Were special techniques successful                  6   1   0   0   0   0   4   5.00     1/ 994   4.88  4.35  3.94  3.98  5.00


             Field Work
 3. Was the instructor available for consultation      10   0   0   0   0   0   1   5.00  ****/  53   ****  5.00  4.45  4.50  ****
 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10  0   0   0   0   0   1   5.00  ****/  49   ****  4.75  4.27  4.82  ****


                                       Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: THTR 220  0201            University of Maryland                             Page 1652
Title       CRAFT OF ACTING I              Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE                    Fall  2005                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     10
Questionnaires:  9                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                    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  0  1  8 4.89  167/1674  4.79  4.58  4.27  4.32  4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1  8 4.89  153/1674  4.54  4.25  4.23  4.26  4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   7  0  0  0  0  2 5.00 ****/1423  ****  4.60  4.27  4.36  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  1  7 4.88  136/1609  4.54  4.40  4.22  4.23  4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  1  7 4.67  224/1585  4.23  4.22  3.96  3.91  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  1  0  8 4.78  154/1535  3.99  4.12  4.08  4.03  4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   1  0  0  0  4  3 4.43  643/1651  4.07  3.98  4.18  4.20  4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  9 5.00    1/1673  4.95  4.85  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  0  2  7 4.78  170/1656  4.83  4.41  4.07  4.10  4.78

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0  0  0  0  0  5 5.00    1/1586  5.00  4.57  4.43  4.48  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0  0  0  0  0  5 5.00    1/1585  4.88  4.80  4.69  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1582  4.83  4.49  4.26  4.35  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1575  4.50  4.58  4.27  4.39  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 3  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/1380  ****  4.08  3.94  4.03  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  9 5.00    1/1520  4.90  4.00  4.01  4.03  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  0  8 5.00    1/1515  5.00  4.10  4.24  4.28  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0  0  0  0  9 5.00    1/1511  5.00  4.26  4.27  4.28  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   1  0  0  1  0  7 4.75  115/ 994  4.88  4.35  3.94  3.98  4.75


                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1        0.00-0.99   0       A    6       Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0     Major       9
  28-55     1        1.00-1.99   0       B    2
  56-83     1        2.00-2.99   0       C    0       General              0    Under-grad   9     Non-major   0
  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 significant
                                        I    0       Other                9
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: THTR 222  0101              University of Maryland                          Page 1653
Title       VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I          Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: WATSON, LYNN                    Fall   2005                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      9
Questionnaires:  9                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        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  1  0  0  2  6  4.33  854/1674   4.56  4.58  4.27  4.32  4.33
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  1  1  0  1  6  4.11 1068/1674   4.28  4.25  4.23  4.26  4.11
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  376/1423   4.46  4.60  4.27  4.36  4.67
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  1  0  2  3  3  3.78 1306/1609   4.22  4.40  4.22  4.23  3.78
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  2  0  1  2  4  3.67 1121/1585   4.11  4.22  3.96  3.91  3.67
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  2  1  2  3  1  3.00 1435/1535   3.61  4.12  4.08  4.03  3.00
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  1  1  1  0  3  2  3.57 1414/1651   3.72  3.98  4.18  4.20  3.57
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1673   5.00  4.85  4.69  4.67  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 1 0 0 3 4  4.13  871/1656   4.19  4.41  4.07  4.10  4.13


              Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  1  0  0  2  6  4.33 1074/1586   4.56  4.57  4.43  4.48  4.33
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  615/1585   4.94  4.80  4.69  4.76  4.89
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  2  0  7  4.56  578/1582   4.61  4.49  4.26  4.35  4.56
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  1  0  1  2  4  4.00 1138/1575   4.39  4.58  4.27  4.39  4.00
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1  1  0  2  1  3  3.71  930/1380   3.93  4.08  3.94  4.03  3.71


              Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0  2  0  0  3  4  3.78 1010/1520   4.28  4.00  4.01  4.03  3.78
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0  1  0  1  1  5  4.13  982/1515   4.34  4.10  4.24  4.28  4.13
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 1  0  1  0  6  4.25  896/1511   4.46  4.26  4.27  4.28  4.25
 4. Were special techniques successful                  0  2  1  0  0  2  4  4.14  420/ 994   4.20  4.35  3.94  3.98  4.14


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1       0.00-0.99   0        A    5      Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0     Major       5
  28-55     1       1.00-1.99   0        B    4
  56-83     0       2.00-2.99   0        C    0      General              0    Under-grad    9     Non-major   4
  84-150    3       3.00-3.49   1        D    0
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   2        F    0      Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                               responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                7
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: THTR 222  0201            University of Maryland                          Page 1654
Title       VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I          Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: WATSON, LYNN                     Fall  2005                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    11
Questionnaires:  9                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        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  0  2  7 4.78  276/1674  4.56 4.58  4.27 4.32 4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  5  4 4.44  673/1674  4.28 4.25  4.23 4.26 4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   1  0  1  0  3  4 4.25  845/1423  4.46 4.60  4.27 4.36 4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  1  7 4.67  312/1609  4.22 4.40  4.22 4.23 4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  2  6 4.56  295/1585  4.11 4.22  3.96 3.91 4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0 4 4 4.22  703/1535  3.61 4.12  4.08 4.03 4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   1  0  0  3  3  2 3.88 1246/1651  3.72 3.98  4.18 4.20 3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0  9 5.00    1/1673  5.00 4.85  4.69 4.67 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 6 2 4.25  719/1656  4.19 4.41  4.07 4.10 4.25


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  2  7 4.78  453/1586  4.56 4.57  4.43 4.48 4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  0  9 5.00    1/1585  4.94 4.80  4.69 4.76 5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67  438/1582  4.61 4.49  4.26 4.35 4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  0  2  7 4.78  327/1575  4.39 4.58  4.27 4.39 4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 0 1 0 3 3 4.14  585/1380  3.93 4.08  3.94 4.03 4.14


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78  213/1520  4.28 4.00  4.01 4.03 4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.56  586/1515  4.34 4.10  4.24 4.28 4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67  507/1511  4.46 4.26  4.27 4.28 4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                 0   1  0  1  1  1  5 4.25  360/ 994  4.20 4.35  3.94 3.98 4.25


                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1      0.00-0.99   0        A    6         Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0     Major       8
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99   0        B    3                                                      
  56-83     1      2.00-2.99   0        C    0         General              0    Under-grad   9     Non-major   1
  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
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0         Other                9
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: THTR 229  0101              University of Maryland                                  Page 1655
Title       MOVEMENT FOR THE ACTOR          Baltimore County                                        JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   ALLEN, ROBERT                      Fall  2005                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     7
Questionnaires: 12                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            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  1  0  0  2  9  4.50   607/1674  4.56  4.58  4.27  4.32  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  0  3  5  3  3.75  1370/1674  3.66  4.25  4.23  4.26  3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   9  0  0  1  0  2  4.33   771/1423  4.33  4.60  4.27  4.36  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  1  1  2  1  7  4.00  1094/1609  4.25  4.40  4.22  4.23  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  1  1  1  2  7  4.08   715/1585  3.67  4.22  3.96  3.91  4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  2  0  1  4  4  3.73  1170/1535  3.49  4.12  4.08  4.03  3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   3  1  0  4  3  1  3.33  1504/1651  3.74  3.98  4.18  4.20  3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  3  9  4.75   958/1673  4.88  4.85  4.69  4.67  4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  1  0  1  4  4  4.00   955/1656  4.07  4.41  4.07  4.10  4.00

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         5   0  2  0  0  4  1  3.29  1518/1586  3.98  4.57  4.43  4.48  3.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    6   0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  1225/1585  4.75  4.80  4.69  4.76  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6   0  1  0  0  3  2  3.83  1255/1582  4.17  4.49  4.26  4.35  3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      6   0  1  0  0  2  3  4.00  1138/1575  4.43  4.58  4.27  4.39  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6  5  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1380  ****  4.08  3.94  4.03  ****

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0  1  0  1  0  5  4.14   743/1520  4.29  4.00  4.01  4.03  4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0  1  0  0  2  4  4.14   971/1515  4.29  4.10  4.24  4.28  4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  1  1  0  0  4  3.83  1177/1511  4.20  4.26  4.27  4.28  3.83
4. Were special techniques successful                   5   2  1  0  0  1  3  4.00   474/ 994  4.42  4.35  3.94  3.98  4.00


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1      0.00-0.99    0        A   8      Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0    Major       8
 28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0        B   2
 56-83     1      2.00-2.99    0        C   0      General              0    Under-grad  12    Non-major   4
 84-150    1      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 significant
                                        I   0      Other               10
                                        ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: THTR 229  0201          University of Maryland                        Page 1656
Title        MOVEMENT FOR THE ACTOR         Baltimore County                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  ALLEN, ROBERT                  Fall  2005                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     14
Questionnaires: 14                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                    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    6  0  0  0  0  3  5 4.63  458/1674  4.56 4.58  4.27 4.32  4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     7  0  0  0  4  2  1 3.57 1465/1674  3.66 4.25  4.23 4.26  3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    6  6  0  0  0  1  1 4.50 ****/1423  4.33 4.60  4.27 4.36  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     6  0  0  0  1  2  5 4.50  490/1609  4.25 4.40  4.22 4.23  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6  0  1  1  3  1  2 3.25 1364/1585  3.67 4.22  3.96 3.91  3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 0 1 2 1 2 2 3.25 1386/1535  3.49 4.12  4.08 4.03  3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             6  1  0  0  2  2  3 4.14  988/1651  3.74 3.98  4.18 4.20  4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled                   7  0  0  0  0  0  7 5.00    1/1673  4.88 4.85  4.69 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 1 4 2 4.14  849/1656  4.07 4.41  4.07 4.10  4.14

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         8  0  0  0  0  2  4 4.67  663/1586  3.98 4.57  4.43 4.48  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    8  0  0  0  0  0  6 5.00    1/1585  4.75 4.80  4.69 4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8  0  0  0  1  1  4 4.50  632/1582  4.17 4.49  4.26 4.35  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      7  0  0  0  0  1  6 4.86  225/1575  4.43 4.58  4.27 4.39  4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 3  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/1380  **** 4.08  3.94 4.03  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  1  2  4 4.43  489/1520  4.29 4.00  4.01 4.03  4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  0  0  1  2  4 4.43  733/1515  4.29 4.10  4.24 4.28  4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0  0  1  0  0  6 4.57  586/1511  4.20 4.26  4.27 4.28  4.57
4. Were special techniques successful                   8  0  0  0  0  1  5 4.83   89/ 994  4.42 4.35  3.94 3.98  4.83

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  13  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 265  **** 4.38  4.23 4.34  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 278  **** 4.38  4.19 4.36  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260  **** 4.58  4.46 4.51  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           13  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 259  **** 4.72  4.33 4.42  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 233  **** 5.00  4.20 4.48  ****

              Seminar
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  95  **** ****  4.31 4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    13  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  99  **** ****  4.39 4.22  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                13  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  97  **** ****  4.14 4.63  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  76  **** 5.00  3.98 3.97  ****

                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type              Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1      0.00-0.99   0        A   6      Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0      Major      6
  28-55     1      1.00-1.99   0        B   2
  56-83     1      2.00-2.99   1        C   0      General              1    Under-grad  14      Non-major  8
  84-150    1      3.00-3.49   1        D   0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   1        F   0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                               responses to be significant
                                        I   0      Other                5
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: THTR 230  0101                University of Maryland                        Page 1657
Title          DRAWING FOR THEATRE             Baltimore County                             JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    ZLOTESCU, ELENA                 Fall   2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    11
Questionnaires: 11                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    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   2  0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  406/1674  4.67  4.58  4.27  4.32  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2  0  0  1  0  2  6  4.44  673/1674  4.44  4.25  4.23  4.26  4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2  7  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/1423  ****  4.60  4.27  4.36  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2  3  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  312/1609  4.67  4.40  4.22  4.23  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  8  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1585  ****  4.22  3.96  3.91  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  8  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1535  ****  4.12  4.08  4.03  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2  1  2  0  3  0  3  3.25 1525/1651  3.25  3.98  4.18  4.20  3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2  0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00     1/1673  5.00  4.85  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  493/1656  4.43  4.41  4.07  4.10  4.43

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3  0  0  0  1  1  6  4.63  723/1586  4.63  4.57  4.43  4.48  4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3  0  0  0  1  0  7  4.75  917/1585  4.75  4.80  4.69  4.76  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  1  0  1  2  4  4.00 1129/1582  4.00  4.49  4.26  4.35  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3  0  0  0  2  0  6  4.50  692/1575  4.50  4.58  4.27  4.39  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  7  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/1380  ****  4.08  3.94  4.03  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  1  0  1  2  1  3.40 1221/1520  3.40  4.00  4.01  4.03  3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  543/1515  4.60  4.10  4.24  4.28  4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  358/1511  4.80  4.26  4.27  4.28  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                  7  2  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  ****/ 994  ****  4.35  3.94  3.98  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  9  1  0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/ 265  ****  4.38  4.23  4.34  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/ 278  ****  4.38  4.19  4.36  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/ 260  ****  4.58  4.46  4.51  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           10  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/ 259  ****  4.72  4.33  4.42  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/ 233  ****  5.00  4.20  4.48  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/ 103  ****  3.50  4.41  4.07  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48  4.45  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31  4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    10  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39  4.22  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                10  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14  4.63  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  76  ****  5.00  3.98  3.97  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  77  ****  4.50  3.93  4.20  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  53  ****  5.00  4.45  4.50  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   10  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/  48  ****  4.00  4.12  4.50  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  49  ****  4.75  4.27  4.82  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  4.23  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    10  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  4.53  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  4.42  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  4.63  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     10  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  4.50  ****
```

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   1   0.00-0.99   0   A   3   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   0   Major   5
28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   2
56-83   1   2.00-2.99   2   C   2   General   1   Under-grad   11   Non-major   6
84-150   2   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 be significant
                                        I   0   Other   5
                                        ?   0

```
Course-Section: THTR 232  0101              University of Maryland                          Page 1658
Title        SCENE DESIGN                      Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  ZLOTESCU, ELENA                   Fall  2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     7
Questionnaires:  7                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         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  2  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1674  5.00  4.58  4.27  4.32  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   2  0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  460/1674  4.60  4.25  4.23  4.26  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  2  3  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  575/1423  4.50  4.60  4.27  4.36  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2  1  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  490/1609  4.50  4.40  4.22  4.23  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 0 0  0  2  0  2  4.00  769/1585  4.00  4.22  3.96  3.91  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 2 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 373/1535 4.50 4.12 4.08 4.03 4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           3  1  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 1377/1651  3.67  3.98  4.18  4.20  3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                 3  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.85  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 310/1656 4.60 4.41 4.07 4.10 4.60

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       3  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  858/1586  4.50  4.57  4.43  4.48  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1585  5.00  4.80  4.69  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 632/1582 4.50 4.49 4.26 4.35 4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    3  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  958/1575  4.25  4.58  4.27  4.39  4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 1 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 200/1380 4.67 4.08 3.94 4.03 4.67

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 572/1520 4.33 4.00 4.01 4.03 4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 483/1515 4.67 4.10 4.24 4.28 4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 816/1511 4.33 4.26 4.27 4.28 4.33
4. Were special techniques successful                 4  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 994  ****  4.35  3.94  3.98  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0      0.00-0.99   0        A   3      Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0       Major      3
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99   0        B   1                                                      
  56-83     1      2.00-2.99   1        C   0      General              1     Under-grad   7       Non-major  4
  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
                                        P   0                                responses to be significant
                                        I   0      Other                3
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: THTR 234  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1659
Title       MAKE-UP FOR THE STAGE           Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  ZLOTESCU, ELENA                     Fall  2005                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     13
Questionnaires: 13                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                           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   2  0  0  0  1  1  9  4.73  331/1674  4.73  4.58  4.27  4.32  4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2  0  1  0  3  3  4  3.82 1333/1674  3.82  4.25  4.23  4.26  3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2  8  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/1423  ****  4.60  4.27  4.36  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2  2  0  0  3  1  5  4.22  892/1609  4.22  4.40  4.22  4.23  4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4 8  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1585  ****  4.22  3.96  3.91  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 8 0 0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1535  ****  4.12  4.08  4.03  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2  2  0  2  2  4  1  3.44 1467/1651  3.44  3.98  4.18  4.20  3.44
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3  0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.85  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 1 4 2 2  3.56 1353/1656  3.56  4.41  4.07  4.10  3.56

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4  0  0  0  2  3  4  4.22 1168/1586  4.22  4.57  4.43  4.48  4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  615/1585  4.89  4.80  4.69  4.76  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 1 0 0  3  5  4.22  967/1582  4.22  4.49  4.26  4.35  4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4  0  0  0  2  1  6  4.44  768/1575  4.44  4.58  4.27  4.39  4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 4 0 1 1 0  2  3.75  902/1380  3.75  4.08  3.94  4.03  3.75

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 1 1 0 1  1  3.00 1353/1520  3.00  4.00  4.01  4.03  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 1 1 0 0  2  3.25 1381/1515  3.25  4.10  4.24  4.28  3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 1 0 1 0 2  3.50 1308/1511  3.50  4.26  4.27  4.28  3.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  9  3  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 994  ****  4.35  3.94  3.98  ****

                            Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons               Type              Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0        A    3      Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0     Major       3
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0        B    5
 56-83      3      2.00-2.99    0        C    0      General              0    Under-grad   13     Non-major  10
 84-150     3      3.00-3.49    3        D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    3        F    0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                8
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: THTR 235  0101              University of Maryland                          Page 1660
Title       LIGHTING DESIGN I               Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  COBB, MILTON T.                    Fall  2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      7
Questionnaires:  7                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         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   4  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1674  5.00  4.58  4.27  4.32  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    4  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  830/1674  4.33  4.25  4.23  4.26  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   5  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1423  5.00  4.60  4.27  4.36  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    4  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  743/1609  4.33  4.40  4.22  4.23  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  224/1585  4.67  4.22  3.96  3.91  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 0 0  0  1  0  2  4.33  578/1535  4.33  4.12  4.08  4.03  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            4  0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00 1097/1651  4.00  3.98  4.18  4.20  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  4  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.85  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0  0  1  2  4.67  257/1656  4.67  4.41  4.07  4.10  4.67


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 1074/1586  4.33  4.57  4.43  4.48  4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 1071/1585  4.67  4.80  4.69  4.76  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  850/1582  4.33  4.49  4.26  4.35  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  495/1575  4.67  4.58  4.27  4.39  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 0 0  0  1  2  4.67  200/1380  4.67  4.08  3.94  4.03  4.67


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  810/1520  4.00  4.00  4.01  4.03  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 1024/1515  4.00  4.10  4.24  4.28  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  642/1511  4.50  4.26  4.27  4.28  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  5  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/ 994  5.00  4.35  3.94  3.98  5.00


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: THTR 250  0101            University of Maryland                          Page 1661
Title       INTRO PRODUCTION TECH          Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  KAPLAN, DAVID                      Fall   2005                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    2
Questionnaires:  2                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          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  0  1  4.00 1196/1674  4.50  4.58  4.27  4.32  4.00
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 1499/1674  4.05  4.25  4.23  4.26  3.50
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1097/1651  4.38  3.98  4.18  4.20  4.00
 8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1673  4.90  4.85  4.69  4.67  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  381/1656  4.13  4.41  4.07  4.10  4.50

                      Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1586  4.75  4.57  4.43  4.48  5.00
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1585  4.75  4.80  4.69  4.76  5.00
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1582  4.75  4.49  4.26  4.35  5.00
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1575  5.00  4.58  4.27  4.39  5.00
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1380  5.00  4.08  3.94  4.03  5.00

                      Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 1515/1520  1.00  4.00  4.01  4.03  1.00
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1420/1515  3.00  4.10  4.24  4.28  3.00
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1420/1511  3.00  4.26  4.27  4.28  3.00

                      Field Work
 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  1   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 76  5.00  5.00  3.98  3.97  5.00
 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  1   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 77  5.00  4.50  3.93  4.20  5.00
 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  1   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 49  5.00  4.75  4.27  4.82  5.00

                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: THTR 250  0102            University of Maryland                              Page 1662
Title       INTRO PRODUCTION TECH          Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  JOYCE, SHELLEY                    Fall  2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      7
Questionnaires:  5                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           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  0  0  5  5.00    1/1674  4.50  4.58  4.27  4.32  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  460/1674  4.05  4.25  4.23  4.26  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  4  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1423  ****  4.60  4.27  4.36  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  1  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  231/1651  4.38  3.98  4.18  4.20  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  887/1673  4.90  4.85  4.69  4.67  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  1  3  0  3.75 1237/1656  4.13  4.41  4.07  4.10  3.75


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  858/1586  4.75  4.57  4.43  4.48  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 1225/1585  4.75  4.80  4.69  4.76  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  632/1582  4.75  4.49  4.26  4.35  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1575  5.00  4.58  4.27  4.39  ****


                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: THTR 253  0101              University of Maryland                         Page 1663
Title       STAGE MANAGEMENT                    Baltimore County                           JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    Hall, Amanda                       Fall   2005                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       8
Questionnaires:   8                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          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   1  0  0  0  0  0  7 5.00    1/1674  5.00  4.58  4.27 4.32  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  0  0  1  6 4.86  176/1674  4.86  4.25  4.23 4.26  4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  0  1  6 4.86  167/1423  4.86  4.60  4.27 4.36  4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  2  0  0  2  0  3 4.20  930/1609  4.20  4.40  4.22 4.23  4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  2  0  0  0  2  3 4.60  265/1585  4.60  4.22  3.96 3.91  4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  2  0  1  0  1  3 4.20  737/1535  4.20  4.12  4.08 4.03  4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  0  2  3  2 4.00 1097/1651  4.00  3.98  4.18 4.20  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  1  6 4.86  796/1673  4.86  4.85  4.69 4.67  4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  1  2  4 4.43  493/1656  4.43  4.41  4.07 4.10  4.43

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  0  1  6 4.86  301/1586  4.86  4.57  4.43 4.48  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  0  7 5.00    1/1585  5.00  4.80  4.69 4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  0  7 5.00    1/1582  5.00  4.49  4.26 4.35  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  0  1  6 4.86  225/1575  4.86  4.58  4.27 4.39  4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  5  0  1  0  1  0 3.00 1217/1380  3.00  4.08  3.94 4.03  3.00

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  0  7 5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.00  4.01 4.03  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  1  6 4.86  266/1515  4.86  4.10  4.24 4.28  4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  0  1  6 4.86  301/1511  4.86  4.26  4.27 4.28  4.86
4. Were special techniques successful                  1  1  0  1  0  1  4 4.33  322/ 994  4.33  4.35  3.94 3.98  4.33

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6  1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 103  ****  3.50  4.41 4.07  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  7  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  76  ****  5.00  3.98 3.97  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09 4.23  ****

                                     Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: THTR 324  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1664
Title      CRAFT OF ACTING III            Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   ALLEN, ROBERT               Fall   2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    12
Questionnaires: 12                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          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    1   0   1  1  1  5  3  3.73 1420/1674  3.73 4.58  4.27 4.26  3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   0  3  5  2  1  3.09 1599/1674  3.09 4.25  4.23 4.21  3.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   2   0  0  2  4  3  4.11 1018/1609  4.11 4.40  4.22 4.27  4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   0   1  1  2  4  2  3.50 1223/1585  3.50 4.22  3.96 3.95  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0   1  0  0  8  2  3.91 1022/1535  3.91 4.12  4.08 4.15  3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   3   2  2  1  3  0  2.63 1606/1651  2.63 3.98  4.18 4.16  2.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1673  5.00 4.85  4.69 4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0   1  1  2  6  1  3.45 1399/1656  3.45 4.41  4.07 4.07  3.45


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        11   0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/1586  **** 4.57  4.43 4.42  ****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   11   0   0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/1585  **** 4.80  4.69 4.66  ****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 11  0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/1582  **** 4.49  4.26 4.26  ****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     11   0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/1575  **** 4.58  4.27 4.25  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/1520  **** 4.00  4.01 4.09  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1515  **** 4.10  4.24 4.32  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/1511  **** 4.26  4.27 4.34  ****


                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons              Type              Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1      0.00-0.99    0        A    6      Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0      Major        1
 28-55      2      1.00-1.99    0        B    4
 56-83      2      2.00-2.99    0        C    0      General              0      Under-grad  12      Non-major   11
 84-150     2      3.00-3.49    4        D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    5        F    0      Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other               10
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: THTR 329  0101                   University of Maryland                              Page 1665
Title      MOVEMENT FOR ACTOR III                   Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   SALKIND, WENDY                           Fall   2005                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      10
Questionnaires:  10                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   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  0  0  10  5.00    1/1674   5.00  4.58  4.27  4.26  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  5   5  4.50  578/1674   4.50  4.25  4.23  4.21  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  0  0  4   5  4.56  517/1423   4.56  4.60  4.27  4.27  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0  0  0  0  3   6  4.67  312/1609   4.67  4.40  4.22  4.27  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  1  1   8  4.70  204/1585   4.70  4.22  3.96  3.95  4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  1  2   7  4.60  283/1535   4.60  4.12  4.08  4.15  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  3  3   4  4.10 1031/1651   4.10  3.98  4.18  4.16  4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   1  0  0  0  0   9  5.00    1/1673   5.00  4.85  4.69  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  0  6   4  4.40  522/1656   4.40  4.41  4.07  4.07  4.40

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         9   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/1586   ****  4.57  4.43  4.42  ****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    9   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/1585   ****  4.80  4.69  4.66  ****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/1582   ****  4.49  4.26  4.26  ****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      9   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/1575   ****  4.58  4.27  4.25  ****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/1380   ****  4.08  3.94  4.01  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/1520   ****  4.00  4.01  4.09  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/1515   ****  4.10  4.24  4.32  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/1511   ****  4.26  4.27  4.34  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   9   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 994   ****  4.35  3.94  3.96  ****
```

```
                                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: THTR 347  0101                University of Maryland                              Page 1666
Title        CHARACTER/SCENE STUDY             Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  MEHTA, XERXES J                   Fall   2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     14
Questionnaires: 14                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             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  0  4 10  4.71  342/1674  4.71  4.58  4.27 4.26  4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  2 11  4.71  314/1674  4.71  4.25  4.23 4.21  4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   8  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  575/1423  4.50  4.60  4.27 4.27  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  0  0  0  2 11  4.85  152/1609  4.85  4.40  4.22 4.27  4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3   9  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/1585  ****  4.22  3.96 3.95  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  4 10  4.71  200/1535  4.71  4.12  4.08 4.15  4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   1  0  0  1  5  6  4.42  658/1651  4.42  3.98  4.18 4.16  4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  915/1673  4.79  4.85  4.69 4.68  4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  1  0 10  4.82  144/1656  4.82  4.41  4.07 4.07  4.82


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        13   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1586  ****  4.57  4.43 4.42  ****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 13 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/1380  ****  4.08  3.94 4.01  ****


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1  0  0  0  1  2 10  4.69  274/1520  4.69  4.00  4.01 4.09  4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  1  0  0  0  0  0 13  5.00    1/1515  5.00  4.10  4.24 4.32  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  0  2 11  4.85  312/1511  4.85  4.26  4.27 4.34  4.85
4. Were special techniques successful                    1  1  0  0  0  1 11  4.92   70/ 994  4.92  4.35  3.94 3.96  4.92


                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     2        0.00-0.99    0    A   10    Required for Majors  1    Graduate      0    Major         1
  28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0    B    3
  56-83     1        2.00-2.99    0    C    0    General              8    Under-grad   14    Non-major    13
  84-150    3        3.00-3.49    4    D    0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    2    F    0    Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                             responses to be significant
                                       I    0    Other                2
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: THTR 360  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1667
Title        MODERN THEATRE I             Baltimore County                                    JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  KREIZENBECK, AL              Fall   2005                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     23
Questionnaires: 23                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         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    6   0   1  1  3  1  11  4.18 1046/1674  4.18  4.58  4.27 4.26  4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     6   0   0  1  5  3   8  4.06 1111/1674  4.06  4.25  4.23 4.21  4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    6   1   1  0  1  2  12  4.50  575/1423  4.50  4.60  4.27 4.27  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     6   1   1  1  2  4   8  4.06 1055/1609  4.06  4.40  4.22 4.27  4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6   0   0  0  0  3  14  4.82  126/1585  4.82  4.22  3.96 3.95  4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 0  1  1  1  4  10  4.24  691/1535  4.24  4.12  4.08 4.15  4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             6   0   1  0  0  4  12  4.53  497/1651  4.53  3.98  4.18 4.16  4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled                   6   0   0  0  0 11   6  4.35 1347/1673  4.35  4.85  4.69 4.68  4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0  0  1  1  6   8  4.31  641/1656  4.31  4.41  4.07 4.07  4.31

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         7   0   0  1  2  3  10  4.38 1034/1586  4.38  4.57  4.43 4.42  4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    7   0   0  0  1  0  15  4.88  640/1585  4.88  4.80  4.69 4.66  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8   0   0  0  3  3   9  4.40  777/1582  4.40  4.49  4.26 4.26  4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      7   0   2  0  1  1  12  4.31  905/1575  4.31  4.58  4.27 4.25  4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7  2   1  0  3  0  10  4.29  463/1380  4.29  4.08  3.94 4.01  4.29

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9   0   1  1  0  2  10  4.36  555/1520  4.36  4.00  4.01 4.09  4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9   0   0  0  1  2  11  4.71  432/1515  4.71  4.10  4.24 4.32  4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0   0  1  1  2  10  4.50  642/1511  4.50  4.26  4.27 4.34  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   9   0   3  0  0  3   8  3.93  549/ 994  3.93  4.35  3.94 3.96  3.93


                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0        A    4        Required for Majors  0    Graduate    0     Major       4
  28-55      1      1.00-1.99   0        B    7
  56-83      4      2.00-2.99   2        C    4        General              3    Under-grad  23    Non-major  19
  84-150     6      3.00-3.49   3        D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   4        F    0        Electives            2    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                9
                                         ?    0
```

```
Title      THEATRE IN PRODUCTION             Baltimore County                             JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    Mehta, Xerxes  Marino, Christopher       Fall   2005                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    17
Questionnaires:  5                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          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    3   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  607/1674  4.50 4.58  4.27 4.26  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     3   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 1146/1674  4.00 4.25  4.23 4.21  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     3   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1609  **** 4.40  4.22 4.27  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3   1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1585  **** 4.22  3.96 3.95  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             3   0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 1442/1651  3.50 3.98  4.18 4.16  3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   3   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1673  5.00 4.85  4.69 4.68  5.00

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1520  **** 4.00  4.01 4.09  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1515  **** 4.10  4.24 4.32  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1511  **** 4.26  4.27 4.34  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   4   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 994  **** 4.35  3.94 3.96  ****
```

```
                                         Frequency Distribution
```

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

```
Course-Section: THTR 450  0201            University of Maryland                              Page 1669
Title        SENIOR PROJECT                  Baltimore County                                 JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  ZLOTESCU, ELENA                   Fall  2005                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     3
Questionnaires:  3                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            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  1  0  1  1  0  2.67 1656/1674  2.67  4.58  4.27  4.42  2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  1  0  1  3.33 1559/1674  3.33  4.25  4.23  4.31  3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1094/1609  4.00  4.40  4.22  4.30  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1585  5.00  4.22  3.96  4.01  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  870/1535  4.00  4.12  4.08  4.18  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   2  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 1651/1651  1.00  3.98  4.18  4.23  1.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.85  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  381/1656  4.50  4.41  4.07  4.19  4.50


              Lecture
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1472/1585  4.00  4.80  4.69  4.76  4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1129/1582  4.00  4.49  4.26  4.31  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1575  5.00  4.58  4.27  4.35  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1217/1380  3.00  4.08  3.94  4.04  3.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1353/1520  3.00  4.00  4.01  4.18  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 1493/1515  2.00  4.10  4.24  4.40  2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1420/1511  3.00  4.26  4.27  4.45  3.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  881/ 994  3.00  4.35  3.94  4.19  3.00


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  76  5.00  5.00  3.98  4.86  5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  2   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00   63/  77  3.00  4.50  3.93  4.24  3.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  53  5.00  5.00  4.45  4.86  5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    2   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00   43/  48  3.00  4.00  4.12  4.13  3.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  2   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00   34/  49  4.00  4.75  4.27  4.48  4.00


                                 Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: THTR 490  0101              University of Maryland                          Page 1670
Title      PRODUCTION WORKSHOP                 Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  MEHTA, XERXES J                     Fall   2005                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      8
Questionnaires:  8                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              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  0  0  8  5.00    1/1674   5.00 4.58  4.27 4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  0  0  7  4.63  433/1674   4.63 4.25  4.23 4.31  4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   5  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1423   5.00 4.60  4.27 4.34  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  490/1609   4.50 4.40  4.22 4.30  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  251/1585   4.63 4.22  3.96 4.01  4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  238/1535   4.67 4.12  4.08 4.18  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   2  1  2  0  0  3  3.33 1504/1651   3.33 3.98  4.18 4.23  3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1673   5.00 4.85  4.69 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0  0  1  5  4.83  136/1656   4.83 4.41  4.07 4.19  4.83


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  173/1520   4.83 4.00  4.01 4.18  4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  289/1515   4.83 4.10  4.24 4.40  4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0  0  1  0  5  4.67  507/1511   4.67 4.26  4.27 4.45  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   2  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/ 994   5.00 4.35  3.94 4.19  5.00
```

```
                                     Frequency Distribution

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