

Course Section: THTR 100 0101
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1639
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	207/1669	4.34	4.63	4.23	4.02	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	957/1666	4.38	4.48	4.19	4.11	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1118/1421	4.38	4.39	4.24	4.11	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	1334/1617	3.80	4.34	4.15	3.99	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1427/1555	3.60	4.29	4.00	3.92	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	1522/1543	2.96	3.98	4.06	3.86	2.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	651/1647	4.26	4.21	4.12	4.06	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	901/1668	4.53	4.62	4.67	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	918/1605	4.20	4.39	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	955/1514	4.31	4.51	4.39	4.32	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1111/1551	4.52	4.81	4.66	4.55	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1066/1503	4.30	4.42	4.24	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	286/1506	4.41	4.62	4.26	4.17	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	846/1311	3.94	4.15	3.85	3.68	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1088/1490	4.10	4.46	4.05	3.85	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1395/1502	3.94	4.45	4.26	4.06	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	532/1489	4.42	4.65	4.29	4.07	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	4.00	4.33	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	4.00	4.33	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	5.00	5.00	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	4.50	4.50	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	4.50	4.50	4.22	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.00	4.34	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	

Course Section: THTR 100 0101
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1639
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course Section: THTR 100 0201
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1640
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1173/1669	4.34	4.63	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	243/1666	4.38	4.48	4.19	4.11	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	557/1421	4.38	4.39	4.24	4.11	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1251/1617	3.80	4.34	4.15	3.99	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	773/1555	3.60	4.29	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	1410/1543	2.96	3.98	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1043/1647	4.26	4.21	4.12	4.06	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1190/1668	4.53	4.62	4.67	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	591/1605	4.20	4.39	4.07	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	799/1514	4.31	4.51	4.39	4.32	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1551	4.52	4.81	4.66	4.55	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	556/1503	4.30	4.42	4.24	4.17	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	642/1506	4.41	4.62	4.26	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	939/1311	3.94	4.15	3.85	3.68	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	849/1490	4.10	4.46	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1013/1502	3.94	4.45	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1038/1489	4.42	4.65	4.29	4.07	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	140/ 226	4.00	4.33	4.20	3.98	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	146/ 233	4.00	4.33	4.19	4.09	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.42	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 223	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.19	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: THTR 100 0201
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1641
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1173/1669	4.34	4.63	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	243/1666	4.38	4.48	4.19	4.11	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	557/1421	4.38	4.39	4.24	4.11	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1251/1617	3.80	4.34	4.15	3.99	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	773/1555	3.60	4.29	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	1410/1543	2.96	3.98	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1043/1647	4.26	4.21	4.12	4.06	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1190/1668	4.53	4.62	4.67	4.62	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	849/1490	4.10	4.46	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1013/1502	3.94	4.45	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1038/1489	4.42	4.65	4.29	4.07	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	140/ 226	4.00	4.33	4.20	3.98	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	146/ 233	4.00	4.33	4.19	4.09	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.42	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 223	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.19	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: THTR 100 0301
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1642
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	590/1669	4.34	4.63	4.23	4.02	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1094/1666	4.38	4.48	4.19	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	557/1421	4.38	4.39	4.24	4.11	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1372/1617	3.80	4.34	4.15	3.99	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1545/1555	3.60	4.29	4.00	3.92	2.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1534/1543	2.96	3.98	4.06	3.86	2.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	481/1647	4.26	4.21	4.12	4.06	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1382/1668	4.53	4.62	4.67	4.62	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	690/1605	4.20	4.39	4.07	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1324/1514	4.31	4.51	4.39	4.32	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1551	4.52	4.81	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	556/1503	4.30	4.42	4.24	4.17	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1243/1506	4.41	4.62	4.26	4.17	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1490	4.10	4.46	4.05	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1502	3.94	4.45	4.26	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1489	4.42	4.65	4.29	4.07	****	

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

Course Section: THTR 100 0401
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1643
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	734/1669	4.34	4.63	4.23	4.02	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	957/1666	4.38	4.48	4.19	4.11	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	466/1421	4.38	4.39	4.24	4.11	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	641/1617	3.80	4.34	4.15	3.99	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1555	3.60	4.29	4.00	3.92	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	516/1543	2.96	3.98	4.06	3.86	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	651/1647	4.26	4.21	4.12	4.06	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1125/1668	4.53	4.62	4.67	4.62	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	759/1605	4.20	4.39	4.07	3.96	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	679/1514	4.31	4.51	4.39	4.32	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	4.52	4.81	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	932/1503	4.30	4.42	4.24	4.17	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	547/1506	4.41	4.62	4.26	4.17	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	189/1311	3.94	4.15	3.85	3.68	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1490	4.10	4.46	4.05	3.85	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1502	3.94	4.45	4.26	4.06	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	4.42	4.65	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.53	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	4.00	4.33	4.19	4.09	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	5.00	4.38	4.04	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	50/ 97	4.50	4.50	4.36	4.19	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	42/ 92	4.50	4.50	4.22	3.79	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	51/ 105	4.50	4.50	4.20	3.94	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 98	4.50	4.50	3.95	3.90	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: THTR 100 0401
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1643
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	5	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 there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course Section: THTR 104 0101
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1644
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	590/1669	4.68	4.63	4.23	4.02	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	957/1666	4.58	4.48	4.19	4.11	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	814/1421	4.52	4.39	4.24	4.11	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	801/1617	4.60	4.34	4.15	3.99	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	773/1555	4.11	4.29	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	895/1543	4.23	3.98	4.06	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	481/1647	4.75	4.21	4.12	4.06	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.62	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	170/1605	4.33	4.39	4.07	3.96	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	799/1514	4.53	4.51	4.39	4.32	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.81	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	879/1503	4.38	4.42	4.24	4.17	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	353/1506	4.92	4.62	4.26	4.17	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1311	4.43	4.15	3.85	3.68	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1233/1490	3.79	4.46	4.05	3.85	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1301/1502	3.63	4.45	4.26	4.06	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1038/1489	4.25	4.65	4.29	4.07	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.33	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.33	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.19	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.00	4.34	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1645
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	207/1669	4.68	4.63	4.23	4.02	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	181/1666	4.58	4.48	4.19	4.11	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1421	4.52	4.39	4.24	4.11	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	161/1617	4.60	4.34	4.15	3.99	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	773/1555	4.11	4.29	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	723/1543	4.23	3.98	4.06	3.86	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1647	4.75	4.21	4.12	4.06	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.62	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	690/1605	4.33	4.39	4.07	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	679/1514	4.53	4.51	4.39	4.32	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.81	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	719/1503	4.38	4.42	4.24	4.17	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	4.92	4.62	4.26	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	764/1311	4.43	4.15	3.85	3.68	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	692/1490	3.79	4.46	4.05	3.85	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1208/1502	3.63	4.45	4.26	4.06	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	684/1489	4.25	4.65	4.29	4.07	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: THTR 104 0105
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1646
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	269/1669	4.68	4.63	4.23	4.02	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	243/1666	4.58	4.48	4.19	4.11	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	557/1421	4.52	4.39	4.24	4.11	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1617	4.60	4.34	4.15	3.99	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	492/1555	4.11	4.29	4.00	3.92	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	390/1543	4.23	3.98	4.06	3.86	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	213/1647	4.75	4.21	4.12	4.06	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.62	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	918/1605	4.33	4.39	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	799/1514	4.53	4.51	4.39	4.32	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.81	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1503	4.38	4.42	4.24	4.17	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	4.92	4.62	4.26	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	264/1311	4.43	4.15	3.85	3.68	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1490	3.79	4.46	4.05	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1502	3.63	4.45	4.26	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1489	4.25	4.65	4.29	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	4.33	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.33	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.19	****	

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

Course Section: THTR 202 0101
 Title INTRO DRAMA LITERATURE
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1647
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	207/1669	4.81	4.63	4.23	4.34	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	715/1666	4.38	4.48	4.19	4.29	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	6	13	4.55	511/1421	4.55	4.39	4.24	4.35	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	958/1617	4.11	4.34	4.15	4.24	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	120/1555	4.86	4.29	4.00	3.96	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	5	5	7	3.89	1027/1543	3.89	3.98	4.06	4.10	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	356/1647	4.62	4.21	4.12	4.19	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	642/1605	4.29	4.39	4.07	4.15	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	291/1514	4.84	4.51	4.39	4.39	4.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.81	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	191/1503	4.83	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	623/1506	4.53	4.62	4.26	4.33	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	676/1311	3.93	4.15	3.85	3.96	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	192/1490	4.83	4.46	4.05	4.11	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	370/1502	4.78	4.45	4.26	4.31	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	467/1489	4.72	4.65	4.29	4.36	4.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	453/1006	4.12	4.53	4.00	3.99	4.12	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 4	General	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

Course Section: THTR 210 0101
 Title HISTORY OF THEATRE I
 Instructor: COYLE, MARGARET
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1648
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	8	11	4.17	1014/1669	4.17	4.63	4.23	4.34	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	8	10	4.13	1010/1666	4.13	4.48	4.19	4.29	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	8	11	4.17	878/1421	4.17	4.39	4.24	4.35	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	6	10	5	3.82	1218/1617	3.82	4.34	4.15	4.24	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	8	10	4.09	721/1555	4.09	4.29	4.00	3.96	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	7	5	8	3.82	1092/1543	3.82	3.98	4.06	4.10	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	759/1647	4.33	4.21	4.12	4.19	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	12	4.52	1177/1668	4.52	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.52	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	4	12	3	3.76	1202/1605	3.76	4.39	4.07	4.15	3.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	8	13	4.45	877/1514	4.45	4.51	4.39	4.39	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	1	20	4.77	843/1551	4.77	4.81	4.66	4.72	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	7	11	4.23	905/1503	4.23	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	6	12	4.23	934/1506	4.23	4.62	4.26	4.33	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	6	7	7	3.82	757/1311	3.82	4.15	3.85	3.96	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	8	8	4.10	808/1490	4.10	4.46	4.05	4.11	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	3	3	12	4.20	920/1502	4.20	4.45	4.26	4.31	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	4	14	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.65	4.29	4.36	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	2	3	4	3	6	3.44	789/1006	3.44	4.53	4.00	3.99	3.44	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.33	4.20	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 1	C 4	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course Section: THTR 220 0101
 Title CRAFT OF ACTING I
 Instructor: MARINO, CHRISTO
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1649
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	269/1669	4.84	4.63	4.23	4.34	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	549/1666	4.55	4.48	4.19	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.39	4.24	4.35	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	612/1617	4.36	4.34	4.15	4.24	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1555	4.75	4.29	4.00	3.96	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	580/1543	4.13	3.98	4.06	4.10	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1187/1647	4.13	4.21	4.12	4.19	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1668	4.89	4.62	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	373/1605	4.52	4.39	4.07	4.15	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1118/1514	4.35	4.51	4.39	4.39	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.81	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1066/1503	4.36	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	770/1506	4.55	4.62	4.26	4.33	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	340/1490	4.71	4.46	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	486/1502	4.83	4.45	4.26	4.31	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	532/1489	4.83	4.65	4.29	4.36	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	344/1006	4.60	4.53	4.00	3.99	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	7

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: THTR 220 0201
 Title CRAFT OF ACTING I
 Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1650
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	89/1669	4.84	4.63	4.23	4.34	4.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	439/1666	4.55	4.48	4.19	4.29	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.39	4.24	4.35	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	770/1617	4.36	4.34	4.15	4.24	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	340/1555	4.75	4.29	4.00	3.96	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	9	3	3.93	981/1543	4.13	3.98	4.06	4.10	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	682/1647	4.13	4.21	4.12	4.19	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	926/1668	4.89	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	350/1605	4.52	4.39	4.07	4.15	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	799/1514	4.35	4.51	4.39	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.81	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	312/1503	4.36	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	433/1506	4.55	4.62	4.26	4.33	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1311	****	4.15	3.85	3.96	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	261/1490	4.71	4.46	4.05	4.11	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1502	4.83	4.45	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1489	4.83	4.65	4.29	4.36	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	105/1006	4.60	4.53	4.00	3.99	4.88	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	38/ 55	4.00	4.00	4.34	4.67	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 5
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 1
				? 1	Other 11

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: THTR 222 0101
 Title: VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I
 Instructor: MARINO, CHRISTO
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1651
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	590/1669	4.64	4.63	4.23	4.34	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	181/1666	4.79	4.48	4.19	4.29	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	632/1421	4.56	4.39	4.24	4.35	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	394/1617	4.61	4.34	4.15	4.24	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	773/1555	4.19	4.29	4.00	3.96	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	543/1543	4.24	3.98	4.06	4.10	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	0	0	7	4.33	759/1647	4.35	4.21	4.12	4.19	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	499/1605	4.49	4.39	4.07	4.15	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	274/1514	4.71	4.51	4.39	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	4.93	4.81	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	686/1503	4.57	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	884/1506	4.57	4.62	4.26	4.33	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	791/1311	3.88	4.15	3.85	3.96	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	535/1490	4.55	4.46	4.05	4.11	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1502	4.76	4.45	4.26	4.31	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	478/1489	4.86	4.65	4.29	4.36	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	307/1006	4.40	4.53	4.00	3.99	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	0	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
			? 2		

Course Section: THTR 222 0201
 Title: VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I
 Instructor: MARINO, CHRISTO
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1652
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	244/1669	4.64	4.63	4.23	4.34	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	218/1666	4.79	4.48	4.19	4.29	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	392/1421	4.56	4.39	4.24	4.35	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	370/1617	4.61	4.34	4.15	4.24	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	461/1555	4.19	4.29	4.00	3.96	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	819/1543	4.24	3.98	4.06	4.10	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	697/1647	4.35	4.21	4.12	4.19	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	320/1605	4.49	4.39	4.07	4.15	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	715/1514	4.71	4.51	4.39	4.39	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	4.93	4.81	4.66	4.72	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	323/1503	4.57	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1506	4.57	4.62	4.26	4.33	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	587/1311	3.88	4.15	3.85	3.96	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	340/1490	4.55	4.46	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	486/1502	4.76	4.45	4.26	4.31	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	4.86	4.65	4.29	4.36	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1006	4.40	4.53	4.00	3.99	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	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 229 0201
 Title MOVEMENT FOR THE ACTOR
 Instructor: ALLEN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1653
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	199/1669	4.81	4.63	4.23	4.34	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.48	4.19	4.29	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	11	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1421	****	4.39	4.24	4.35	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	370/1617	4.63	4.34	4.15	4.24	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	558/1555	4.25	4.29	4.00	3.96	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	250/1543	4.67	3.98	4.06	4.10	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	1012/1647	4.07	4.21	4.12	4.19	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	9	5	4.13	820/1605	4.13	4.39	4.07	4.15	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1514	4.88	4.51	4.39	4.39	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.81	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1503	4.71	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.62	4.26	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	****	4.15	3.85	3.96	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	372/1490	4.63	4.46	4.05	4.11	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	266/1502	4.88	4.45	4.26	4.31	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	827/1489	4.38	4.65	4.29	4.36	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	178/1006	4.67	4.53	4.00	3.99	4.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	19	Non-major	9
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	13				
				?	0						

Course Section: THTR 237 0101
 Title SOUND DESIGN
 Instructor: COBB, MILTON T.
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1654
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	705/1669	4.43	4.63	4.23	4.34	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.48	4.19	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.39	4.24	4.35	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	922/1617	4.14	4.34	4.15	4.24	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	980/1555	3.86	4.29	4.00	3.96	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	1294/1543	3.43	3.98	4.06	4.10	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	2.14	1616/1647	2.14	4.21	4.12	4.19	2.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1257/1668	4.43	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1357/1605	3.50	4.39	4.07	4.15	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1337/1514	3.71	4.51	4.39	4.39	3.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1135/1551	4.57	4.81	4.66	4.72	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	3.29	1389/1503	3.29	4.42	4.24	4.29	3.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	995/1506	4.14	4.62	4.26	4.33	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	333/1311	4.40	4.15	3.85	3.96	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	849/1490	4.00	4.46	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	4.45	4.26	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.36	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	****	4.53	4.00	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: THTR 250 0101
 Title INTRO PRODUCTION TECH
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1655
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.63	4.23	4.34	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	984/1666	4.42	4.48	4.19	4.29	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1393/1647	4.25	4.21	4.12	4.19	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1190/1668	4.75	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1605	4.75	4.39	4.07	4.15	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.51	4.39	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.81	4.66	4.72	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	800/1503	4.33	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	471/1506	4.67	4.62	4.26	4.33	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	****	4.15	3.85	3.96	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1490	****	4.46	4.05	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1502	****	4.45	4.26	4.31	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1489	****	4.65	4.29	4.36	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	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	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	3
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 0102
 Title INTRO PRODUCTION TECH
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1656
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.63	4.23	4.34	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	359/1666	4.42	4.48	4.19	4.29	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1516/1617	3.00	4.34	4.15	4.24	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1647	4.25	4.21	4.12	4.19	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	4.75	4.62	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1605	4.75	4.39	4.07	4.15	4.50	

Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 226	5.00	4.33	4.20	4.42	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.33	4.19	4.36	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.74	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 223	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.71	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 206	5.00	5.00	4.15	4.59	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	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course Section: THTR 252 0101
 Title THEATRE LAB
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1657
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.63	4.23	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.48	4.19	4.29	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.34	4.15	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.29	4.00	3.96	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.21	4.12	4.19	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.39	4.07	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.51	4.39	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1551	4.50	4.81	4.66	4.72	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.62	4.26	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.15	3.85	3.96	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.46	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.45	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.36	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.53	4.00	3.99	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: THTR 324 0101
 Title CRAFT OF ACTING III
 Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1658
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	433/1669	4.64	4.63	4.23	4.28	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	620/1666	4.45	4.48	4.19	4.20	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	466/1421	4.60	4.39	4.24	4.25	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	156/1617	4.82	4.34	4.15	4.22	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	308/1555	4.55	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	735/1543	4.18	3.98	4.06	4.14	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	997/1647	4.09	4.21	4.12	4.14	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	1370/1668	4.27	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	343/1605	4.55	4.39	4.07	4.09	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.51	4.39	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.81	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.42	4.24	4.28	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.62	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	****	4.15	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	316/1490	4.70	4.46	4.05	4.11	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	459/1502	4.70	4.45	4.26	4.28	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	596/1489	4.60	4.65	4.29	4.35	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	98/1006	4.90	4.53	4.00	4.10	4.90	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course Section: THTR 329 0101
 Title MOVEMENT FOR ACTOR III
 Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1659
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	306/1669	4.73	4.63	4.23	4.28	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	966/1666	4.18	4.48	4.19	4.20	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	773/1421	4.30	4.39	4.24	4.25	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	253/1617	4.73	4.34	4.15	4.22	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	308/1555	4.55	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	638/1543	4.27	3.98	4.06	4.14	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1161/1647	3.90	4.21	4.12	4.14	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	1482/1668	4.09	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	335/1605	4.56	4.39	4.07	4.09	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.51	4.39	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.81	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.42	4.24	4.28	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.62	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1311	****	4.15	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	316/1490	4.70	4.46	4.05	4.11	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	336/1502	4.80	4.45	4.26	4.28	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	98/1006	4.90	4.53	4.00	4.10	4.90	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: THTR 331 0101
 Title: PATTERN DRAFTING
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1660
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	159/1669	4.87	4.63	4.23	4.28	4.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	439/1666	4.60	4.48	4.19	4.20	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	863/1421	4.20	4.39	4.24	4.25	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	358/1617	4.64	4.34	4.15	4.22	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1555	****	4.29	4.00	4.03	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	819/1543	4.11	3.98	4.06	4.14	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	4	8	2	3.86	1205/1647	3.86	4.21	4.12	4.14	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1170/1668	4.53	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	170/1605	4.75	4.39	4.07	4.09	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.51	4.39	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.81	4.66	4.70	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	932/1503	4.20	4.42	4.24	4.28	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	164/1506	4.90	4.62	4.26	4.30	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1027/1311	3.33	4.15	3.85	3.97	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1490	****	4.46	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1502	****	4.45	4.26	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1489	****	4.65	4.29	4.35	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1006	****	4.53	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.33	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.33	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.08	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.00	4.34	4.03	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	15	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	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	2				
				?	1						

Course Section: THTR 345 0101
 Title BUSINESS OF ACTING
 Instructor: WATSON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1661
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	852/1669	4.31	4.63	4.23	4.28	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	993/1666	4.15	4.48	4.19	4.20	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	939/1421	4.08	4.39	4.24	4.25	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	821/1617	4.23	4.34	4.15	4.22	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	428/1555	4.42	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	759/1543	4.17	3.98	4.06	4.14	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	6	3	3	3.75	1275/1647	3.75	4.21	4.12	4.14	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	1092/1605	3.91	4.39	4.07	4.09	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	939/1514	4.42	4.51	4.39	4.46	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.81	4.66	4.70	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	702/1503	4.42	4.42	4.24	4.28	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	757/1506	4.42	4.62	4.26	4.30	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	542/1311	4.09	4.15	3.85	3.97	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	364/1490	4.64	4.46	4.05	4.11	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	4	0	7	4.27	866/1502	4.27	4.45	4.26	4.28	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	1015/1489	4.09	4.65	4.29	4.35	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	459/1006	4.10	4.53	4.00	4.10	4.10	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

Course Section: THTR 360 0101
 Title MODERN THEATRE I
 Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1662
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	159/1669	4.87	4.63	4.23	4.28	4.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.48	4.19	4.20	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.39	4.24	4.25	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	161/1617	4.80	4.34	4.15	4.22	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	70/1555	4.93	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	157/1543	4.79	3.98	4.06	4.14	4.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	728/1647	4.36	4.21	4.12	4.14	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1274/1668	4.40	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	268/1605	4.64	4.39	4.07	4.09	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	424/1514	4.77	4.51	4.39	4.46	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.81	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	451/1503	4.62	4.42	4.24	4.28	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	534/1506	4.62	4.62	4.26	4.30	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	112/1311	4.82	4.15	3.85	3.97	4.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.46	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.45	4.26	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	196/1489	4.93	4.65	4.29	4.35	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	317/1006	4.38	4.53	4.00	4.10	4.38	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 2		

Course Section: THTR 390 0101
 Title THEATRE IN PRODUCTION
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1663
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	207/1669	4.80	4.63	4.23	4.28	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	439/1666	4.60	4.48	4.19	4.20	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.39	4.24	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.34	4.15	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	141/1555	4.80	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	390/1543	4.50	3.98	4.06	4.14	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1321/1647	3.67	4.21	4.12	4.14	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	901/1668	4.80	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	298/1605	4.60	4.39	4.07	4.09	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1514	****	4.51	4.39	4.46	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1551	****	4.81	4.66	4.70	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1503	****	4.42	4.24	4.28	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1506	****	4.62	4.26	4.30	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	622/1490	4.33	4.46	4.05	4.11	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.45	4.26	4.28	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.35	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.53	4.00	4.10	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: THTR 421 0101
 Title ACTING SHAKESPEARE
 Instructor: MEHTA, XERXES J
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1664
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	102/1669	4.93	4.63	4.23	4.39	4.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	293/1666	4.71	4.48	4.19	4.22	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	847/1421	4.21	4.39	4.24	4.38	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	207/1617	4.77	4.34	4.15	4.22	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	195/1555	4.71	4.29	4.00	4.08	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	390/1543	4.50	3.98	4.06	4.18	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1002/1647	4.08	4.21	4.12	4.14	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	807/1668	4.86	4.62	4.67	4.70	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	163/1605	4.77	4.39	4.07	4.16	4.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1514	****	4.51	4.39	4.45	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1551	****	4.81	4.66	4.73	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1503	****	4.42	4.24	4.27	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	232/1490	4.79	4.46	4.05	4.26	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	358/1502	4.79	4.45	4.26	4.46	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	776/1489	4.43	4.65	4.29	4.52	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	120/1006	4.82	4.53	4.00	4.21	4.82	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course Section: THTR 490 0101
 Title PRODUCTION WORKSHOP
 Instructor: ALLEN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1665
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.63	4.23	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	1028/1666	4.11	4.48	4.19	4.22	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.39	4.24	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	161/1617	4.80	4.34	4.15	4.22	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	159/1555	4.78	4.29	4.00	4.08	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.98	4.06	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	302/1647	4.67	4.21	4.12	4.14	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	591/1605	4.33	4.39	4.07	4.16	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1514	****	4.51	4.39	4.45	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1551	****	4.81	4.66	4.73	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1503	****	4.42	4.24	4.27	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1506	****	4.62	4.26	4.29	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	****	4.15	3.85	3.88	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.46	4.05	4.26	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.45	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	****	4.53	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

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