

Course-Section: THTR 100 0101
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1438
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1324/1481	4.06	4.67	4.29	4.14	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1420/1481	3.80	4.29	4.23	4.18	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	1136/1249	4.14	4.61	4.27	4.14	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1242/1424	3.62	4.43	4.21	4.06	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	3.00	1292/1396	3.24	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1332/1342	2.74	4.08	4.07	3.88	2.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	827/1459	4.16	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	839/1480	4.91	4.70	4.68	4.64	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1406/1450	3.60	4.29	4.09	3.97	2.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1238/1409	4.45	4.48	4.42	4.36	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1184/1407	4.71	4.86	4.69	4.57	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1381/1399	3.75	4.37	4.26	4.23	2.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	1256/1400	4.15	4.50	4.27	4.19	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	590/1179	3.48	4.31	3.96	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1146/1262	3.74	4.41	4.05	3.77	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1162/1259	3.13	4.36	4.29	4.06	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1212/1256	3.62	4.40	4.30	4.08	2.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	226/ 246	3.92	3.94	4.20	3.93	3.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	189/ 249	3.67	3.67	4.11	3.95	3.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	84/ 242	4.50	4.54	4.40	4.33	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 240	4.71	4.77	4.20	4.20	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 217	4.17	4.17	4.04	4.02	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1439
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	3	4.43	652/1481	4.06	4.67	4.29	4.14	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1000/1481	3.80	4.29	4.23	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	718/1249	4.14	4.61	4.27	4.14	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	840/1424	3.62	4.43	4.21	4.06	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1042/1396	3.24	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	2	0	2.71	1322/1342	2.74	4.08	4.07	3.88	2.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1331/1459	4.16	4.14	4.16	4.17	3.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	797/1480	4.91	4.70	4.68	4.64	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	836/1450	3.60	4.29	4.09	3.97	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	865/1409	4.45	4.48	4.42	4.36	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	614/1407	4.71	4.86	4.69	4.57	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	801/1399	3.75	4.37	4.26	4.23	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	591/1400	4.15	4.50	4.27	4.19	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	1128/1179	3.48	4.31	3.96	3.85	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	931/1262	3.74	4.41	4.05	3.77	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	1094/1259	3.13	4.36	4.29	4.06	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1069/1256	3.62	4.40	4.30	4.08	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	****	4.68	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	64/ 246	3.92	3.94	4.20	3.93	4.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	145/ 249	3.67	3.67	4.11	3.95	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	229/ 242	4.50	4.54	4.40	4.33	3.60	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	91/ 240	4.71	4.77	4.20	4.20	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	165/ 217	4.17	4.17	4.04	4.02	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	48/ 69	4.00	4.73	4.35	4.14	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	47/ 68	3.50	4.58	3.92	3.80	3.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 59	5.00	4.60	4.30	4.00	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	28/ 51	4.00	3.90	4.00	3.44	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.70	4.60	5.00	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.67	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.88	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.63	****	

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1439
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 100 0103
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1440
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	2	2	2	3.71	1277/1481	4.06	4.67	4.29	4.14	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1226/1481	3.80	4.29	4.23	4.18	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	1001/1249	4.14	4.61	4.27	4.14	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	5	1	3.71	1207/1424	3.62	4.43	4.21	4.06	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1136/1396	3.24	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	1313/1342	2.74	4.08	4.07	3.88	2.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	854/1459	4.16	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.70	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1329/1450	3.60	4.29	4.09	3.97	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	682/1409	4.45	4.48	4.42	4.36	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1053/1407	4.71	4.86	4.69	4.57	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1178/1399	3.75	4.37	4.26	4.23	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1165/1400	4.15	4.50	4.27	4.19	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	945/1179	3.48	4.31	3.96	3.85	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	0	3.29	1074/1262	3.74	4.41	4.05	3.77	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	2	3	0	3.00	1162/1259	3.13	4.36	4.29	4.06	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1159/1256	3.62	4.40	4.30	4.08	3.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	194/ 246	3.92	3.94	4.20	3.93	3.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	230/ 249	3.67	3.67	4.11	3.95	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	63/ 242	4.50	4.54	4.40	4.33	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	147/ 240	4.71	4.77	4.20	4.20	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	129/ 217	4.17	4.17	4.04	4.02	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 100 0104
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1441
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	549/1481	4.06	4.67	4.29	4.14	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1481	3.80	4.29	4.23	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1249	4.14	4.61	4.27	4.14	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1361/1424	3.62	4.43	4.21	4.06	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1292/1396	3.24	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1269/1342	2.74	4.08	4.07	3.88	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	4.16	4.14	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.70	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	334/1450	3.60	4.29	4.09	3.97	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1409	4.45	4.48	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	4.71	4.86	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	567/1399	3.75	4.37	4.26	4.23	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1400	4.15	4.50	4.27	4.19	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	590/1179	3.48	4.31	3.96	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	3.74	4.41	4.05	3.77	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1162/1259	3.13	4.36	4.29	4.06	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	3.62	4.40	4.30	4.08	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	155/ 246	3.92	3.94	4.20	3.93	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	145/ 249	3.67	3.67	4.11	3.95	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 242	4.50	4.54	4.40	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	4.71	4.77	4.20	4.20	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0102
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1442
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	1/1481	4.81	4.67	4.29	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1481	4.39	4.29	4.23	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1249	4.77	4.61	4.27	4.14	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1424	4.46	4.43	4.21	4.06	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1083/1396	4.02	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	755/1342	4.03	4.08	4.07	3.88	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1256/1459	4.06	4.14	4.16	4.17	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	4.60	4.70	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	836/1450	4.20	4.29	4.09	3.97	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	762/1409	4.41	4.48	4.42	4.36	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	4.96	4.86	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1399	4.64	4.37	4.26	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1400	4.84	4.50	4.27	4.19	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	590/1179	4.35	4.31	3.96	3.85	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0102
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1443
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	1/1481	4.81	4.67	4.29	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1481	4.39	4.29	4.23	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1249	4.77	4.61	4.27	4.14	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1424	4.46	4.43	4.21	4.06	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1083/1396	4.02	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	755/1342	4.03	4.08	4.07	3.88	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1256/1459	4.06	4.14	4.16	4.17	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	4.60	4.70	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	836/1450	4.20	4.29	4.09	3.97	4.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1152/1409	4.41	4.48	4.42	4.36	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	4.96	4.86	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	4.64	4.37	4.26	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	4.84	4.50	4.27	4.19	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	590/1179	4.35	4.31	3.96	3.85	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0103
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1444
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	652/1481	4.81	4.67	4.29	4.14	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	632/1481	4.39	4.29	4.23	4.18	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	598/1249	4.77	4.61	4.27	4.14	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	863/1424	4.46	4.43	4.21	4.06	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	241/1396	4.02	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	649/1342	4.03	4.08	4.07	3.88	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	872/1459	4.06	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1295/1480	4.60	4.70	4.68	4.64	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	722/1450	4.20	4.29	4.09	3.97	4.17	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	865/1409	4.41	4.48	4.42	4.36	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	4.96	4.86	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	801/1399	4.64	4.37	4.26	4.23	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	521/1400	4.84	4.50	4.27	4.19	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	104/1179	4.35	4.31	3.96	3.85	4.83	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1445
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	233/1481	4.81	4.67	4.29	4.14	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	884/1481	4.39	4.29	4.23	4.18	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	405/1249	4.77	4.61	4.27	4.14	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	437/1424	4.46	4.43	4.21	4.06	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	297/1396	4.02	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	755/1342	4.03	4.08	4.07	3.88	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	460/1459	4.06	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1044/1480	4.60	4.70	4.68	4.64	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	217/1450	4.20	4.29	4.09	3.97	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	648/1409	4.41	4.48	4.42	4.36	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	728/1407	4.96	4.86	4.69	4.57	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	459/1399	4.64	4.37	4.26	4.23	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	250/1400	4.84	4.50	4.27	4.19	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	259/1179	4.35	4.31	3.96	3.85	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	507/1262	4.42	4.41	4.05	3.77	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.36	4.29	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	901/1256	4.25	4.40	4.30	4.08	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.68	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	3.67	3.67	4.11	3.95	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.17	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.90	4.00	3.44	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.67	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.88	4.75	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0105
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1446
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	210/1481	4.81	4.67	4.29	4.14	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	736/1481	4.39	4.29	4.23	4.18	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	184/1249	4.77	4.61	4.27	4.14	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	287/1424	4.46	4.43	4.21	4.06	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	707/1396	4.02	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	755/1342	4.03	4.08	4.07	3.88	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	276/1459	4.06	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1158/1480	4.60	4.70	4.68	4.64	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	722/1450	4.20	4.29	4.09	3.97	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	762/1409	4.41	4.48	4.42	4.36	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	4.96	4.86	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	753/1399	4.64	4.37	4.26	4.23	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	218/1400	4.84	4.50	4.27	4.19	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	340/1179	4.35	4.31	3.96	3.85	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1262	4.42	4.41	4.05	3.77	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.36	4.29	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	571/1256	4.25	4.40	4.30	4.08	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	155/ 246	4.00	3.94	4.20	3.93	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	189/ 249	3.67	3.67	4.11	3.95	3.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	84/ 242	4.67	4.54	4.40	4.33	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.77	4.20	4.20	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.17	4.04	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 110 0201
 Title INTRODUCTION TO ACTING
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1447
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	13	4.76	280/1481	4.76	4.67	4.29	4.14	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	560/1481	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.18	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1249	****	4.61	4.27	4.14	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	318/1424	4.63	4.43	4.21	4.06	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	7	6	4.00	707/1396	4.00	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	603/1342	4.19	4.08	4.07	3.88	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	890/1459	4.13	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.70	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.29	4.09	3.97	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	466/1409	4.73	4.48	4.42	4.36	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	335/1399	4.70	4.37	4.26	4.23	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	218/1400	4.83	4.50	4.27	4.19	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1179	****	4.31	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.41	4.05	3.77	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.36	4.29	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.40	4.30	4.08	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.68	4.00	3.80	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 17 Non-major 14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 0		

Course-Section: THTR 202 0101
 Title INTRO DRAMA LITERATURE
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1448
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	9	11	4.48	587/1481	4.48	4.67	4.29	4.40	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	10	4.43	632/1481	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.29	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	573/1249	4.45	4.61	4.27	4.36	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	557/1424	4.40	4.43	4.21	4.28	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	193/1396	4.67	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	7	9	4.19	592/1342	4.19	4.08	4.07	4.05	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	505/1459	4.48	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.70	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	546/1450	4.33	4.29	4.09	4.15	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	574/1409	4.65	4.48	4.42	4.47	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	614/1407	4.85	4.86	4.69	4.78	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.37	4.26	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	312/1400	4.75	4.50	4.27	4.34	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	5	6	7	4.00	590/1179	4.00	4.31	3.96	4.05	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	167/1262	4.80	4.41	4.05	4.11	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	304/1259	4.80	4.36	4.29	4.34	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	382/1256	4.73	4.40	4.30	4.28	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	192/ 788	4.47	4.68	4.00	3.98	4.47	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	3.94	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 249	****	3.67	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.54	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.77	4.20	4.58	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.17	4.04	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.73	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.58	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 59	****	4.60	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.90	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.70	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.67	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.88	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.71	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: THTR 202 0101
 Title INTRO DRAMA LITERATURE
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1448
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	21	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 211 0101
 Title HISTORY OF THEATRE II
 Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1449
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	613/1481	4.45	4.67	4.29	4.40	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	704/1481	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.29	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	11	9	4.32	695/1249	4.32	4.61	4.27	4.36	4.32	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	11	4.32	671/1424	4.32	4.43	4.21	4.28	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	5	12	4.29	476/1396	4.29	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	10	8	4.10	701/1342	4.10	4.08	4.07	4.05	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	8	10	4.29	749/1459	4.29	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	4	4.19	1260/1480	4.19	4.70	4.68	4.68	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	4	9	7	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.29	4.09	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.48	4.42	4.47	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	20	4.90	500/1407	4.90	4.86	4.69	4.78	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	4	12	4.24	846/1399	4.24	4.37	4.26	4.29	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	16	4.57	521/1400	4.57	4.50	4.27	4.34	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	442/1179	4.25	4.31	3.96	4.05	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	797/1262	3.90	4.41	4.05	4.11	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.36	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	680/1256	4.40	4.40	4.30	4.28	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 788	****	4.68	4.00	3.98	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.73	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.58	3.92	3.55	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 11	Graduate	0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 3	Other	16

Course-Section: THTR 221 0201
 Title CRAFT OF ACTING II
 Instructor: MEHTA, XERXES J
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1450
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	0	12	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.67	4.29	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	219/1481	4.77	4.29	4.23	4.29	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	7	4.75	245/1249	4.75	4.61	4.27	4.36	4.75		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	209/1424	4.77	4.43	4.21	4.28	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	584/1396	4.17	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	394/1342	4.42	4.08	4.07	4.05	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	367/1459	4.58	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1215/1480	4.25	4.70	4.68	4.68	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	99/1450	4.90	4.29	4.09	4.15	4.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	101/1262	4.92	4.41	4.05	4.11	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	266/1259	4.85	4.36	4.29	4.34	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	345/1256	4.77	4.40	4.30	4.28	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.68	4.00	3.98	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	36/ 55	4.67	4.67	4.55	4.44	4.67	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	24/ 31	4.88	4.88	4.75	4.50	4.88	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.66	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	2	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	29/ 34	4.71	4.71	4.83	4.43	4.71	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.82	5.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 13
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	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: THTR 223 0201
 Title: VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I
 Instructor: WATSON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1451
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	12	4.80	233/1481	4.80	4.67	4.29	4.40	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	811/1481	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.29	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	8	4.80	203/1249	4.80	4.61	4.27	4.36	4.80		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	557/1424	4.40	4.43	4.21	4.28	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	594/1396	4.15	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	5	6	4.07	713/1342	4.07	4.08	4.07	4.05	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	872/1459	4.14	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	561/1480	4.93	4.70	4.68	4.68	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	732/1450	4.15	4.29	4.09	4.15	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	682/1409	4.57	4.48	4.42	4.47	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	400/1407	4.93	4.86	4.69	4.78	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	491/1399	4.57	4.37	4.26	4.29	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.50	4.27	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	464/1179	4.22	4.31	3.96	4.05	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	264/1262	4.67	4.41	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	524/1259	4.58	4.36	4.29	4.34	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.40	4.30	4.28	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	213/ 788	4.42	4.68	4.00	3.98	4.42	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.67	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.88	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.71	4.83	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	11	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	12				
				? 1						

Course-Section: THTR 231 0101
 Title DRAFTING FOR THE THEAT
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1452
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	5	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	749/1481	4.33	4.67	4.29	4.40	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1160/1481	3.83	4.29	4.23	4.29	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	2	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1275/1424	3.50	4.43	4.21	4.28	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	1	0	2	2.83	1337/1396	2.83	4.07	3.98	3.94	2.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1342	****	4.08	4.07	4.05	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	1356/1459	3.17	4.14	4.16	4.17	3.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.70	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1406/1450	2.75	4.29	4.09	4.15	2.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	1404/1409	2.20	4.48	4.42	4.47	2.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	1334/1407	3.83	4.86	4.69	4.78	3.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	1375/1399	2.60	4.37	4.26	4.29	2.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	1376/1400	2.40	4.50	4.27	4.34	2.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	590/1179	4.00	4.31	3.96	4.05	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	1239/1262	2.25	4.41	4.05	4.11	2.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	1240/1259	2.25	4.36	4.29	4.34	2.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	2	0	0	0	1.50	1252/1256	1.50	4.40	4.30	4.28	1.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	****	4.68	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	3.94	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	3.67	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 242	****	4.54	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.77	4.20	4.58	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 217	****	4.17	4.04	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	5.00	4.44	4.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.58	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	4.60	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	3.90	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	4.70	4.60	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.67	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	4.88	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.66	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: THTR 231 0101
 Title DRAFTING FOR THE THEAT
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1452
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 233 0101
 Title COSTUME DESIGN
 Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1453
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	181/1481	4.88	4.67	4.29	4.40	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	822/1481	4.25	4.29	4.23	4.29	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.61	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	248/1424	4.71	4.43	4.21	4.28	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1396	****	4.07	3.98	3.94	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	****	4.08	4.07	4.05	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1256/1459	3.50	4.14	4.16	4.17	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.70	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	164/1450	4.75	4.29	4.09	4.15	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	483/1409	4.71	4.48	4.42	4.47	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	311/1399	4.71	4.37	4.26	4.29	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	361/1400	4.71	4.50	4.27	4.34	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	134/1179	4.75	4.31	3.96	4.05	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.41	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.36	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.40	4.30	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.68	4.00	3.98	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 234 0101
 Title MAKE-UP FOR THE STAGE
 Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1454
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	12	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.67	4.29	4.40	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	374/1481	4.63	4.29	4.23	4.29	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1249	****	4.61	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	354/1424	4.58	4.43	4.21	4.28	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1396	****	4.07	3.98	3.94	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1342	****	4.08	4.07	4.05	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	1233/1459	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.17	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	2	4.13	1309/1480	4.13	4.70	4.68	4.68	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	702/1450	4.19	4.29	4.09	4.15	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	618/1409	4.63	4.48	4.42	4.47	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	823/1407	4.75	4.86	4.69	4.78	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.37	4.26	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	670/1400	4.44	4.50	4.27	4.34	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	223/1179	4.57	4.31	3.96	4.05	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	437/1262	4.40	4.41	4.05	4.11	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	680/1259	4.40	4.36	4.29	4.34	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	809/1256	4.20	4.40	4.30	4.28	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.68	4.00	3.98	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	3.67	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	4.54	4.40	4.63	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.73	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.58	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	4.60	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.90	4.00	4.07	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.67	4.55	4.44	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: THTR 239 0101
 Title MOVEMENT FOR/ACTOR II
 Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1455
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	5	4.71	340/1481	4.76	4.67	4.29	4.40	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	264/1481	4.76	4.29	4.23	4.29	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	810/1249	4.33	4.61	4.27	4.36	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	334/1424	4.63	4.43	4.21	4.28	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	707/1396	4.43	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	920/1342	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.05	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	961/1459	4.29	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1349/1480	4.32	4.70	4.68	4.68	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	692/1450	4.45	4.29	4.09	4.15	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	968/1409	4.50	4.48	4.42	4.47	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	963/1407	4.83	4.86	4.69	4.78	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1002/1399	4.42	4.37	4.26	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	791/1400	4.54	4.50	4.27	4.34	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	590/1179	4.38	4.31	3.96	4.05	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	507/1262	4.67	4.41	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	276/1259	4.92	4.36	4.29	4.34	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	457/1256	4.83	4.40	4.30	4.28	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	254/ 788	4.51	4.68	4.00	3.98	4.33	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 1		

Course-Section: THTR 239 0201
 Title MOVEMENT FOR/ACTOR II
 Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1456
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	12	4.80	233/1481	4.76	4.67	4.29	4.40	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	183/1481	4.76	4.29	4.23	4.29	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	498/1249	4.33	4.61	4.27	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	287/1424	4.63	4.43	4.21	4.28	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	96/1396	4.43	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	649/1342	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.05	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	378/1459	4.29	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	966/1480	4.32	4.70	4.68	4.68	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	196/1450	4.45	4.29	4.09	4.15	4.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	559/1409	4.50	4.48	4.42	4.47	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1407	4.83	4.86	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	187/1399	4.42	4.37	4.26	4.29	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	312/1400	4.54	4.50	4.27	4.34	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	134/1179	4.38	4.31	3.96	4.05	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1262	4.67	4.41	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1259	4.92	4.36	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1256	4.83	4.40	4.30	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	124/ 788	4.51	4.68	4.00	3.98	4.69	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.67	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.88	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.71	4.83	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 4					
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major 7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	13			
				? 0					

Course-Section: THTR 242 0101
 Title PRESENTATION SKILLS
 Instructor: WATSON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1457
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	4	7	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.67	4.29	4.40	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.29	4.23	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	679/1249	4.33	4.61	4.27	4.36	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.43	4.21	4.28	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	877/1396	3.80	4.07	3.98	3.94	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	987/1342	3.75	4.08	4.07	4.05	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	595/1459	4.42	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.70	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	238/1450	4.64	4.29	4.09	4.15	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	290/1409	4.83	4.48	4.42	4.47	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	450/1407	4.92	4.86	4.69	4.78	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	187/1399	4.83	4.37	4.26	4.29	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	131/1400	4.92	4.50	4.27	4.34	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	259/1179	4.50	4.31	3.96	4.05	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	320/1262	4.56	4.41	4.05	4.11	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	229/1259	4.89	4.36	4.29	4.34	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.40	4.30	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	133/ 788	4.67	4.68	4.00	3.98	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 250 0101
 Title INTRO PRODUCTION TECH
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1458
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1481	4.50	4.67	4.29	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1481	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.29	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.61	4.27	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.43	4.21	4.28	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.07	3.98	3.94	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.08	4.07	4.05	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1459	4.25	4.14	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1215/1480	4.53	4.70	4.68	4.68	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	164/1450	4.38	4.29	4.09	4.15	4.75

Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 59	4.00	4.60	4.30	4.67	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 51	4.25	3.90	4.00	4.07	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 36	4.75	4.70	4.60	4.64	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.26	4.69	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.80	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 250 0201
 Title INTRO PRODUCTION TECH
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1459
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1069/1481	4.50	4.67	4.29	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1286/1481	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.29	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1424	5.00	4.43	4.21	4.28	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1256/1459	4.25	4.14	4.16	4.17	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	839/1480	4.53	4.70	4.68	4.68	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	836/1450	4.38	4.29	4.09	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1031/1409	4.25	4.48	4.42	4.47	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.86	4.69	4.78	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1277/1399	3.33	4.37	4.26	4.29	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1183/1400	3.67	4.50	4.27	4.34	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.31	3.96	4.05	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	995/1262	3.50	4.41	4.05	4.11	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1094/1259	3.50	4.36	4.29	4.34	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1167/1256	3.00	4.40	4.30	4.28	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 246	****	3.94	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	3.67	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.54	4.40	4.63	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.17	4.04	4.28	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.83	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	53/ 59	4.00	4.60	4.30	4.67	3.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	40/ 51	4.25	3.90	4.00	4.07	3.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	24/ 36	4.75	4.70	4.60	4.64	4.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.26	4.69	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.67	4.55	4.44	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	4.71	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1460
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.67	4.29	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1420/1481	3.00	4.29	4.23	4.29	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.70	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.29	4.09	4.15	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 321 0101
 Title SCRIPT ANALYSIS
 Instructor: MEHTA, XERXES J
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1461
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	11	4.92	143/1481	4.92	4.67	4.29	4.29	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	162/1481	4.83	4.29	4.23	4.23	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.61	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	122/1424	4.92	4.43	4.21	4.27	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.07	3.98	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	86/1342	4.91	4.08	4.07	4.12	4.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	101/1459	4.91	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.70	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	135/1450	4.82	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1409	****	4.48	4.42	4.43	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1407	****	4.86	4.69	4.67	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1399	****	4.37	4.26	4.27	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1400	****	4.50	4.27	4.28	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1179	****	4.31	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	113/1262	4.92	4.41	4.05	4.14	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	190/1259	4.92	4.36	4.29	4.34	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	194/1256	4.92	4.40	4.30	4.34	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	78/ 788	4.90	4.68	4.00	4.07	4.90	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.70	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.53	4.66	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 63	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.56	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	24/ 69	4.92	4.73	4.35	4.48	4.92	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	21/ 68	4.83	4.58	3.92	4.43	4.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
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 325 0101
 Title VOCAL TRAINING ACTOR I
 Instructor: WATSON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1462
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	8	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.67	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.29	4.23	4.23	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.61	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	318/1424	4.63	4.43	4.21	4.27	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	241/1396	4.60	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	542/1342	4.25	4.08	4.07	4.12	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	224/1459	4.71	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.70	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	111/1450	4.88	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	231/1409	4.88	4.48	4.42	4.43	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.37	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	312/1400	4.75	4.50	4.27	4.28	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	99/1179	4.86	4.31	3.96	4.02	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	205/1262	4.75	4.41	4.05	4.14	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.36	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1256	4.88	4.40	4.30	4.34	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	105/ 788	4.75	4.68	4.00	4.07	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: THTR 335 0101
 Title ADVANCED LIGHTING DESI
 Instructor: COBB, MILTON T.
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1463
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	1/1481	5.00	4.67	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.29	4.23	4.23	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.61	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.43	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.07	3.98	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.08	4.07	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.14	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.70	4.68	4.65	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.29	4.09	4.10	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.48	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.37	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.28	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.31	3.96	4.02	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.41	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.36	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.40	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.68	4.00	4.07	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.70	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.53	4.66	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 63	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.56	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.48	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.58	3.92	4.43	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 339 0101
 Title ADV PRODUCTION TECHNQU
 Instructor: COBB, MILTON T.
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1464
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.67	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.29	4.23	4.23	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.61	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.43	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.07	3.98	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.08	4.07	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	695/1459	4.33	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.70	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	217/1450	4.67	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.48	4.42	4.43	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.37	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	791/1400	4.33	4.50	4.27	4.28	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.31	3.96	4.02	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.41	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.36	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.40	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.68	4.00	4.07	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.70	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.53	4.66	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 63	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.56	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.48	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.58	3.92	4.43	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 59	5.00	4.60	4.30	4.48	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	3.90	4.00	4.13	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.70	4.60	4.33	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.00	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 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 3	Non-major 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: THTR 346 0101
 Title THEATRE & SOCIAL DEVEL
 Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1465
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	0	0	6	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.67	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1160/1481	3.83	4.29	4.23	4.23	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.61	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.43	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1083/1396	3.50	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.70	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	630/1450	4.25	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.48	4.42	4.43	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.37	4.26	4.27	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.50	4.27	4.28	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1179	****	4.31	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1262	4.80	4.41	4.05	4.14	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	509/1259	4.60	4.36	4.29	4.34	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	296/1256	4.80	4.40	4.30	4.34	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	152/ 788	4.60	4.68	4.00	4.07	4.60	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 59	5.00	4.60	4.30	4.48	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	47/ 51	2.00	3.90	4.00	4.13	2.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	27/ 36	4.00	4.70	4.60	4.33	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 350 0101
 Title DIRECTING I
 Instructor: ALLEN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1466
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	6	4.56	505/1481	4.56	4.67	4.29	4.29	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	950/1481	4.11	4.29	4.23	4.23	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.61	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1108/1424	3.88	4.43	4.21	4.27	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	0	4	3.56	1054/1396	3.56	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	905/1342	3.88	4.08	4.07	4.12	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	2	1	1	2	2.88	1407/1459	2.88	4.14	4.16	4.17	2.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.70	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	741/1450	4.14	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	483/1409	4.71	4.48	4.42	4.43	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.37	4.26	4.27	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.50	4.27	4.28	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	384/1179	4.33	4.31	3.96	4.02	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.41	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.36	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.40	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.68	4.00	4.07	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	8	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: THTR 361 0101
 Title MODERN THEATRE II
 Instructor: McCULLY, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1467
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	8	4.89	173/1481	4.89	4.67	4.29	4.29	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	458/1481	4.56	4.29	4.23	4.23	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.61	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	144/1424	4.89	4.43	4.21	4.27	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	126/1396	4.78	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	91/1342	4.89	4.08	4.07	4.12	4.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	775/1459	4.25	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1238/1480	4.22	4.70	4.68	4.65	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	504/1450	4.38	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	968/1409	4.33	4.48	4.42	4.43	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	545/1407	4.89	4.86	4.69	4.67	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	513/1399	4.56	4.37	4.26	4.27	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	541/1400	4.56	4.50	4.27	4.28	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	590/1179	4.00	4.31	3.96	4.02	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	134/1262	4.89	4.41	4.05	4.14	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.36	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	457/1256	4.67	4.40	4.30	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	501/ 788	3.86	4.68	4.00	4.07	3.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: THTR 371 0101
 Title WRITING FOR THE THEATR
 Instructor: McCULLY, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1468
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	8	4.64	428/1481	4.64	4.67	4.29	4.29	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	589/1481	4.45	4.29	4.23	4.23	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1249	****	4.61	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.43	4.21	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	985/1396	3.67	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	112/1342	4.80	4.08	4.07	4.12	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	1063/1459	3.89	4.14	4.16	4.17	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	1200/1480	4.27	4.70	4.68	4.65	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	179/1450	4.73	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	891/1409	4.40	4.48	4.42	4.43	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	883/1399	4.20	4.37	4.26	4.27	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	250/1400	4.80	4.50	4.27	4.28	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1179	****	4.31	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	284/1262	4.63	4.41	4.05	4.14	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	238/1259	4.88	4.36	4.29	4.34	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1256	4.88	4.40	4.30	4.34	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	83/ 788	4.86	4.68	4.00	4.07	4.86	

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 1		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: THTR 390 0101
 Title THEATRE IN PRODUCTION
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1469
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	11	4.92	143/1481	4.92	4.67	4.29	4.29	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	822/1481	4.25	4.29	4.23	4.23	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	245/1249	4.75	4.61	4.27	4.28	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	533/1424	4.43	4.43	4.21	4.27	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	0	7	4.18	564/1396	4.18	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.08	4.07	4.12	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	749/1459	4.29	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.70	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	692/1450	4.20	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.48	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.37	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1400	4.75	4.50	4.27	4.28	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.31	3.96	4.02	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1262	****	4.41	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1259	****	4.36	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1256	****	4.40	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.68	4.00	4.07	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	4.60	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.90	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.70	4.60	4.33	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 490 0101
 Title PRODUCTION WORKSHOP
 Instructor: ALLEN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1470
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	652/1481	4.43	4.67	4.29	4.45	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	5	2	3.50	1320/1481	3.50	4.29	4.23	4.32	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	595/1424	4.38	4.43	4.21	4.35	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	877/1396	3.80	4.07	3.98	4.09	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.08	4.07	4.21	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	9	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1297/1459	3.40	4.14	4.16	4.25	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	561/1480	4.93	4.70	4.68	4.74	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	741/1450	4.14	4.29	4.09	4.28	4.14	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	684/1262	4.07	4.41	4.05	4.33	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	402/1259	4.71	4.36	4.29	4.57	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	173/1256	4.93	4.40	4.30	4.60	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	105/ 788	4.75	4.68	4.00	4.26	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 14 Non-major 11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 8	
			? 1		