

Course-Section: THTR 100 0101
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1640
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	0	5	5.00	1/1670	4.87	4.64	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	259/1666	4.77	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	261/1406	4.74	4.58	4.32	4.31	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	245/1615	4.60	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	187/1566	4.37	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1528	4.43	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	429/1650	4.67	4.31	4.22	4.28	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	4.91	4.63	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	728/1626	4.41	4.39	4.11	4.07	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	435/1559	4.88	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	4.95	4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1549	4.72	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1032/1546	4.36	4.52	4.32	4.32	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	590/1323	4.27	4.43	4.00	3.91	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	4.50	4.54	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	4.50	4.45	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	4.83	4.38	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	4.75	4.65	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 100 0101
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1641
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	0	5	5.00	1/1670	4.87	4.64	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	259/1666	4.77	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	261/1406	4.74	4.58	4.32	4.31	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	245/1615	4.60	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	187/1566	4.37	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1528	4.43	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	429/1650	4.67	4.31	4.22	4.28	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	4.91	4.63	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	953/1626	4.41	4.39	4.11	4.07	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	4.88	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	4.95	4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	683/1549	4.72	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1379/1546	4.36	4.52	4.32	4.32	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1179/1323	4.27	4.43	4.00	3.91	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	4.50	4.54	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	4.50	4.45	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	4.83	4.38	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	4.75	4.65	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 100 0102
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1642
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1670	4.87	4.64	4.31	4.23	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	233/1666	4.77	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	4.74	4.58	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	379/1615	4.60	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	491/1566	4.37	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	560/1528	4.43	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	570/1650	4.67	4.31	4.22	4.28	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	4.91	4.63	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	403/1626	4.41	4.39	4.11	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1559	4.88	4.58	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	4.95	4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1549	4.72	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	345/1546	4.36	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1323	4.27	4.43	4.00	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	4.50	4.54	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	4.50	4.45	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	4.83	4.38	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	4.75	4.65	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	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 2	Under-grad 7 Non-major 6
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	
			? 1		

Course-Section: THTR 100 0103
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1643
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	2	5	4.50	665/1670	4.87	4.64	4.31	4.23	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	312/1666	4.77	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	318/1406	4.74	4.58	4.32	4.31	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	724/1615	4.60	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1285/1566	4.37	4.39	4.07	4.03	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	823/1528	4.43	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	406/1650	4.67	4.31	4.22	4.28	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	730/1667	4.91	4.63	4.67	4.61	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	693/1626	4.41	4.39	4.11	4.07	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	739/1559	4.88	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	948/1560	4.95	4.91	4.72	4.68	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	683/1549	4.72	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	570/1546	4.36	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	641/1323	4.27	4.43	4.00	3.91	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	608/1384	4.50	4.54	4.10	3.92	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	481/1378	4.50	4.45	4.29	4.09	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	531/1378	4.83	4.38	4.31	4.08	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	243/ 904	4.75	4.65	4.03	3.94	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 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 8	Non-major 8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 4		
				? 0			

Course-Section: THTR 100 0104
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1644
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1670	4.87	4.64	4.31	4.23	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1666	4.77	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	799/1406	4.74	4.58	4.32	4.31	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	775/1615	4.60	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	559/1566	4.37	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	899/1528	4.43	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	4.67	4.31	4.22	4.28	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1022/1667	4.91	4.63	4.67	4.61	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1626	4.41	4.39	4.11	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	4.88	4.58	4.46	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	4.95	4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1549	4.72	4.50	4.31	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	520/1546	4.36	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1323	4.27	4.43	4.00	3.91	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1384	4.50	4.54	4.10	3.92	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	797/1378	4.50	4.45	4.29	4.09	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	4.83	4.38	4.31	4.08	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 904	4.75	4.65	4.03	3.94	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	5.00	4.19	4.25	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 239	5.00	5.00	4.21	4.35	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 230	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.58	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	159/ 231	4.00	4.00	4.31	4.45	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 218	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.47	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.67	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.72	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	58/ 75	4.00	4.00	4.57	4.46	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.59	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	34/ 41	4.00	4.00	4.50	3.91	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	19/ 38	4.50	4.50	4.19	4.07	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	25/ 38	4.50	4.50	4.62	4.63	4.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.42	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.28	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.59	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	26/ 27	3.00	3.00	4.54	4.46	3.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 6	5.00	5.00	4.92	4.83	5.00	

Course-Section: THTR 100 0104
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1644
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0101
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1645
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	2	4.50	665/1670	4.77	4.64	4.31	4.23	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	4.71	4.56	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1406	4.85	4.58	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	290/1615	4.56	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	389/1566	4.43	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	706/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1650	4.66	4.31	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.15	4.63	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.33	4.39	4.11	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	521/1559	4.83	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	683/1549	4.66	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546	4.93	4.52	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1323	4.93	4.43	4.00	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	434/1384	4.58	4.54	4.10	3.92	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	603/1378	4.05	4.45	4.29	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	977/1378	3.90	4.38	4.31	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	4.89	4.65	4.03	3.94	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0101
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1646
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	2	2	4.50	665/1670	4.77	4.64	4.31	4.23	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	4.71	4.56	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1406	4.85	4.58	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	290/1615	4.56	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	389/1566	4.43	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	706/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1650	4.66	4.31	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.15	4.63	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.33	4.39	4.11	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	4.83	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1549	4.66	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	4.93	4.52	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	4.93	4.43	4.00	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	434/1384	4.58	4.54	4.10	3.92	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	603/1378	4.05	4.45	4.29	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	977/1378	3.90	4.38	4.31	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	4.89	4.65	4.03	3.94	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0102
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1647
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	1	4	4.80	300/1670	4.77	4.64	4.31	4.23	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	259/1666	4.71	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	261/1406	4.85	4.58	4.32	4.31	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	446/1615	4.56	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	706/1566	4.43	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	560/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	720/1650	4.66	4.31	4.22	4.28	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1409/1667	4.15	4.63	4.67	4.61	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	563/1626	4.33	4.39	4.11	4.07	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1022/1559	4.83	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	562/1549	4.66	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	595/1546	4.93	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	273/1323	4.93	4.43	4.00	3.91	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	4.58	4.54	4.10	3.92	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	970/1378	4.05	4.45	4.29	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	977/1378	3.90	4.38	4.31	4.08	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0102
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1648
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	300/1670	4.77	4.64	4.31	4.23	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	259/1666	4.71	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	261/1406	4.85	4.58	4.32	4.31	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	446/1615	4.56	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	706/1566	4.43	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	560/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	720/1650	4.66	4.31	4.22	4.28	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1409/1667	4.15	4.63	4.67	4.61	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.33	4.39	4.11	4.07	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	4.83	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	4.66	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1546	4.93	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1323	4.93	4.43	4.00	3.91	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	4.58	4.54	4.10	3.92	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	970/1378	4.05	4.45	4.29	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	977/1378	3.90	4.38	4.31	4.08	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0103
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1649
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	4.77	4.64	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	622/1666	4.71	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	4.85	4.58	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	552/1615	4.56	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	4.43	4.39	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1650	4.66	4.31	4.22	4.28	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.15	4.63	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	4.33	4.39	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	4.83	4.58	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	4.66	4.50	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1546	4.93	4.52	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1323	4.93	4.43	4.00	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	434/1384	4.58	4.54	4.10	3.92	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1193/1378	4.05	4.45	4.29	4.09	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	977/1378	3.90	4.38	4.31	4.08	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	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	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: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1650
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1670	4.77	4.64	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1070/1666	4.71	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	597/1406	4.85	4.58	4.32	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	972/1615	4.56	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	734/1566	4.43	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	787/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	361/1650	4.66	4.31	4.22	4.28	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1157/1667	4.15	4.63	4.67	4.61	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1347/1626	4.33	4.39	4.11	4.07	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	387/1559	4.83	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	266/1549	4.66	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1546	4.93	4.52	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1323	4.93	4.43	4.00	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	820/1384	4.58	4.54	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1092/1378	4.05	4.45	4.29	4.09	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1230/1378	3.90	4.38	4.31	4.08	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	179/ 904	4.89	4.65	4.03	3.94	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 7	Non-major 7
84-150	1	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 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: THTR 110 0101
 Title INTRODUCTION TO ACTING
 Instructor: YATES, PEGGY
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1651
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	9	4.54	632/1670	4.54	4.64	4.31	4.23	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	808/1666	4.38	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1406	****	4.58	4.32	4.31	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	6	6	4.23	898/1615	4.23	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	743/1566	4.15	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	796/1528	4.15	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	744/1650	4.38	4.31	4.22	4.28	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	909/1667	4.77	4.63	4.67	4.61	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	728/1626	4.25	4.39	4.11	4.07	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	1205/1559	4.18	4.58	4.46	4.47	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	864/1549	4.36	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	595/1546	4.60	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	545/1323	4.25	4.43	4.00	3.91	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	579/1384	4.36	4.54	4.10	3.92	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1378	4.91	4.45	4.29	4.09	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	470/1378	4.73	4.38	4.31	4.08	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	202/ 904	4.60	4.65	4.03	3.94	4.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.00	4.57	4.46	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 0						

Course-Section: THTR 202 0101
 Title INTRO DRAMA LITERATURE
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1652
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	2	0	5	10	9	3.92	1318/1670	3.92	4.64	4.31	4.32	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	6	13	4.12	1114/1666	4.12	4.56	4.27	4.27	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	1	6	5	9	3.78	1194/1406	3.78	4.58	4.32	4.39	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	2	2	7	11	3.96	1158/1615	3.96	4.46	4.24	4.29	3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	331/1566	4.62	4.39	4.07	4.00	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	2	9	10	3.96	955/1528	3.96	4.35	4.12	4.11	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	2	7	13	4.16	1008/1650	4.16	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	540/1667	4.92	4.63	4.67	4.64	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	1	2	10	2	3.87	1162/1626	3.87	4.39	4.11	4.06	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	4	6	12	4.26	1150/1559	4.26	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	0	21	4.83	803/1560	4.83	4.91	4.72	4.73	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	2	6	13	4.30	936/1549	4.30	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	3	3	14	4.13	1079/1546	4.13	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	2	3	6	6	3.63	975/1323	3.63	4.43	4.00	4.08	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	2	2	15	4.43	519/1384	4.43	4.54	4.10	4.07	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	0	5	14	4.48	637/1378	4.48	4.45	4.29	4.25	4.48
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	0	2	1	15	4.35	795/1378	4.35	4.38	4.31	4.26	4.35
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	413/ 904	4.18	4.65	4.03	4.01	4.18
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.00	4.31	4.52	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.00	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 41	****	4.00	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	3.00	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: THTR 202 0101
 Title INTRO DRAMA LITERATURE
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1652
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 211 0101
 Title HISTORY OF THEATRE II
 Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1653
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	3	3	16	4.59	567/1670	4.59	4.64	4.31	4.32	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	503/1666	4.59	4.56	4.27	4.27	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	459/1406	4.64	4.58	4.32	4.39	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	4	2	11	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	12	4.32	579/1566	4.32	4.39	4.07	4.00	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	580/1528	4.39	4.35	4.12	4.11	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	4	12	4.18	985/1650	4.18	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	14	7	4.33	1310/1667	4.33	4.63	4.67	4.64	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	499/1626	4.45	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	725/1560	4.85	4.91	4.72	4.73	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	658/1549	4.53	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	5	14	4.55	655/1546	4.55	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	481/1323	4.33	4.43	4.00	4.08	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	0	2	7	4.09	798/1384	4.09	4.54	4.10	4.07	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	0	1	0	8	4.09	935/1378	4.09	4.45	4.29	4.25	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1086/1378	3.80	4.38	4.31	4.26	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	417/ 904	4.17	4.65	4.03	4.01	4.17
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.00	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	4.30	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors		2	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General		0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	2							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		19				
				?	0							

Course-Section: THTR 221 0101
 Title CRAFT OF ACTING II
 Instructor: MEHTA, XERXES J
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1654
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.64	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.56	4.27	4.27	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.00	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	361/1528	4.59	4.35	4.12	4.11	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	457/1650	4.75	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1368/1667	4.31	4.63	4.67	4.64	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.39	4.11	4.06	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1559	****	4.58	4.46	4.40	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1560	****	4.91	4.72	4.73	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1549	****	4.50	4.31	4.25	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1546	****	4.52	4.32	4.30	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1323	****	4.43	4.00	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	152/1384	4.96	4.54	4.10	4.07	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.38	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	112/ 904	4.95	4.65	4.03	4.01	4.91

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 4	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1				
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 14	Non-major 10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	10		
				? 0				

Course-Section: THTR 221 0201
 Title CRAFT OF ACTING II
 Instructor: MEHTA, XERXES J
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1655
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	0	11	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.64	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.56	4.27	4.27	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.00	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	346/1528	4.59	4.35	4.12	4.11	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	159/1650	4.75	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1287/1667	4.31	4.63	4.67	4.64	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.39	4.11	4.06	5.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1384	4.96	4.54	4.10	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.38	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 904	4.95	4.65	4.03	4.01	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 223 0101
 Title: VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I
 Instructor: WATSON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1656
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	10	4.91	206/1670	4.18	4.64	4.31	4.32	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	344/1666	4.05	4.56	4.27	4.27	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1406	3.00	4.58	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	412/1615	3.88	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	851/1566	3.67	4.39	4.07	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	560/1528	3.53	4.35	4.12	4.11	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1084/1650	3.60	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	4.72	4.63	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	670/1626	3.71	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	896/1559	3.55	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	596/1560	4.65	4.91	4.72	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	451/1549	3.65	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	345/1546	3.80	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	857/1323	3.86	4.43	4.00	4.08	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1384	4.00	4.54	4.10	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1378	4.00	4.45	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1378	3.86	4.38	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	194/ 904	4.53	4.65	4.03	4.01	4.63

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 223 0201
 Title VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I
 Instructor: FORTE, ELIZABET
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1657
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	0	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	1554/1670	4.18	4.64	4.31	4.32	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1552/1666	4.05	4.56	4.27	4.27	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	3	0	0	0	3	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	4.58	4.32	4.39	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	1557/1615	3.88	4.46	4.24	4.29	3.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	1373/1566	3.67	4.39	4.07	4.00	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	1	2	1	2.67	1502/1528	3.53	4.35	4.12	4.11	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	0	1	3	2	3.11	1566/1650	3.60	4.31	4.22	4.20	3.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1216/1667	4.72	4.63	4.67	4.64	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	0	3	3	1	3.11	1527/1626	3.71	4.39	4.11	4.06	3.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1537/1559	3.55	4.58	4.46	4.40	2.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1326/1560	4.65	4.91	4.72	4.73	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	1522/1549	3.65	4.50	4.31	4.25	2.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1507/1546	3.80	4.52	4.32	4.30	2.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	1260/1384	4.00	4.54	4.10	4.07	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1297/1378	4.00	4.45	4.29	4.25	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	0	1	2	1	2.71	1336/1378	3.86	4.38	4.31	4.26	2.71
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	279/ 904	4.53	4.65	4.03	4.01	4.43

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	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 231 0101
 Title DRAFTING FOR THE THEAT
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1658
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	0	9	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.64	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	291/1666	4.78	4.56	4.27	4.27	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	****	4.58	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	224/1615	4.83	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1029/1566	3.89	4.39	4.07	4.00	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1528	****	4.35	4.12	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	938/1650	4.22	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1310/1667	4.33	4.63	4.67	4.64	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	207/1626	4.75	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	673/1560	4.88	4.91	4.72	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	366/1549	4.75	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	288/1323	4.57	4.43	4.00	4.08	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	608/1384	4.33	4.54	4.10	4.07	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	481/1378	4.67	4.45	4.29	4.25	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	813/1378	4.33	4.38	4.31	4.26	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.65	4.03	4.01	****

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 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 9	Non-major 3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 7		
				? 1			

Course-Section: THTR 233 0101
 Title COSTUME DESIGN
 Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1659
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.64	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	751/1666	4.43	4.56	4.27	4.27	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	477/1615	4.57	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	295/1566	4.67	4.39	4.07	4.00	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1528	****	4.35	4.12	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.63	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	278/1626	4.67	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.58	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	900/1549	4.33	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.52	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	4.43	4.00	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	608/1384	4.33	4.54	4.10	4.07	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	797/1378	4.33	4.45	4.29	4.25	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	813/1378	4.33	4.38	4.31	4.26	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.65	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	4
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 234 0101
 Title MAKE-UP FOR THE STAGE
 Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1660
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	9	4.64	518/1670	4.64	4.64	4.31	4.32	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	943/1666	4.27	4.56	4.27	4.27	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1406	4.75	4.58	4.32	4.39	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	491/1566	4.40	4.39	4.07	4.00	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.35	4.12	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	471/1650	4.57	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	675/1667	4.90	4.63	4.67	4.64	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	670/1626	4.30	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	852/1549	4.38	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	403/1323	4.43	4.43	4.00	4.08	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.54	4.10	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378	4.83	4.45	4.29	4.25	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	915/1378	4.17	4.38	4.31	4.26	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	146/ 904	4.75	4.65	4.03	4.01	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 250 0101
 Title INTRO PRODUCTION TECH
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1661
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

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	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 250 0201
 Title INTRO PRODUCTION TECH
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1662
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	6	4.86	253/1670	4.64	4.64	4.31	4.32	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	355/1666	4.71	4.56	4.27	4.27	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1275/1406	3.88	4.58	4.32	4.39	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1083/1615	4.33	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1566	5.00	4.39	4.07	4.00	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1528	5.00	4.35	4.12	4.11	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	690/1650	4.50	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	970/1667	4.86	4.63	4.67	4.64	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	141/1626	4.83	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	521/1559	4.63	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	4.88	4.91	4.72	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	683/1549	4.63	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	715/1546	4.50	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	712/1384	4.10	4.54	4.10	4.07	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	603/1378	4.25	4.45	4.29	4.25	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	4.38	4.38	4.31	4.26	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.00	4.50	2.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.19	2.50	****	

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	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 252 0101
 Title THEATRE LAB
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1663
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.64	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.56	4.27	4.27	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.39	4.07	4.00	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.35	4.12	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.31	4.22	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.63	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.39	4.11	4.06	5.00
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.43	4.00	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.54	4.10	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.38	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.65	4.03	4.01	5.00

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

Course-Section: THTR 321 0101
 Title SCRIPT ANALYSIS
 Instructor: MCCULLY, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1664
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	2	6	6	4.13	1128/1670	4.13	4.64	4.31	4.24	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	6	3	3.73	1419/1666	3.73	4.56	4.27	4.18	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	****	4.58	4.32	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	4	8	4.20	944/1615	4.20	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	295/1566	4.67	4.39	4.07	4.04	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	611/1528	4.36	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	2	6	1	2	2.67	1615/1650	2.67	4.31	4.22	4.12	2.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	1347/1667	4.29	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1354/1626	3.58	4.39	4.11	4.06	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	722/1559	4.64	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	596/1560	4.91	4.91	4.72	4.67	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	5	2	3	3.64	1355/1549	3.64	4.50	4.31	4.25	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1040/1546	4.18	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	217/1323	4.70	4.43	4.00	3.99	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	221/1384	4.80	4.54	4.10	4.12	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	281/1378	4.90	4.38	4.31	4.33	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	594/ 904	3.83	4.65	4.03	4.03	3.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.00	4.57	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.68	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****	

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	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	12
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	2						

Course-Section: THTR 325 0101
 Title: VOCAL TRAINING ACTOR I
 Instructor: WATSON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1665
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	3	6	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.64	4.31	4.24	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	490/1666	4.60	4.56	4.27	4.18	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	****	4.58	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	944/1615	4.20	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1246/1566	3.57	4.39	4.07	4.04	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1368/1528	3.33	4.35	4.12	4.07	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	973/1650	4.20	4.31	4.22	4.12	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.63	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	355/1559	4.86	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	1023/1560	4.71	4.91	4.72	4.67	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	266/1549	4.83	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	1071/1546	4.14	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	894/1323	3.80	4.43	4.00	3.99	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	257/1384	4.75	4.54	4.10	4.12	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	653/1378	4.50	4.38	4.31	4.33	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.65	4.03	4.03	****

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	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	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: THTR 335 0101
 Title ADVANCED LIGHTING DESI
 Instructor: COBB, MILTON T.
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1666
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	1	5	4.83	271/1670	4.83	4.64	4.31	4.24	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1070/1666	4.17	4.56	4.27	4.18	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1078/1566	3.83	4.39	4.07	4.04	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1521/1650	3.33	4.31	4.22	4.12	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1310/1667	4.33	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1280/1559	4.00	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	855/1560	4.80	4.91	4.72	4.67	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	562/1549	4.60	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	345/1546	4.80	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	960/1323	3.67	4.43	4.00	3.99	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.54	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.38	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.65	4.03	4.03	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	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 339 0101
 Title ADV PRODUCTION TECHNQU
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1667
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	1	6	4.86	253/1670	4.86	4.64	4.31	4.24	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.56	4.27	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1615	****	4.46	4.24	4.18	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.04	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.31	4.22	4.12	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	805/1667	4.83	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	151/1626	4.83	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1560	****	4.91	4.72	4.67	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1546	****	4.52	4.32	4.24	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1323	****	4.43	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1384	****	4.54	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1378	****	4.45	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1378	****	4.38	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	4.65	4.03	4.03	****

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	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: THTR 347 0101
 Title CHARACTER/SCENE STUDY
 Instructor: MEHTA, XERXES J
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1668
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	14	4.88	234/1670	4.88	4.64	4.31	4.24	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.56	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	203/1615	4.87	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	210/1566	4.78	4.39	4.07	4.04	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	560/1528	4.40	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	229/1650	4.80	4.31	4.22	4.12	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	472/1667	4.94	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.39	4.11	4.06	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1559	****	4.58	4.46	4.40	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1560	****	4.91	4.72	4.67	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1549	****	4.50	4.31	4.25	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1546	****	4.52	4.32	4.24	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.54	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	225/1378	4.92	4.38	4.31	4.33	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.65	4.03	4.03	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	11	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	4	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	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: THTR 361 0101
 Title MODERN THEATRE II
 Instructor: MCCULLY, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1669
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	2	6	4.56	611/1670	4.56	4.64	4.31	4.24	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1003/1666	4.22	4.56	4.27	4.18	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	948/1406	4.17	4.58	4.32	4.22	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	143/1566	4.89	4.39	4.07	4.04	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	504/1528	4.44	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	1521/1650	3.33	4.31	4.22	4.12	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1465/1667	4.11	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	728/1626	4.25	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	1280/1559	4.00	4.58	4.46	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1087/1549	4.13	4.50	4.31	4.25	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1139/1546	4.00	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	260/1323	4.63	4.43	4.00	3.99	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	205/1384	4.83	4.54	4.10	4.12	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	481/1378	4.67	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	813/1378	4.33	4.38	4.31	4.33	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 904	****	4.65	4.03	4.03	****

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0	
84-150	5	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		9
			? 0			

Course-Section: THTR 390 0101
 Title THEATRE IN PRODUCTION
 Instructor: WATSON, LYNN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1670
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	3	3	4.13	1139/1670	4.13	4.64	4.31	4.24	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.56	4.27	4.18	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1615	****	4.46	4.24	4.18	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.39	4.07	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1528	****	4.35	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.31	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.63	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	877/1626	4.06	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.06

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 390 0101
 Title THEATRE IN PRODUCTION
 Instructor: WATSON, LYNN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1671
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	3	3	4.13	1139/1670	4.13	4.64	4.31	4.24	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.56	4.27	4.18	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1615	****	4.46	4.24	4.18	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.39	4.07	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1528	****	4.35	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.31	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.63	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	953/1626	4.06	4.39	4.11	4.06	4.06

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2 Under-grad 8 Non-major 7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: THTR 490 0101
 Title PRODUCTION WORKSHOP
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1672
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	0	1	1	0	0	11	4.46	722/1670	4.46	4.64	4.31	4.45	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	516/1666	4.58	4.56	4.27	4.35	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1406	****	4.58	4.32	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.46	4.24	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	226/1566	4.75	4.39	4.07	4.17	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	842/1528	4.10	4.35	4.12	4.26	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	2	0	2	2	5	3.73	1376/1650	3.73	4.31	4.22	4.28	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	992/1667	4.69	4.63	4.67	4.73	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	0	3	8	4.31	670/1626	4.31	4.39	4.11	4.28	4.31

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						