**Course-Section: THTR 100 01** 

Title: Intro Theatre Scenogrphy

**Instructor:** Schraven, Greggo

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 24

	_			Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1644	5.00	4.76	4.32	4.16	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	331/1644	4.73	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	265/1419	4.80	4.74	4.35	4.25	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1596	5.00	4.73	4.24	4.09	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	84/1535	4.93	4.58	4.15	4.02	4.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	429/1510	4.50	4.35	4.13	3.91	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	249/1620	4.73	4.34	4.20	4.13	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	1394/1642	4.27	4.56	4.68	4.68	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	382/1596	4.50	4.54	4.12	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	173/1534	4.93	4.73	4.48	4.45	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.97	4.76	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	275/1531	4.80	4.69	4.33	4.30	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	356/1530	4.80	4.79	4.35	4.30	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	151/1409	4.80	4.42	4.08	3.97	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1366	5.00	4.78	4.18	3.96	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	342/1364	4.80	4.82	4.33	4.10	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	503/1361	4.70	4.82	4.39	4.17	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1019	5.00	4.61	4.09	3.97	5.00

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: THTR 100 01** 

**Title: Intro Theatre Scenogrphy** 

**Instructor:** Schraven, Greggo

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 16

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/185	****	****	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/209	****	****	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/181	****	****	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/183	****	****	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/172	****	****	4.14	4.22	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	12	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

**Course-Section: THTR 104 01** 

**Title: Intro To Costume** 

**Instructor:** Joyce, Shelley

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 24

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	17	4.65	496/1644	4.65	4.76	4.32	4.16	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	751/1644	4.43	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	476/1419	4.65	4.74	4.35	4.25	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	7	14	4.55	515/1596	4.55	4.73	4.24	4.09	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	3	4	12	4.09	896/1535	4.09	4.58	4.15	4.02	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	3	8	8	4.05	902/1510	4.05	4.35	4.13	3.91	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	3	15	4.43	637/1620	4.43	4.34	4.20	4.13	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	16	6	4.27	1387/1642	4.27	4.56	4.68	4.68	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	877/1596	4.13	4.54	4.12	4.07	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	6	11	4.23	1178/1534	4.23	4.73	4.48	4.45	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	548/1539	4.91	4.97	4.76	4.72	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	852/1531	4.41	4.69	4.33	4.30	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	6	15	4.59	655/1530	4.59	4.79	4.35	4.30	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	347/1409	4.55	4.42	4.08	3.97	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	0	2	10	4.43	581/1366	4.43	4.78	4.18	3.96	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	1	2	9	4.29	857/1364	4.29	4.82	4.33	4.10	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	911/1361	4.29	4.82	4.39	4.17	4.29

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: THTR 104 01

Title: Intro To Costume

Instructor: Joyce, Shelley

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 23

				Fre	quend	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	726/1019	3.80	4.61	4.09	3.97	3.80

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	Α	18	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	1	Major	13
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	3	Under-grad	22	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

**Course-Section: THTR 110 01** 

**Title: Introduction To Acting** 

**Instructor:** Searls, Colette

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 20

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	601/1644	4.58	4.76	4.32	4.16	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	683/1644	4.66	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1419	4.77	4.74	4.35	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	356/1596	4.72	4.73	4.24	4.09	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	3	6	6	3.83	1119/1535	4.10	4.58	4.15	4.02	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	3	6	5	3.42	1325/1510	3.81	4.35	4.13	3.91	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	2	2	11	4.29	834/1620	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.13	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	5	4.26	1394/1642	4.36	4.56	4.68	4.68	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	322/1596	4.39	4.54	4.12	4.07	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	343/1534	4.75	4.73	4.48	4.45	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.97	4.76	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	406/1531	4.74	4.69	4.33	4.30	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	502/1530	4.78	4.79	4.35	4.30	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	6	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1409	4.57	4.42	4.08	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	237/1366	4.65	4.78	4.18	3.96	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1364	4.94	4.82	4.33	4.10	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1361	4.93	4.82	4.39	4.17	5.00

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: THTR 110 01

Title: Introduction To Acting

Instructor: Searls, Colette

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 19

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	339/1019	4.51	4.61	4.09	3.97	4.40

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	Α	11	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	7	Under-grad	19	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

**Course-Section: THTR 110 02** 

**Title: Introduction To Acting** 

**Instructor:** Crocker, Martha

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 20

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	197/1644	4.58	4.76	4.32	4.16	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	160/1644	4.66	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	308/1419	4.77	4.74	4.35	4.25	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	68/1596	4.72	4.73	4.24	4.09	4.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	781/1535	4.10	4.58	4.15	4.02	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	679/1510	3.81	4.35	4.13	3.91	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	423/1620	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.13	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	15	2	4.12	1487/1642	4.36	4.56	4.68	4.68	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	157/1596	4.39	4.54	4.12	4.07	4.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	173/1534	4.75	4.73	4.48	4.45	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.97	4.76	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1531	4.74	4.69	4.33	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	248/1530	4.78	4.79	4.35	4.30	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	381/1409	4.57	4.42	4.08	3.97	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	237/1366	4.65	4.78	4.18	3.96	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	342/1364	4.94	4.82	4.33	4.10	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1361	4.93	4.82	4.39	4.17	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: THTR 110 02

Title: Introduction To Acting

Instructor: Crocker, Martha

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 18

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1019	4.51	4.61	4.09	3.97	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	8	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

**Course-Section: THTR 110 03** 

**Title: Introduction To Acting** 

**Instructor:** Crocker, Martha

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 19

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	564/1644	4.58	4.76	4.32	4.16	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	331/1644	4.66	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1419	4.77	4.74	4.35	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	292/1596	4.72	4.73	4.24	4.09	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	624/1535	4.10	4.58	4.15	4.02	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	2	2	7	3.80	1113/1510	3.81	4.35	4.13	3.91	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	0	5	7	4.21	953/1620	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.13	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	1381/1642	4.36	4.56	4.68	4.68	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	8	5	4.07	931/1596	4.39	4.54	4.12	4.07	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	286/1534	4.75	4.73	4.48	4.45	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.97	4.76	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	318/1531	4.74	4.69	4.33	4.30	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	232/1530	4.78	4.79	4.35	4.30	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1409	4.57	4.42	4.08	3.97	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	492/1366	4.65	4.78	4.18	3.96	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1364	4.94	4.82	4.33	4.10	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	340/1361	4.93	4.82	4.39	4.17	4.83

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: THTR 110 03

Title: Introduction To Acting

Instructor: Crocker, Martha

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 16

				Fre	quend	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	125/1019	4.51	4.61	4.09	3.97	4.80

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	9	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

**Course-Section: THTR 110 4** 

**Title: Introduction To Acting** 

**Instructor:** Hirshorn, Rachel

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 20

				Fre	quend	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	3	4	9	4.00	1218/1644	4.58	4.76	4.32	4.16	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	13	4.44	734/1644	4.66	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	775/1419	4.77	4.74	4.35	4.25	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	702/1596	4.72	4.73	4.24	4.09	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	4	7	3.67	1235/1535	4.10	4.58	4.15	4.02	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	4	6	3.56	1238/1510	3.81	4.35	4.13	3.91	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	3	10	4.17	1003/1620	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.13	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	1203/1642	4.36	4.56	4.68	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	768/1596	4.39	4.54	4.12	4.07	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	1155/1534	4.75	4.73	4.48	4.45	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.97	4.76	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	879/1531	4.74	4.69	4.33	4.30	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	755/1530	4.78	4.79	4.35	4.30	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	523/1409	4.57	4.42	4.08	3.97	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	685/1366	4.65	4.78	4.18	3.96	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	240/1364	4.94	4.82	4.33	4.10	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	273/1361	4.93	4.82	4.39	4.17	4.89

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: THTR 110 4

Title: Introduction To Acting

**Instructor:** Hirshorn, Rachel

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 18

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	508/1019	4.51	4.61	4.09	3.97	4.14

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	Α	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	10	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

**Course-Section: THTR 110 5** 

**Title: Introduction To Acting** 

**Instructor:** Hirshorn, Rachel

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 20

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	231/1644	4.58	4.76	4.32	4.16	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	288/1644	4.66	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	170/1419	4.77	4.74	4.35	4.25	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	160/1596	4.72	4.73	4.24	4.09	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	550/1535	4.10	4.58	4.15	4.02	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	921/1510	3.81	4.35	4.13	3.91	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	1	1	7	4.18	985/1620	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.13	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1100/1642	4.36	4.56	4.68	4.68	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	642/1596	4.39	4.54	4.12	4.07	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	381/1534	4.75	4.73	4.48	4.45	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.97	4.76	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	241/1531	4.74	4.69	4.33	4.30	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	181/1530	4.78	4.79	4.35	4.30	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	486/1409	4.57	4.42	4.08	3.97	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	191/1366	4.65	4.78	4.18	3.96	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1364	4.94	4.82	4.33	4.10	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1361	4.93	4.82	4.39	4.17	5.00

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: THTR 110 5

**Title: Introduction To Acting** 

**Instructor:** Hirshorn, Rachel

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 14

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	161/1019	4.51	4.61	4.09	3.97	4.71

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						

**Course-Section: THTR 120 01** 

Title: Intro Thtr: Thry & Prac

**Instructor:** McCully,Susan

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 24

·	1 0 0 0 1 5 10 4.56 558/164  1 10 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 236/141  1 0 0 1 1 2 12 4.56 489/159  led 1 0 0 0 0 2 14 4.88 130/153  larned 1 0 0 1 0 1 14 4.75 196/151  1 0 1 1 1 2 11 4.31 806/162  2 0 0 0 0 0 9 6 4.40 1286/164  eness 4 0 0 0 1 3 9 4.62 288/159  rly 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 14 4.88 305/153  larned 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 9 4.62 288/159  rly 1 0 0 0 0 0 5 11 4.69 449/153  larned 1 0 0 0 0 4 10 4.71 205/140  led 7 0 0 0 0 1 1 8 4.70 332/136				structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	358/1644	4.75	4.76	4.32	4.16	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	558/1644	4.56	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	236/1419	4.83	4.74	4.35	4.25	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	489/1596	4.56	4.73	4.24	4.09	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	130/1535	4.88	4.58	4.15	4.02	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	196/1510	4.75	4.35	4.13	3.91	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	2	11	4.31	806/1620	4.31	4.34	4.20	4.13	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1286/1642	4.40	4.56	4.68	4.68	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	288/1596	4.62	4.54	4.12	4.07	4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	305/1534	4.88	4.73	4.48	4.45	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.97	4.76	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	449/1531	4.69	4.69	4.33	4.30	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	340/1530	4.81	4.79	4.35	4.30	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	205/1409	4.71	4.42	4.08	3.97	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	332/1366	4.70	4.78	4.18	3.96	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	342/1364	4.80	4.82	4.33	4.10	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	380/1361	4.80	4.82	4.39	4.17	4.80

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: THTR 120 01** 

**Title: Intro Thtr: Thry & Prac** 

**Instructor:** McCully,Susan

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 24

**Questionnaires: 17** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	97/1019	4.89	4.61	4.09	3.97	4.89

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	Α	11	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

**Course-Section: THTR 202 01** 

**Title: Intro Drama Literature** 

**Instructor:** Searls, Colette

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 30

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	588/1644	4.45	4.76	4.32	4.36	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	454/1644	4.52	4.63	4.28	4.35	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	462/1419	4.60	4.74	4.35	4.42	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	292/1596	4.56	4.73	4.24	4.31	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	122/1535	4.89	4.58	4.15	4.20	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	564/1510	4.30	4.35	4.13	4.17	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	449/1620	4.40	4.34	4.20	4.25	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	1185/1642	4.45	4.56	4.68	4.67	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	475/1596	4.24	4.54	4.12	4.13	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	400/1534	4.76	4.73	4.48	4.51	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	365/1539	4.95	4.97	4.76	4.80	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	263/1531	4.66	4.69	4.33	4.38	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	519/1530	4.63	4.79	4.35	4.41	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	1	3	9	4.20	675/1409	3.95	4.42	4.08	4.23	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	191/1366	4.74	4.78	4.18	4.24	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	278/1364	4.75	4.82	4.33	4.39	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	197/1361	4.74	4.82	4.39	4.48	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	331/1019	4.19	4.61	4.09	4.14	4.42

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: THTR 202 01** 

**Title: Intro Drama Literature** 

**Instructor:** Searls, Colette

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 30

Questionnaires: 17

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/209	****	****	4.19	4.45	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/72	****	4.40	4.53	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	4.16	4.38	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	4.45	4.40	4.47	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.32	4.09	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/48	****	4.89	4.16	4.81	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/45	****	4.33	4.19	4.58	****
Self Paced										-				
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/51	****	****	4.03	5.00	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	Α	8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	8	Under-grad	17	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

**Course-Section: THTR 202 02** 

**Title: Intro Drama Literature** 

**Instructor:** Searls, Colette

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 31

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	3	6	18	4.31	911/1644	4.45	4.76	4.32	4.36	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	7	16	4.39	815/1644	4.52	4.63	4.28	4.35	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	6	17	4.54	605/1419	4.60	4.74	4.35	4.42	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	5	6	16	4.41	717/1596	4.56	4.73	4.24	4.31	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	27	4.90	113/1535	4.89	4.58	4.15	4.20	4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	1	1	5	10	4.22	763/1510	4.30	4.35	4.13	4.17	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	7	16	4.24	908/1620	4.40	4.34	4.20	4.25	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	18	11	4.38	1310/1642	4.45	4.56	4.68	4.67	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	4	13	7	4.04	944/1596	4.24	4.54	4.12	4.13	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	3	24	4.69	643/1534	4.76	4.73	4.48	4.51	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	244/1539	4.95	4.97	4.76	4.80	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	6	20	4.52	708/1531	4.66	4.69	4.33	4.38	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	7	20	4.55	699/1530	4.63	4.79	4.35	4.41	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	3	1	4	12	7	3.70	1065/1409	3.95	4.42	4.08	4.23	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	5	18	4.63	405/1366	4.74	4.78	4.18	4.24	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	1	2	19	4.65	512/1364	4.75	4.82	4.33	4.39	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	2	3	18	4.54	669/1361	4.74	4.82	4.39	4.48	4.54

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: THTR 202 02

Title: Intro Drama Literature

Instructor: Searls, Colette

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 31

Questionnaires: 30

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	3	4	6	9	3.95	610/1019	4.19	4.61	4.09	4.14	3.95

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	Α	15	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	1	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	4	General	10	Under-grad	29	Non-major	25
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

**Course-Section: THTR 220 01** 

Title: Craft Of Acting I

**Instructor:** Kreizenbeck, Ala

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 17

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	208/1644	4.88	4.76	4.32	4.36	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	633/1644	4.50	4.63	4.28	4.35	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1419	****	4.74	4.35	4.42	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	463/1596	4.58	4.73	4.24	4.31	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	148/1535	4.86	4.58	4.15	4.20	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	330/1510	4.60	4.35	4.13	4.17	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	4	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	864/1620	4.27	4.34	4.20	4.25	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	4	4.25	1400/1642	4.25	4.56	4.68	4.67	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	124/1596	4.85	4.54	4.12	4.13	4.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	324/1534	4.87	4.73	4.48	4.51	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.97	4.76	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	377/1531	4.73	4.69	4.33	4.38	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	141/1530	4.93	4.79	4.35	4.41	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	199/1409	4.73	4.42	4.08	4.23	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	227/1366	4.82	4.78	4.18	4.24	4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	329/1364	4.82	4.82	4.33	4.39	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	247/1361	4.90	4.82	4.39	4.48	4.90

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: THTR 220 01

Title: Craft Of Acting I

Instructor: Kreizenbeck, Ala

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 17

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1019	5.00	4.61	4.09	4.14	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	Α	12	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

**Course-Section: THTR 232 01** 

**Title: Scene Design** 

**Instructor: Zlotescu, Elena** 

**Term - Fall 2013** 

**Enrollment:** 5

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	358/1644	4.75	4.76	4.32	4.36	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	302/1644	4.75	4.63	4.28	4.35	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1419	5.00	4.74	4.35	4.42	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1596	5.00	4.73	4.24	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.58	4.15	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	429/1510	4.50	4.35	4.13	4.17	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	331/1620	4.67	4.34	4.20	4.25	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	914/1642	4.75	4.56	4.68	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1596	5.00	4.54	4.12	4.13	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1534	5.00	4.73	4.48	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.97	4.76	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1531	5.00	4.69	4.33	4.38	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1530	5.00	4.79	4.35	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	245/1409	4.67	4.42	4.08	4.23	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1366	5.00	4.78	4.18	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1364	5.00	4.82	4.33	4.39	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1361	5.00	4.82	4.39	4.48	5.00

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: THTR 232 01

Title: Scene Design

Instructor: Zlotescu, Elena

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 5

Questionnaires: 4

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1019	5.00	4.61	4.09	4.14	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

**Course-Section: THTR 235 01** 

Title: Lighting Design I

**Instructor:** Mendelson,Adam

**Term - Fall 2013** 

**Enrollment:** 6

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1644	5.00	4.76	4.32	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	230/1644	4.80	4.63	4.28	4.35	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	775/1419	4.40	4.74	4.35	4.42	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1596	5.00	4.73	4.24	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	225/1535	4.75	4.58	4.15	4.20	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1510	5.00	4.35	4.13	4.17	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1620	5.00	4.34	4.20	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	840/1642	4.80	4.56	4.68	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	178/1596	4.75	4.54	4.12	4.13	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	439/1534	4.80	4.73	4.48	4.51	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.97	4.76	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	275/1531	4.80	4.69	4.33	4.38	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1530	5.00	4.79	4.35	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.42	4.08	4.23	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1366	5.00	4.78	4.18	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1364	5.00	4.82	4.33	4.39	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1361	5.00	4.82	4.39	4.48	5.00

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: THTR 235 01

Title: Lighting Design I

Instructor: Mendelson,Adam

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 6

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1019	****	4.61	4.09	4.14	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	Α	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

**Course-Section: THTR 241 01** 

**Title: Theatre Ensemble I** 

**Instructor:** Muson, Eve B

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 17

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	122/1644	4.94	4.76	4.32	4.36	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	401/1644	4.69	4.63	4.28	4.35	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	198/1419	4.88	4.74	4.35	4.42	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	273/1596	4.73	4.73	4.24	4.31	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	1	12	4.31	681/1535	4.31	4.58	4.15	4.20	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	429/1510	4.50	4.35	4.13	4.17	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	653/1620	4.43	4.34	4.20	4.25	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.56	4.68	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	199/1596	4.73	4.54	4.12	4.13	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	419/1534	4.82	4.73	4.48	4.51	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.97	4.76	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	660/1531	4.55	4.69	4.33	4.38	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	340/1530	4.82	4.79	4.35	4.41	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	124/1409	4.86	4.42	4.08	4.23	4.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1366	5.00	4.78	4.18	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1364	5.00	4.82	4.33	4.39	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	273/1361	4.89	4.82	4.39	4.48	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1019	5.00	4.61	4.09	4.14	5.00

**Course-Section: THTR 241 01** 

Title: Theatre Ensemble I

**Instructor:** Muson, Eve B

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 17

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/185	****	****	4.23	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/209	****	****	4.19	4.45	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	****	4.53	4.67	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/183	****	****	4.46	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/172	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/72	****	4.40	4.53	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/71	****	4.16	4.38	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	4.11	4.41	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	4.45	4.40	4.47	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	3.32	4.09	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/48	****	4.89	4.16	4.81	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/45	****	4.33	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	4.64	4.57	4.57	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	4.38	4.25	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/51	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.18	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.33	****	****

Run Date: 1/30/2014 2:34:41 PM

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: THTR 241 01** 

**Title: Theatre Ensemble I** 

**Instructor:** Muson, Eve B

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 17

**Questionnaires: 17** 

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.17	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.17	****	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

**Course-Section: THTR 262 01** 

**Title: Theatre Production: Ligh** 

Instructor: Mendelson,Adam

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 10

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1644	5.00	4.76	4.32	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1644	5.00	4.63	4.28	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1419	5.00	4.74	4.35	4.42	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1596	5.00	4.73	4.24	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.58	4.15	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1510	5.00	4.35	4.13	4.17	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1620	5.00	4.34	4.20	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.56	4.68	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	246/1596	4.67	4.54	4.12	4.13	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1534	5.00	4.73	4.48	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.97	4.76	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1531	5.00	4.69	4.33	4.38	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1530	5.00	4.79	4.35	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.42	4.08	4.23	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1366	5.00	4.78	4.18	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1364	5.00	4.82	4.33	4.39	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1361	5.00	4.82	4.39	4.48	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1019	5.00	4.61	4.09	4.14	5.00

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: THTR 262 01** 

**Title: Theatre Production: Ligh** 

**Instructor:** Mendelson,Adam

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 3

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/48	5.00	4.89	4.16	4.81	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/45	5.00	4.33	4.19	4.58	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/30	5.00	4.64	4.57	4.57	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/27	5.00	4.38	4.25	5.00	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/25	5.00	4.50	4.35	5.00	5.00

#### **Frequency Distribution**

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	3	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Run Date: 1/30/2014 2:34:41 PM

**Course-Section: THTR 310 01** 

**Title: History Of Theatre** 

**Instructor:** Kreizenbeck, Ala

**Term - Fall 2013** 

**Enrollment: 33** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	496/1644	4.65	4.76	4.32	4.31	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	8	15	4.42	768/1644	4.42	4.63	4.28	4.25	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	462/1419	4.67	4.74	4.35	4.31	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	8	13	4.31	859/1596	4.31	4.73	4.24	4.25	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	9	14	4.42	550/1535	4.42	4.58	4.15	4.14	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	4	4	15	4.38	577/1510	4.38	4.35	4.13	4.16	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	5	7	12	4.00	1134/1620	4.00	4.34	4.20	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	21	5	4.15	1469/1642	4.15	4.56	4.68	4.65	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	13	7	4.23	742/1596	4.23	4.54	4.12	4.09	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	542/1534	4.74	4.73	4.48	4.44	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	487/1539	4.93	4.97	4.76	4.74	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	7	17	4.52	708/1531	4.52	4.69	4.33	4.30	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	4	20	4.56	699/1530	4.56	4.79	4.35	4.32	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	18	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1224/1409	3.38	4.42	4.08	4.09	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	992/1366	3.83	4.78	4.18	4.22	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	3	0	2	2	5	3.50	1221/1364	3.50	4.82	4.33	4.37	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	917/1361	4.27	4.82	4.39	4.39	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	17	3	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	431/1019	4.25	4.61	4.09	4.04	4.25

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: THTR 310 01** 

**Title: History Of Theatre** 

**Instructor:** Kreizenbeck, Ala

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 33

Questionnaires: 28

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/72	****	4.40	4.53	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/71	****	4.16	4.38	4.61	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/68	****	4.11	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/71	****	4.45	4.40	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	3.32	4.09	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/51	****	****	4.03	4.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.18	4.80	****

<b>Credits Earned</b>		Cum. GPA		<b>Expected Grades</b>		Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	9	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	7	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	11							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	С	2	General	4	Under-grad	28	Non-major	21	
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses		
				Р	1			to be significant				
				1	0	Other	0					
				?	5							

**Course-Section: THTR 324 01** 

Title: Craft Of Acting III

Instructor: Muson, Eve B

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 11

			Frequencies					In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1644	5.00	4.76	4.32	4.31	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	346/1644	4.73	4.63	4.28	4.25	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1419	5.00	4.74	4.35	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1596	5.00	4.73	4.24	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	182/1535	4.82	4.58	4.15	4.14	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	143/1510	4.82	4.35	4.13	4.16	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	864/1620	4.27	4.34	4.20	4.18	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	1387/1642	4.27	4.56	4.68	4.65	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	144/1596	4.80	4.54	4.12	4.09	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1178/1534	4.22	4.73	4.48	4.44	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	666/1539	4.89	4.97	4.76	4.74	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	1018/1531	4.22	4.69	4.33	4.30	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	232/1530	4.89	4.79	4.35	4.32	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1089/1409	3.67	4.42	4.08	4.09	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1366	5.00	4.78	4.18	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1364	5.00	4.82	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1361	5.00	4.82	4.39	4.39	5.00

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: THTR 324 01

Title: Craft Of Acting III

Instructor: Muson, Eve B

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 11

			Frequencies			Instructor		Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1019	****	4.61	4.09	4.04	****

Credits E	<b>Credits Earned</b>		Cum. GPA		Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses		
				Р	0			to be significant				
				I	0	Other	0					
				?	0							

**Course-Section: THTR 325 01** 

Title: Vocal Training Actor III

**Instructor:** Watson, Janet L

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 7

				Fre	quend	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	231/1644	4.86	4.76	4.32	4.31	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	545/1644	4.57	4.63	4.28	4.25	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	462/1419	4.67	4.74	4.35	4.31	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	292/1596	4.71	4.73	4.24	4.25	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	823/1535	4.17	4.58	4.15	4.14	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1113/1510	3.80	4.35	4.13	4.16	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	436/1620	4.57	4.34	4.20	4.18	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	736/1642	4.86	4.56	4.68	4.65	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	382/1596	4.50	4.54	4.12	4.09	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	807/1534	4.57	4.73	4.48	4.44	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	751/1539	4.86	4.97	4.76	4.74	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	406/1531	4.71	4.69	4.33	4.30	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	502/1530	4.71	4.79	4.35	4.32	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	134/1409	4.83	4.42	4.08	4.09	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	322/1366	4.71	4.78	4.18	4.22	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1364	5.00	4.82	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1361	5.00	4.82	4.39	4.39	5.00

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: THTR 325 01** 

Title: Vocal Training Actor III

**Instructor:** Watson, Janet L

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 7

**Questionnaires: 7** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	108/1019	4.86	4.61	4.09	4.04	4.86

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

**Course-Section: THTR 329 01** 

**Title: Movement For Actor III** 

**Instructor:** Salkind, Wendy

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 9

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1644	5.00	4.76	4.32	4.31	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1644	5.00	4.63	4.28	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1419	5.00	4.74	4.35	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1596	5.00	4.73	4.24	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	130/1535	4.88	4.58	4.15	4.14	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1510	5.00	4.35	4.13	4.16	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	527/1620	4.50	4.34	4.20	4.18	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	694/1642	4.88	4.56	4.68	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1596	5.00	4.54	4.12	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1534	5.00	4.73	4.48	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.97	4.76	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1531	5.00	4.69	4.33	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1530	5.00	4.79	4.35	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1316/1409	3.00	4.42	4.08	4.09	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1366	5.00	4.78	4.18	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1364	5.00	4.82	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1361	5.00	4.82	4.39	4.39	5.00

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: THTR 329 01

**Title: Movement For Actor III** 

**Instructor:** Salkind, Wendy

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 8

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1019	5.00	4.61	4.09	4.04	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	<b>A</b>	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	2					-	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

**Course-Section: THTR 337 01** 

**Title: Advanced Sound Design** 

**Instructor:** Mendelson, Adam

**Term - Fall 2013** 

**Enrollment:** 6

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1644	5.00	4.76	4.32	4.31	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	428/1644	4.67	4.63	4.28	4.25	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	337/1419	4.75	4.74	4.35	4.31	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1596	5.00	4.73	4.24	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	300/1535	4.67	4.58	4.15	4.14	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	538/1510	4.40	4.35	4.13	4.16	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	968/1620	4.20	4.34	4.20	4.18	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.56	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1596	5.00	4.54	4.12	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	891/1534	4.50	4.73	4.48	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.97	4.76	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	478/1531	4.67	4.69	4.33	4.30	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	356/1530	4.80	4.79	4.35	4.32	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.42	4.08	4.09	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1366	5.00	4.78	4.18	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1364	5.00	4.82	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1361	5.00	4.82	4.39	4.39	5.00

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: THTR 337 01

Title: Advanced Sound Design

**Instructor:** Mendelson,Adam

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 6

**Questionnaires:** 6

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1019	5.00	4.61	4.09	4.04	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: THTR 339 01** 

**Title: Adv Production Technques** 

**Instructor:** Mendelson,Adam

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 1

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1644	5.00	4.76	4.32	4.31	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1210/1644	4.00	4.63	4.28	4.25	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1620	5.00	4.34	4.20	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.56	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1596	5.00	4.54	4.12	4.09	5.00

### **Frequency Distribution**

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Run Date: 1/30/2014 2:34:42 PM

**Course-Section: THTR 349 01** 

**Title: Gender, Sex and Theatre** 

**Instructor:** McCully,Susan

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 25

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	428/1644	4.71	4.76	4.32	4.31	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	288/1644	4.76	4.63	4.28	4.25	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	812/1419	4.38	4.74	4.35	4.31	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	245/1596	4.76	4.73	4.24	4.25	4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	340/1535	4.63	4.58	4.15	4.14	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	295/1510	4.65	4.35	4.13	4.16	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	2	4	9	4.12	1048/1620	4.12	4.34	4.20	4.18	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	14	3	4.18	1450/1642	4.18	4.56	4.68	4.65	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	7	8	4.31	629/1596	4.31	4.54	4.12	4.09	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	611/1534	4.71	4.73	4.48	4.44	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.97	4.76	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	628/1531	4.56	4.69	4.33	4.30	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	544/1530	4.69	4.79	4.35	4.32	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	2	1	11	4.40	486/1409	4.40	4.42	4.08	4.09	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1366	5.00	4.78	4.18	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	215/1364	4.91	4.82	4.33	4.37	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	478/1361	4.73	4.82	4.39	4.39	4.73

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: THTR 349 01** 

**Title: Gender, Sex and Theatre** 

**Instructor:** McCully,Susan

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 25

**Questionnaires: 19** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	765/1019	3.71	4.61	4.09	4.04	3.71

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	5	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	3	Under-grad	19	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						

**Course-Section: THTR 390 01** 

**Title: Theatre In Production** 

**Instructor:** Minnick, Michele

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 10

	Frequencies           NR         NA         1         2         3         4         5         Me					Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	482/1644	4.83	4.76	4.32	4.31	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1644	4.93	4.63	4.28	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1419	5.00	4.74	4.35	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	141/1596	4.85	4.73	4.24	4.25	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.58	4.15	4.14	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	359/1510	4.59	4.35	4.13	4.16	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	779/1620	4.17	4.34	4.20	4.18	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	1344/1642	4.67	4.56	4.68	4.65	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	553/1596	4.47	4.54	4.12	4.09	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	525/1534	4.79	4.73	4.48	4.44	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.97	4.76	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	195/1531	4.85	4.69	4.33	4.30	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1530	5.00	4.79	4.35	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	296/1409	4.60	4.42	4.08	4.09	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1366	5.00	4.78	4.18	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1364	5.00	4.82	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1361	4.67	4.82	4.39	4.39	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: THTR 390 01

Title: Theatre In Production

Instructor: Minnick, Michele

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 9

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1019	5.00	4.61	4.09	4.04	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP/	١	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	Α	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

**Course-Section: THTR 390 02** 

**Title: Theatre In Production** 

**Instructor: Hartman, Nyalls** 

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 10

							In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1644	4.83	4.76	4.32	4.31	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	186/1644	4.93	4.63	4.28	4.25	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1419	5.00	4.74	4.35	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	178/1596	4.85	4.73	4.24	4.25	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.58	4.15	4.14	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	330/1510	4.59	4.35	4.13	4.16	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	1134/1620	4.17	4.34	4.20	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1642	4.67	4.56	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	322/1596	4.47	4.54	4.12	4.09	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	381/1534	4.79	4.73	4.48	4.44	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.97	4.76	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	241/1531	4.85	4.69	4.33	4.30	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1530	5.00	4.79	4.35	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1409	4.60	4.42	4.08	4.09	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1366	5.00	4.78	4.18	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1364	5.00	4.82	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	549/1361	4.67	4.82	4.39	4.39	4.67

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: THTR 390 02

Title: Theatre In Production

Instructor: Hartman,Nyalls

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 7

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1019	5.00	4.61	4.09	4.04	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

**Course-Section: THTR 460 01** 

**Title: Theatre Capstone** 

**Instructor:** Salkind, Wendy

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 13

	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean					structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	242/1644	4.85	4.76	4.32	4.47	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	829/1644	4.38	4.63	4.28	4.35	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	942/1419	4.25	4.74	4.35	4.48	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	567/1596	4.50	4.73	4.24	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	270/1535	4.69	4.58	4.15	4.26	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	399/1510	4.54	4.35	4.13	4.29	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	3	4	3.69	1354/1620	3.69	4.34	4.20	4.25	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	1176/1642	4.54	4.56	4.68	4.67	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	297/1596	4.60	4.54	4.12	4.20	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	223/1534	4.92	4.73	4.48	4.54	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	548/1539	4.92	4.97	4.76	4.81	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	478/1531	4.67	4.69	4.33	4.38	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	309/1530	4.83	4.79	4.35	4.41	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	279/1409	4.63	4.42	4.08	4.15	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1366	5.00	4.78	4.18	4.37	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	342/1364	4.80	4.82	4.33	4.52	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	380/1361	4.80	4.82	4.39	4.59	4.80

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: THTR 460 01

Title: Theatre Capstone

Instructor: Salkind, Wendy

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 13

Questionnaires: 13

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	Questions NR NA					4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	125/1019	4.80	4.61	4.09	4.32	4.80

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						