

Course-Section: THTR 100 0101
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1490
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	4.57	525/1522	4.27	4.59	4.30	4.14	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	986/1522	3.95	4.40	4.26	4.18	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	745/1285	3.81	4.40	4.30	4.22	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1150/1476	3.59	4.33	4.22	4.09	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	1	0	2	3.00	1327/1412	2.95	4.04	4.06	4.01	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	3	0	2.86	1323/1381	3.15	3.97	4.08	3.93	2.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	415/1500	4.41	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1251/1517	4.61	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	782/1497	3.90	4.25	4.11	4.02	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	532/1440	4.43	4.37	4.45	4.40	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	629/1448	4.84	4.81	4.71	4.63	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	972/1436	3.95	4.28	4.29	4.24	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	394/1432	4.37	4.49	4.29	4.23	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	606/1221	2.75	3.96	3.93	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1081/1280	2.80	4.18	4.10	3.92	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1113/1277	2.78	4.17	4.34	4.13	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1002/1269	2.52	4.11	4.31	4.04	3.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	40/ 215	4.92	4.96	4.36	4.31	4.83	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	69/ 228	4.30	4.32	4.35	4.33	4.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	58/ 216	4.90	4.96	4.42	4.41	4.80	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 205	5.00	5.00	4.23	4.28	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 2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 5
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Electives 2
					Other 3

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: THTR 100 0102
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1491
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1/1522	4.27	4.59	4.30	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	432/1522	3.95	4.40	4.26	4.18	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	809/1285	3.81	4.40	4.30	4.22	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	629/1476	3.59	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1257/1412	2.95	4.04	4.06	4.01	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1016/1381	3.15	3.97	4.08	3.93	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	387/1500	4.41	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	4.61	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	718/1497	3.90	4.25	4.11	4.02	4.20	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1440	4.43	4.37	4.45	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	4.84	4.81	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1056/1436	3.95	4.28	4.29	4.24	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	454/1432	4.37	4.49	4.29	4.23	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	983/1221	2.75	3.96	3.93	3.86	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 100 0103
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1492
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1402/1522	4.27	4.59	4.30	4.14	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1442/1522	3.95	4.40	4.26	4.18	3.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1088/1285	3.81	4.40	4.30	4.22	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1462/1476	3.59	4.33	4.22	4.09	2.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1287/1412	2.95	4.04	4.06	4.01	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1227/1381	3.15	3.97	4.08	3.93	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	780/1500	4.41	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	802/1517	4.61	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1277/1497	3.90	4.25	4.11	4.02	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1047/1440	4.43	4.37	4.45	4.40	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1157/1448	4.84	4.81	4.71	4.63	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1056/1436	3.95	4.28	4.29	4.24	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1191/1432	4.37	4.49	4.29	4.23	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1216/1221	2.75	3.96	3.93	3.86	1.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1273/1280	2.80	4.18	4.10	3.92	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1276/1277	2.78	4.17	4.34	4.13	1.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1268/1269	2.52	4.11	4.31	4.04	1.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 215	4.92	4.96	4.36	4.31	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	178/ 228	4.30	4.32	4.35	4.33	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 216	4.90	4.96	4.42	4.41	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 100 0104
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1493
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1122/1522	4.27	4.59	4.30	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1244/1522	3.95	4.40	4.26	4.18	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1248/1285	3.81	4.40	4.30	4.22	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1281/1476	3.59	4.33	4.22	4.09	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	1398/1412	2.95	4.04	4.06	4.01	2.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	2	0	2.60	1347/1381	3.15	3.97	4.08	3.93	2.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	839/1500	4.41	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1161/1517	4.61	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1147/1497	3.90	4.25	4.11	4.02	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1304/1440	4.43	4.37	4.45	4.40	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	4.84	4.81	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1241/1436	3.95	4.28	4.29	4.24	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	820/1432	4.37	4.49	4.29	4.23	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1148/1221	2.75	3.96	3.93	3.86	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1187/1280	2.80	4.18	4.10	3.92	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1066/1277	2.78	4.17	4.34	4.13	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1242/1269	2.52	4.11	4.31	4.04	2.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	194/ 854	4.50	4.09	4.02	3.87	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	4.92	4.96	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 228	4.30	4.32	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	4.90	4.96	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	5.00	5.00	4.23	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0102
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1494
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	4.91	4.59	4.30	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	358/1522	4.78	4.40	4.26	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1285	4.91	4.40	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	4.68	4.33	4.22	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	760/1412	4.00	4.04	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	519/1381	3.93	3.97	4.08	3.93	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	312/1500	4.41	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	4.92	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	898/1497	4.30	4.25	4.11	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1331/1440	3.83	4.37	4.45	4.40	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	4.96	4.81	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1056/1436	4.40	4.28	4.29	4.24	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	454/1432	4.67	4.49	4.29	4.23	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1221	4.58	3.96	3.93	3.86	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	4.96	4.36	4.31	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	178/ 228	4.00	4.32	4.35	4.33	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 216	5.00	4.96	4.42	4.41	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0103
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1495
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	4.83	225/1522	4.91	4.59	4.30	4.14	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	358/1522	4.78	4.40	4.26	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1285	4.91	4.40	4.30	4.22	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	473/1476	4.68	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1165/1412	4.00	4.04	4.06	4.01	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1152/1381	3.93	3.97	4.08	3.93	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	312/1500	4.41	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	932/1517	4.92	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	898/1497	4.30	4.25	4.11	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1331/1440	3.83	4.37	4.45	4.40	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	683/1448	4.96	4.81	4.71	4.63	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	793/1436	4.40	4.28	4.29	4.24	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	632/1432	4.67	4.49	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	408/1221	4.58	3.96	3.93	3.86	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	5.00	4.96	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	4.00	4.32	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	5.00	4.96	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.28	****	

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	1	1.00-1.99	1	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 3	Under-grad 6	Non-major 5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: THTR 104 0104
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1496
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	246/1522	4.91	4.59	4.30	4.14	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1522	4.78	4.40	4.26	4.18	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	228/1285	4.91	4.40	4.30	4.22	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	860/1476	4.68	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	339/1412	4.00	4.04	4.06	4.01	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	434/1381	3.93	3.97	4.08	3.93	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	160/1500	4.41	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	4.92	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	718/1497	4.30	4.25	4.11	4.02	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1359/1440	3.83	4.37	4.45	4.40	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	4.96	4.81	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	876/1436	4.40	4.28	4.29	4.24	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1432	4.67	4.49	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	279/1221	4.58	3.96	3.93	3.86	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	390/1280	3.75	4.18	4.10	3.92	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	930/1277	3.50	4.17	4.34	4.13	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.11	4.31	4.04	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	5.00	4.96	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	4.00	4.32	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	5.00	4.96	4.42	4.41	****	

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	3	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	4				
				? 0						

Course-Section: THTR 104 0105
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1497
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	4.91	4.59	4.30	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	4.78	4.40	4.26	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1285	4.91	4.40	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	4.68	4.33	4.22	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	760/1412	4.00	4.04	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1152/1381	3.93	3.97	4.08	3.93	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1298/1500	4.41	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	4.92	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	4.30	4.25	4.11	4.02	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	798/1440	3.83	4.37	4.45	4.40	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	4.96	4.81	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1436	4.40	4.28	4.29	4.24	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	4.67	4.49	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	279/1221	4.58	3.96	3.93	3.86	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1187/1280	3.75	4.18	4.10	3.92	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1214/1277	3.50	4.17	4.34	4.13	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.11	4.31	4.04	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	847/ 854	2.00	4.09	4.02	3.87	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 110 0101
 Title INTRODUCTION TO ACTING
 Instructor: ALLEN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1498
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	1074/1522	4.35	4.59	4.30	4.14	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	3	4	3.69	1293/1522	4.06	4.40	4.26	4.18	3.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.40	4.30	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	4	5	3.85	1155/1476	4.35	4.33	4.22	4.09	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	2	3	3.25	1287/1412	3.41	4.04	4.06	4.01	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	2	5	3.46	1170/1381	3.42	3.97	4.08	3.93	3.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	6	0	0	2	4	2.83	1452/1500	3.64	4.14	4.18	4.16	2.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1177/1517	4.69	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1239/1497	4.02	4.25	4.11	4.02	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	1259/1440	4.34	4.37	4.45	4.40	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	821/1448	4.89	4.81	4.71	4.63	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	906/1436	4.38	4.28	4.29	4.24	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	907/1432	4.54	4.49	4.29	4.23	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1221	****	3.96	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	477/1280	4.56	4.18	4.10	3.92	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	930/1277	4.36	4.17	4.34	4.13	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	1207/1269	4.00	4.11	4.31	4.04	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	426/ 854	4.50	4.09	4.02	3.87	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: THTR 110 0201
 Title INTRODUCTION TO ACTING
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1499
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	11	4.63	472/1522	4.35	4.59	4.30	4.14	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	654/1522	4.06	4.40	4.26	4.18	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	****	4.40	4.30	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	151/1476	4.35	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	4	4	5	3.56	1133/1412	3.41	4.04	4.06	4.01	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	3	5	4	3.38	1210/1381	3.42	3.97	4.08	3.93	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	585/1500	3.64	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1517	4.69	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	469/1497	4.02	4.25	4.11	4.02	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	353/1440	4.34	4.37	4.45	4.40	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1448	4.89	4.81	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	564/1436	4.38	4.28	4.29	4.24	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	227/1432	4.54	4.49	4.29	4.23	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1221	****	3.96	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	253/1280	4.56	4.18	4.10	3.92	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	421/1277	4.36	4.17	4.34	4.13	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	4.00	4.11	4.31	4.04	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 854	4.50	4.09	4.02	3.87	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 12	Required for Majors	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course-Section: THTR 202 0101
 Title INTRO DRAMA LITERATURE
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1500
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	19	4.83	232/1522	4.83	4.59	4.30	4.34	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	186/1522	4.83	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	268/1285	4.76	4.40	4.30	4.36	4.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.04	4.06	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	482/1381	4.36	3.97	4.08	3.97	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	149/1500	4.83	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	577/1517	4.87	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	421/1497	4.48	4.25	4.11	4.11	4.48	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	115/1440	4.95	4.37	4.45	4.42	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	123/1436	4.90	4.28	4.29	4.29	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.31	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	606/1221	4.00	3.96	3.93	4.02	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	83/1280	4.95	4.18	4.10	4.08	4.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	340/1277	4.79	4.17	4.34	4.33	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	233/1269	4.89	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	3	0	16	4.68	133/ 854	4.68	4.09	4.02	4.00	4.68	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 23 Non-major 17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 1		

Course-Section: THTR 211 0101
 Title HISTORY OF THEATRE II
 Instructor: COYLE, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1501
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	492/1522	4.60	4.59	4.30	4.34	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	298/1285	4.74	4.40	4.30	4.36	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	14	4.45	393/1412	4.45	4.04	4.06	4.00	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	10	4.10	753/1381	4.10	3.97	4.08	3.97	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	325/1500	4.65	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	5	4.25	1268/1517	4.25	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	794/1497	4.13	4.25	4.11	4.11	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	774/1440	4.53	4.37	4.45	4.42	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	296/1448	4.95	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	446/1436	4.63	4.28	4.29	4.29	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	558/1432	4.58	4.49	4.29	4.31	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	246/1221	4.56	3.96	3.93	4.02	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	337/1280	4.59	4.18	4.10	4.08	4.59	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	819/1277	4.24	4.17	4.34	4.33	4.24	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	524/1269	4.59	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.00	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 20	Non-major 12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 16		
				? 2			

Course-Section: THTR 221 0101
 Title CRAFT OF ACTING II
 Instructor: MEHTA, XERXES J
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1502
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	106/1522	4.94	4.59	4.30	4.34	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	179/1522	4.83	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	228/1285	4.80	4.40	4.30	4.36	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	336/1476	4.64	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1412	****	4.04	4.06	4.00	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	2	6	4	3.71	1070/1381	3.71	3.97	4.08	3.97	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	799/1500	4.24	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	4	4.22	1284/1517	4.22	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	112/1497	4.89	4.25	4.11	4.11	4.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	147/1280	4.88	4.18	4.10	4.08	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	433/1277	4.71	4.17	4.34	4.33	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	371/1269	4.76	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	363/ 854	4.20	4.09	4.02	4.00	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 18 Non-major 11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 14	
			? 0		

Course-Section: THTR 223 0101
 Title: VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I
 Instructor: MARINO, CHRISTO
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1503
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	290/1522	4.53	4.59	4.30	4.34	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	233/1522	4.60	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	278/1285	4.38	4.40	4.30	4.36	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	207/1476	4.46	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	760/1412	3.75	4.04	4.06	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	604/1381	3.77	3.97	4.08	3.97	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	700/1500	4.24	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1037/1517	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	348/1497	3.90	4.25	4.11	4.11	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	798/1440	4.54	4.37	4.45	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1157/1448	4.68	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	876/1436	4.13	4.28	4.29	4.29	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	350/1432	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.31	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1221	****	3.96	3.93	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1280	3.71	4.18	4.10	4.08	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	3.86	4.17	4.34	4.33	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	3.64	4.11	4.31	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	141/ 854	3.83	4.09	4.02	4.00	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 223 0201
 Title: VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I
 Instructor: WATSON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1504
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	2	4.29	869/1522	4.53	4.59	4.30	4.34	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	670/1522	4.60	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	938/1285	4.38	4.40	4.30	4.36	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	913/1476	4.46	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1165/1412	3.75	4.04	4.06	4.00	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	1243/1381	3.77	3.97	4.08	3.97	3.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	892/1500	4.24	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1370/1497	3.90	4.25	4.11	4.11	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	716/1440	4.54	4.37	4.45	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	629/1448	4.68	4.81	4.71	4.78	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1056/1436	4.13	4.28	4.29	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1036/1432	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.31	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1221	****	3.96	3.93	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	1	0	2.43	1262/1280	3.71	4.18	4.10	4.08	2.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	3	1	1	1	2.71	1257/1277	3.86	4.17	4.34	4.33	2.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	2	2	1	0	2.29	1261/1269	3.64	4.11	4.31	4.33	2.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	779/ 854	3.83	4.09	4.02	4.00	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 234 0101
 Title MAKE-UP FOR THE STAGE
 Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1505
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	9	4.90	176/1522	4.90	4.59	4.30	4.34	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	322/1522	4.70	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.40	4.30	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	140/1476	4.88	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	760/1412	4.00	4.04	4.06	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1097/1381	3.67	3.97	4.08	3.97	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	731/1500	4.30	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	994/1517	4.60	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	240/1497	4.70	4.25	4.11	4.11	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	412/1440	4.78	4.37	4.45	4.42	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	217/1436	4.80	4.28	4.29	4.29	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	161/1432	4.90	4.49	4.29	4.31	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	380/1221	4.38	3.96	3.93	4.02	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	184/1280	4.80	4.18	4.10	4.08	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	317/1277	4.80	4.17	4.34	4.33	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1269	4.80	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	88/ 854	4.80	4.09	4.02	4.00	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: THTR 239 0101
 Title MOVEMENT FOR/ACTOR II
 Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1506
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	8	4.89	190/1522	4.94	4.59	4.30	4.34	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	233/1522	4.78	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	366/1285	4.61	4.40	4.30	4.36	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	473/1476	4.58	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	231/1412	4.67	4.04	4.06	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	633/1381	4.42	3.97	4.08	3.97	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	780/1500	4.01	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	932/1517	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	172/1497	4.45	4.25	4.11	4.11	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1440	4.94	4.37	4.45	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	295/1436	4.76	4.28	4.29	4.29	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1432	4.94	4.49	4.29	4.31	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1221	4.40	3.96	3.93	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	657/1280	4.46	4.18	4.10	4.08	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	547/1277	4.79	4.17	4.34	4.33	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	461/1269	4.77	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	726/ 854	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.00	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 1		

Course-Section: THTR 239 0201
 Title MOVEMENT FOR/ACTOR II
 Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1507
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1522	4.94	4.59	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	233/1522	4.78	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	478/1285	4.61	4.40	4.30	4.36	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	316/1476	4.58	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	231/1412	4.67	4.04	4.06	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	233/1381	4.42	3.97	4.08	3.97	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1168/1500	4.01	4.14	4.18	4.20	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	532/1517	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	807/1497	4.45	4.25	4.11	4.11	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	224/1440	4.94	4.37	4.45	4.42	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	263/1436	4.76	4.28	4.29	4.29	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	187/1432	4.94	4.49	4.29	4.31	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	359/1221	4.40	3.96	3.93	4.02	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	207/1280	4.46	4.18	4.10	4.08	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1277	4.79	4.17	4.34	4.33	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1269	4.77	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	174/ 854	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.00	4.57	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 9 Non-major 5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	8
			? 1		

Course-Section: THTR 250 0101
 Title INTRO PRODUCTION TECH
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1508
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean						Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	246/1522	4.90	4.59	4.30	4.34	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.29	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1476	****	4.33	4.22	4.20	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1412	****	4.04	4.06	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	312/1500	4.83	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	994/1517	4.80	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	189/1497	4.88	4.25	4.11	4.11	4.75
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.83	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	17/ 45	4.67	4.56	4.30	4.58	4.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.40	4.75	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.75	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	4.67	4.30	4.17	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 250 0201
 Title INTRO PRODUCTION TECH
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1509
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	4.90	4.59	4.30	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.29	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	4.83	4.14	4.18	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	4.80	4.73	4.65	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1497	4.88	4.25	4.11	4.11	5.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	178/ 228	4.00	4.32	4.35	4.56	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.57	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 216	5.00	4.96	4.42	4.72	5.00

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 2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 3 Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: THTR 252 0101
 Title THEATRE LAB
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1510
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.59	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.29	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.25	4.11	4.11	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	4.96	4.36	4.62	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 228	5.00	4.32	4.35	4.56	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.57	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 216	5.00	4.96	4.42	4.72	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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 321 0101
 Title SCRIPT ANALYSIS
 Instructor: MCCULLY, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1511
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	3	10	4.24	919/1522	4.24	4.59	4.30	4.34	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	1146/1522	3.94	4.40	4.26	4.25	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.40	4.30	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	7	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	294/1412	4.59	4.04	4.06	4.03	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	743/1381	4.12	3.97	4.08	4.13	4.12	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	1	3	3	2	4	3.38	1363/1500	3.38	4.14	4.18	4.13	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	1011/1517	4.59	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	3	7	5	3.82	1097/1497	3.82	4.25	4.11	4.13	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	1118/1440	4.15	4.37	4.45	4.46	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	935/1448	4.71	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.28	4.29	4.30	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	1108/1432	3.93	4.49	4.29	4.29	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	524/1221	4.17	3.96	3.93	3.94	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	869/1280	3.82	4.18	4.10	4.14	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	1013/1277	3.91	4.17	4.34	4.38	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	997/1269	3.82	4.11	4.31	4.39	3.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	726/ 854	3.33	4.09	4.02	4.00	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: THTR 325 0101
 Title: VOCAL TRAINING ACTOR I
 Instructor: WATSON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1512
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	681/1522	4.44	4.59	4.30	4.34	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	787/1522	4.33	4.40	4.26	4.25	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	706/1285	4.33	4.40	4.30	4.30	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	827/1476	4.22	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	760/1412	4.00	4.04	4.06	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	806/1381	4.00	3.97	4.08	4.13	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1280/1500	3.56	4.14	4.18	4.13	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.25	4.11	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	412/1440	4.78	4.37	4.45	4.46	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	995/1436	4.11	4.28	4.29	4.30	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	579/1432	4.56	4.49	4.29	4.29	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	564/1221	4.11	3.96	3.93	3.94	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	357/1280	4.56	4.18	4.10	4.14	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	470/1277	4.67	4.17	4.34	4.38	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.11	4.31	4.39	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	287/ 854	4.33	4.09	4.02	4.00	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: THTR 332 0101
 Title ADV SCENE/COSTUME DESI
 Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1513
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	6	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.59	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.40	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	316/1476	4.67	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.04	4.06	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1381	4.75	3.97	4.08	4.13	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.25	4.11	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.37	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.28	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.96	3.93	3.94	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.18	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.17	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.11	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.09	4.02	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 337 0101
 Title ADVANCED SOUND DESIGN
 Instructor: COBB, MILTON T.
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1514
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1489/1522	3.00	4.59	4.30	4.34	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1481/1522	3.00	4.40	4.26	4.25	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1279/1285	2.00	4.40	4.30	4.30	2.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1416/1476	3.00	4.33	4.22	4.26	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1327/1412	3.00	4.04	4.06	4.03	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1430/1500	3.00	4.14	4.18	4.13	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1418/1497	3.00	4.25	4.11	4.13	3.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1404/1440	3.00	4.37	4.45	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1441/1448	3.00	4.81	4.71	4.71	3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1378/1436	3.00	4.28	4.29	4.30	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1364/1432	3.00	4.49	4.29	4.29	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1197/1221	2.00	3.96	3.93	3.94	2.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1187/1280	3.00	4.18	4.10	4.14	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1214/1277	3.00	4.17	4.34	4.38	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1207/1269	3.00	4.11	4.31	4.39	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	847/ 854	2.00	4.09	4.02	4.00	2.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0.00-0.99	0	A 0	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		0
56-83	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0
84-150	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		1
Grad.	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: THTR 339 0101
 Title ADV PRODUCTION TECHNQU
 Instructor: COBB, MILTON T.
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1515
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	605/1522	4.50	4.59	4.30	4.34	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	874/1522	4.25	4.40	4.26	4.25	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.33	4.22	4.26	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.04	4.06	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1381	5.00	3.97	4.08	4.13	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1298/1500	3.50	4.14	4.18	4.13	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.25	4.11	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.37	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.81	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1436	4.67	4.28	4.29	4.30	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.96	3.93	3.94	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.18	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.17	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.11	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.09	4.02	4.00	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.56	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	30/ 45	4.00	4.56	4.30	4.39	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.40	4.68	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	22/ 34	4.00	4.67	4.30	4.12	4.00	

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	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1					
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad	4	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0					
				I 0	Other 1				
				? 0					

Course-Section: THTR 346 0101
 Title THEATRE & SOCIAL DEVEL
 Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1516
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.59	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1227/1522	3.83	4.40	4.26	4.25	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.40	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	892/1476	4.17	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	493/1412	4.33	4.04	4.06	4.03	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	519/1381	4.33	3.97	4.08	4.13	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	622/1497	4.29	4.25	4.11	4.13	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1440	****	4.37	4.45	4.46	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.18	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.17	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.11	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	141/ 854	4.67	4.09	4.02	4.00	4.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.56	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	4.56	4.30	4.39	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.40	4.68	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.26	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	4.67	4.30	4.12	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 349 0101
 Title WOMEN AND THEATRE
 Instructor: MCCULLY, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1517
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	7	11	4.53	582/1522	4.53	4.59	4.30	4.34	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	811/1522	4.32	4.40	4.26	4.25	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	650/1285	4.40	4.40	4.30	4.30	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	10	4.32	511/1412	4.32	4.04	4.06	4.03	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	361/1381	4.47	3.97	4.08	4.13	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	6	9	4.16	882/1500	4.16	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	10	7	4.33	1217/1517	4.33	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	1	11	6	4.11	833/1497	4.11	4.25	4.11	4.13	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	1142/1440	4.12	4.37	4.45	4.46	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	683/1448	4.83	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	4	12	4.44	672/1436	4.44	4.28	4.29	4.30	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	4	12	4.39	775/1432	4.39	4.49	4.29	4.29	4.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	187/1221	4.65	3.96	3.93	3.94	4.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	286/1280	4.67	4.18	4.10	4.14	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	398/1277	4.73	4.17	4.34	4.38	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	400/1269	4.73	4.11	4.31	4.39	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	262/ 854	4.38	4.09	4.02	4.00	4.38	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	8
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course-Section: THTR 361 0101
 Title MODERN THEATRE II
 Instructor: MCCULLY, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1518
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	1001/1522	4.15	4.59	4.30	4.34	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	4	2	3.33	1419/1522	3.33	4.40	4.26	4.25	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1088/1285	3.75	4.40	4.30	4.30	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1127/1476	3.90	4.33	4.22	4.26	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	585/1412	4.23	4.04	4.06	4.03	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	7	3	3.85	984/1381	3.85	3.97	4.08	4.13	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	3	4	2	1	2.75	1458/1500	2.75	4.14	4.18	4.13	2.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	4	7	1	3.62	1484/1517	3.62	4.73	4.65	4.62	3.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	5	3	3	3.58	1246/1497	3.58	4.25	4.11	4.13	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1283/1440	3.82	4.37	4.45	4.46	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	1123/1448	4.55	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	8	3	0	3.27	1347/1436	3.27	4.28	4.29	4.30	3.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	6	1	3	3.55	1259/1432	3.55	4.49	4.29	4.29	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	860/1221	3.60	3.96	3.93	3.94	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	834/1280	3.89	4.18	4.10	4.14	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	1020/1277	3.89	4.17	4.34	4.38	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1074/1269	3.67	4.11	4.31	4.39	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	547/ 854	3.86	4.09	4.02	4.00	3.86

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 390 0101
 Title THEATRE IN PRODUCTION
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1519
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	991/1522	4.17	4.59	4.30	4.34	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	965/1522	4.17	4.40	4.26	4.25	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.40	4.30	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1476	****	4.33	4.22	4.26	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.04	4.06	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	519/1381	4.33	3.97	4.08	4.13	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	573/1497	4.33	4.25	4.11	4.13	4.33

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1280	****	4.18	4.10	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.17	4.34	4.38	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.11	4.31	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 490 0101
 Title PRODUCTION WORKSHOP
 Instructor: MEHTA, XERXES J
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1520
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	9	4.90	176/1522	4.90	4.59	4.30	4.42	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	322/1522	4.70	4.40	4.26	4.34	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.40	4.30	4.42	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.33	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	155/1412	4.78	4.04	4.06	4.11	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1381	5.00	3.97	4.08	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	312/1500	4.67	4.14	4.18	4.25	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	532/1517	4.89	4.73	4.65	4.71	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.25	4.11	4.21	5.00	
Lecture															
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1221	****	3.96	3.93	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	138/1280	4.90	4.18	4.10	4.28	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.17	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	223/1269	4.90	4.11	4.31	4.49	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	157/ 854	4.63	4.09	4.02	4.31	4.63	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		