

Course-Section: THTR 100 0101  
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP  
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1549  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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 | 1 | 3.75 | 1345/1576  | 3.44 | 4.47   | 4.30 | 4.11 | 3.75  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 939/1576   | 3.75 | 4.48   | 4.27 | 4.18 | 4.25  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | 972/1342   | 3.71 | 4.53   | 4.32 | 4.19 | 4.00  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3.50 | 1362/1520  | 3.64 | 4.42   | 4.25 | 4.09 | 3.50  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3.50 | 1242/1465  | 3.06 | 4.25   | 4.12 | 4.02 | 3.50  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.50 | 1204/1434  | 3.48 | 4.17   | 4.14 | 3.94 | 3.50  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 1459/1547  | 3.17 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.10 | 3.00  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 1324/1574  | 4.60 | 4.68   | 4.64 | 4.59 | 4.25  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 924/1554   | 3.75 | 4.44   | 4.10 | 4.01 | 4.00  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.75 | 1353/1488  | 4.00 | 4.60   | 4.47 | 4.41 | 3.75  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 908/1493   | 4.63 | 4.90   | 4.73 | 4.65 | 4.75  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 959/1486   | 3.94 | 4.51   | 4.32 | 4.26 | 4.25  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 | 1255/1489  | 3.88 | 4.55   | 4.32 | 4.22 | 3.75  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 533/1277   | 3.69 | 4.31   | 4.03 | 3.91 | 4.25  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 157/ 234   | 4.50 | 4.50   | 4.23 | 4.08 | 4.00  |      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 234/ 240   | 4.00 | 4.00   | 4.35 | 4.29 | 3.00  |      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 226/ 229   | 4.00 | 4.00   | 4.51 | 4.43 | 3.00  |      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 232     | 5.00 | 5.00   | 4.29 | 4.27 | 5.00  |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 2           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 379     | 5.00 | 4.94   | 4.20 | 4.15 | 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 1 | Graduate 0  | Major 0     |
| 28-55          | 0        | 1.00-1.99       | 1       | B 1  |                       |   |             |
| 56-83          | 1        | 2.00-2.99       | 0       | C 0  | General 1             | Under-grad 4  | Non-major 4 |
| 84-150         | 0        | 3.00-3.49       | 0       | D 0  |                       |   |             |
| Grad.          | 0        | 3.50-4.00       | 1       | F 0  | Electives 0           | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |             |
|                |          |                 |         | P 0  |                       |   |             |
|                |          |                 |         | I 0  | Other 2               |   |             |
|                |          |                 |         | ? 0  |                       |   |             |

Course-Section: THTR 100 0102  
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP  
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1550  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | 1148/1576  | 3.44 | 4.47   | 4.30 | 4.11 | 4.00  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 1138/1576  | 3.75 | 4.48   | 4.27 | 4.18 | 4.00  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.60 | 1184/1342  | 3.71 | 4.53   | 4.32 | 4.19 | 3.60  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.80 | 1232/1520  | 3.64 | 4.42   | 4.25 | 4.09 | 3.80  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3.40 | 1292/1465  | 3.06 | 4.25   | 4.12 | 4.02 | 3.40  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 524/1434   | 3.48 | 4.17   | 4.14 | 3.94 | 4.40  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.00 | 1459/1547  | 3.17 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.10 | 3.00  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 665/1574   | 4.60 | 4.68   | 4.64 | 4.59 | 4.80  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | 924/1554   | 3.75 | 4.44   | 4.10 | 4.01 | 4.00  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 1           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.25 | 1428/1488  | 4.00 | 4.60   | 4.47 | 4.41 | 3.25  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 1355/1493  | 4.63 | 4.90   | 4.73 | 4.65 | 4.25  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 959/1486   | 3.94 | 4.51   | 4.32 | 4.26 | 4.25  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 1           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.75 | 1255/1489  | 3.88 | 4.55   | 4.32 | 4.22 | 3.75  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 | 889/1277   | 3.69 | 4.31   | 4.03 | 3.91 | 3.75  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 2           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.67 | 1000/1279  | 4.33 | 4.51   | 4.17 | 3.96 | 3.67  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 2           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 1208/1270  | 4.00 | 4.50   | 4.35 | 4.09 | 3.00  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 2           | 0  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.33 | 1253/1269  | 3.67 | 4.36   | 4.35 | 4.09 | 2.33  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 2           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 878  | **** | 4.48   | 4.05 | 3.91 | ****  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 234     | 4.50 | 4.50   | 4.23 | 4.08 | 5.00  |      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 240     | 4.00 | 4.00   | 4.35 | 4.29 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 229     | 4.00 | 4.00   | 4.51 | 4.43 | 5.00  |      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 232     | 5.00 | 5.00   | 4.29 | 4.27 | 5.00  |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 3           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 379  | 5.00 | 4.94   | 4.20 | 4.15 | ****  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 375  | **** | 3.29   | 4.01 | 3.78 | ****  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 326  | **** | 3.34   | 4.03 | 3.64 | ****  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 382  | 3.00 | 3.50   | 4.08 | 3.86 | ****  |      |

Frequency Distribution

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

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1551  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |   |   |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | 1148/1576  | 3.44 | 4.47   | 4.30 | 4.11 | 4.00  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.75 | 1311/1576  | 3.75 | 4.48   | 4.27 | 4.18 | 3.75  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.25 | 1269/1342  | 3.71 | 4.53   | 4.32 | 4.19 | 3.25  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.25 | 1438/1520  | 3.64 | 4.42   | 4.25 | 4.09 | 3.25  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 1  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2.33 | 1456/1465  | 3.06 | 4.25   | 4.12 | 4.02 | 2.33  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 1  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | 1380/1434  | 3.48 | 4.17   | 4.14 | 3.94 | 3.00  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 1  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.67 | 1506/1547  | 3.17 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.10 | 2.67  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 1262/1574  | 4.60 | 4.68   | 4.64 | 4.59 | 4.33  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 924/1554   | 3.75 | 4.44   | 4.10 | 4.01 | 4.00  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 1233/1488  | 4.00 | 4.60   | 4.47 | 4.41 | 4.00  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 1210/1493  | 4.63 | 4.90   | 4.73 | 4.65 | 4.50  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.25 | 959/1486   | 3.94 | 4.51   | 4.32 | 4.26 | 4.25  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | 1118/1489  | 3.88 | 4.55   | 4.32 | 4.22 | 4.00  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.75 | 889/1277   | 3.69 | 4.31   | 4.03 | 3.91 | 3.75  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1279     | 4.33 | 4.51   | 4.17 | 3.96 | 5.00  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1270     | 4.00 | 4.50   | 4.35 | 4.09 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1269     | 3.67 | 4.36   | 4.35 | 4.09 | 5.00  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 313/ 382   | 3.00 | 3.50   | 4.08 | 3.86 | 3.00  |      |

Frequency Distribution

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



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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1553  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |   |   |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1576     | 4.76 | 4.47   | 4.30 | 4.11 | 5.00  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1576     | 4.80 | 4.48   | 4.27 | 4.18 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 709/1342   | 4.52 | 4.53   | 4.32 | 4.19 | 4.40  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 197/1520   | 4.74 | 4.42   | 4.25 | 4.09 | 4.80  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 206/1465   | 4.15 | 4.25   | 4.12 | 4.02 | 4.75  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 323/1434   | 4.20 | 4.17   | 4.14 | 3.94 | 4.60  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 186/1547   | 4.78 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.10 | 4.80  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1574     | 4.81 | 4.68   | 4.64 | 4.59 | 5.00  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 194/1554   | 4.94 | 4.44   | 4.10 | 4.01 | 4.75  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 750/1488   | 4.67 | 4.60   | 4.47 | 4.41 | 4.60  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1493     | 4.95 | 4.90   | 4.73 | 4.65 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1486     | 5.00 | 4.51   | 4.32 | 4.26 | 5.00  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1489     | 4.95 | 4.55   | 4.32 | 4.22 | 5.00  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 132/1277   | 4.89 | 4.31   | 4.03 | 3.91 | 4.80  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 802/1279   | 3.78 | 4.51   | 4.17 | 3.96 | 4.00  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | 1091/1270  | 3.58 | 4.50   | 4.35 | 4.09 | 3.67  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 2           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.33 | 1163/1269  | 3.32 | 4.36   | 4.35 | 4.09 | 3.33  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 382  | **** | 3.50   | 4.08 | 3.86 | ****  |      |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0102  
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME  
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1554  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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 | 243/1576   | 4.76 | 4.47   | 4.30 | 4.11 | 4.80  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 476/1576   | 4.80 | 4.48   | 4.27 | 4.18 | 4.60  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 240/1342   | 4.52 | 4.53   | 4.32 | 4.19 | 4.80  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 197/1520   | 4.74 | 4.42   | 4.25 | 4.09 | 4.80  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 366/1465   | 4.15 | 4.25   | 4.12 | 4.02 | 4.50  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 151/1434   | 4.20 | 4.17   | 4.14 | 3.94 | 4.80  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1547     | 4.78 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.10 | 5.00  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 665/1574   | 4.81 | 4.68   | 4.64 | 4.59 | 4.80  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1554     | 4.94 | 4.44   | 4.10 | 4.01 | 5.00  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1488     | 4.67 | 4.60   | 4.47 | 4.41 | 5.00  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 810/1493   | 4.95 | 4.90   | 4.73 | 4.65 | 4.80  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1486     | 5.00 | 4.51   | 4.32 | 4.26 | 5.00  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 309/1489   | 4.95 | 4.55   | 4.32 | 4.22 | 4.80  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1277     | 4.89 | 4.31   | 4.03 | 3.91 | 5.00  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 665/1279   | 3.78 | 4.51   | 4.17 | 3.96 | 4.25  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.25 | 1181/1270  | 3.58 | 4.50   | 4.35 | 4.09 | 3.25  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 1           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.25 | 1180/1269  | 3.32 | 4.36   | 4.35 | 4.09 | 3.25  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 1           | 3  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 878  | 4.00 | 4.48   | 4.05 | 3.91 | ****  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 379  | **** | 4.94   | 4.20 | 4.15 | ****  |      |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0103  
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME  
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1555  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | NR | NA | Frequencies |   |   |   |   | Instructor |           | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
|   |    |    | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean       | Rank      |             |           |           |            |           |
| General   |    |    |             |   |   |   |   |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course     | 0  | 0  | 1           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.00       | 1148/1576 | 4.76        | 4.47      | 4.30      | 4.11       | 4.00      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40       | 759/1576  | 4.80        | 4.48      | 4.27      | 4.18       | 4.40      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.40       | 709/1342  | 4.52        | 4.53      | 4.32      | 4.19       | 4.40      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60       | 395/1520  | 4.74        | 4.42      | 4.25      | 4.09       | 4.60      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0  | 2  | 1           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.00       | 1386/1465 | 4.15        | 4.25      | 4.12      | 4.02       | 3.00      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0  | 0  | 1           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.60       | 1172/1434 | 4.20        | 4.17      | 4.14      | 3.94       | 3.60      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60       | 411/1547  | 4.78        | 4.21      | 4.19      | 4.10       | 4.60      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75       | 758/1574  | 4.81        | 4.68      | 4.64      | 4.59       | 4.75      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00       | 1/1554    | 4.94        | 4.44      | 4.10      | 4.01       | 5.00      |
| Lecture   |    |    |             |   |   |   |   |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 2  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00       | 1/1488    | 4.67        | 4.60      | 4.47      | 4.41       | 5.00      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00       | 1/1493    | 4.95        | 4.90      | 4.73      | 4.65       | 5.00      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00       | 1/1486    | 5.00        | 4.51      | 4.32      | 4.26       | 5.00      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00       | 1/1489    | 4.95        | 4.55      | 4.32      | 4.22       | 5.00      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 1  | 1  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00       | 1/1277    | 4.89        | 4.31      | 4.03      | 3.91       | 5.00      |
| Discussion  |    |    |             |   |   |   |   |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 3  | 0  | 1           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00       | 1270/1279 | 3.78        | 4.51      | 4.17      | 3.96       | 2.00      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 3  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00       | 1208/1270 | 3.58        | 4.50      | 4.35      | 4.09       | 3.00      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 3  | 0  | 0           | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00       | 1259/1269 | 3.32        | 4.36      | 4.35      | 4.09       | 2.00      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 4  | 0  | 1           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00       | ****/ 878 | 4.00        | 4.48      | 4.05      | 3.91       | ****      |
| Laboratory  |    |    |             |   |   |   |   |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 4  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00       | ****/ 234 | ****        | 4.50      | 4.23      | 4.08       | ****      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 4  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00       | ****/ 240 | ****        | 4.00      | 4.35      | 4.29       | ****      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 4  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00       | ****/ 229 | ****        | 4.00      | 4.51      | 4.43       | ****      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 4  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00       | ****/ 232 | ****        | 5.00      | 4.29      | 4.27       | ****      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 4  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00       | ****/ 379 | ****        | 4.94      | 4.20      | 4.15       | ****      |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0104  
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME  
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1556  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | NR | NA | Frequencies |   |   |   |      | Instructor |        | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|------|------------|--------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
|   |    |    | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5    | Mean       | Rank   |             |           |           |            |           |
| General   |    |    |             |   |   |   |      |            |        |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course     | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4    | 5.00       | 1/1576 | 4.76        | 4.47      | 4.30      | 4.11       | 5.00      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4    | 5.00       | 1/1576 | 4.80        | 4.48      | 4.27      | 4.18       | 5.00      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 583/1342   | 4.52   | 4.53        | 4.32      | 4.19      | 4.50       |           |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 249/1520   | 4.74   | 4.42        | 4.25      | 4.09      | 4.75       |           |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 647/1465   | 4.15   | 4.25        | 4.12      | 4.02      | 4.25       |           |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | 878/1434   | 4.20   | 4.17        | 4.14      | 3.94      | 4.00       |           |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 238/1547   | 4.78   | 4.21        | 4.19      | 4.10      | 4.75       |           |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 758/1574   | 4.81   | 4.68        | 4.64      | 4.59      | 4.75       |           |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2  | 1  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1554     | 4.94   | 4.44        | 4.10      | 4.01      | 5.00       |           |
| Lecture   |    |    |             |   |   |   |      |            |        |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 505/1488   | 4.67   | 4.60        | 4.47      | 4.41      | 4.38       |           |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1493     | 4.95   | 4.90        | 4.73      | 4.65      | 5.00       |           |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1486     | 5.00   | 4.51        | 4.32      | 4.26      | 5.00       |           |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1489     | 4.95   | 4.55        | 4.32      | 4.22      | 5.00       |           |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 159/1277   | 4.89   | 4.31        | 4.03      | 3.91      | 4.75       |           |
| Discussion  |    |    |             |   |   |   |      |            |        |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 603/1279   | 3.78   | 4.51        | 4.17      | 3.96      | 4.33       |           |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 1  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 928/1270   | 3.58   | 4.50        | 4.35      | 4.09      | 4.00       |           |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 1  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 928/1269   | 3.32   | 4.36        | 4.35      | 4.09      | 4.00       |           |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 1  | 2  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 464/ 878   | 4.00   | 4.48        | 4.05      | 3.91      | 4.00       |           |
| Field Work  |    |    |             |   |   |   |      |            |        |             |           |           |            |           |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 3  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 251/ 326   | 3.00   | 3.34        | 4.03      | 3.64      | 3.00       |           |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type                | Majors |   |   |           |   |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------|---|---|-----------|---|
| 00-27          | 2        | 0.00-0.99       | A 3     | Required for Majors | 1      | Graduate  | 0 | Major     | 2 |
| 28-55          | 0        | 1.00-1.99       | B 1     |                     |        |   |   |           |   |
| 56-83          | 0        | 2.00-2.99       | C 0     | General             | 1      | Under-grad  | 4 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150         | 0        | 3.00-3.49       | D 0     |                     |        |   |   |           |   |
| Grad.          | 0        | 3.50-4.00       | F 0     | Electives           | 0      | #### - 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: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1557  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1576     | 4.76 | 4.47   | 4.30 | 4.11 | 5.00  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1576     | 4.80 | 4.48   | 4.27 | 4.18 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 583/1342   | 4.52 | 4.53   | 4.32 | 4.19 | 4.50  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 249/1520   | 4.74 | 4.42   | 4.25 | 4.09 | 4.75  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 647/1465   | 4.15 | 4.25   | 4.12 | 4.02 | 4.25  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | 878/1434   | 4.20 | 4.17   | 4.14 | 3.94 | 4.00  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 238/1547   | 4.78 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.10 | 4.75  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 758/1574   | 4.81 | 4.68   | 4.64 | 4.59 | 4.75  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 1233/1488  | 4.67 | 4.60   | 4.47 | 4.41 | 4.38  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 603/1279   | 3.78 | 4.51   | 4.17 | 3.96 | 4.33  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 928/1270   | 3.58 | 4.50   | 4.35 | 4.09 | 4.00  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 928/1269   | 3.32 | 4.36   | 4.35 | 4.09 | 4.00  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 1           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 464/ 878   | 4.00 | 4.48   | 4.05 | 3.91 | 4.00  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 251/ 326   | 3.00 | 3.34   | 4.03 | 3.64 | 3.00  |      |

Frequency Distribution

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

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: THTR 110 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTION TO ACTING  
 Instructor: YATES, PEGGY  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1558  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |    |    |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|----|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5  | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5  | 13 | 4.72 | 335/1576   | 4.72 | 4.47   | 4.30 | 4.11 | 4.72  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3  | 15 | 4.83 | 201/1576   | 4.83 | 4.48   | 4.27 | 4.18 | 4.83  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5  | 12 | 4.71 | 302/1520   | 4.71 | 4.42   | 4.25 | 4.09 | 4.71  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4  | 7  | 4.00 | 850/1465   | 4.00 | 4.25   | 4.12 | 4.02 | 4.00  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6  | 7  | 4.18 | 768/1434   | 4.18 | 4.17   | 4.14 | 3.94 | 4.18  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6  | 8  | 4.11 | 963/1547   | 4.11 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.10 | 4.11  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 6  | 4.33 | 1262/1574  | 4.33 | 4.68   | 4.64 | 4.59 | 4.33  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7  | 8  | 4.38 | 571/1554   | 4.38 | 4.44   | 4.10 | 4.01 | 4.38  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 11 | 4.92 | 223/1488   | 4.92 | 4.60   | 4.47 | 4.41 | 4.92  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1493     | 5.00 | 4.90   | 4.73 | 4.65 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 7           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 10 | 4.91 | 172/1486   | 4.91 | 4.51   | 4.32 | 4.26 | 4.91  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 11 | 4.92 | 174/1489   | 4.92 | 4.55   | 4.32 | 4.22 | 4.92  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 6           | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 1  | 4.00 | ****/1277  | **** | 4.31   | 4.03 | 3.91 | ****  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2  | 8  | 4.80 | 219/1279   | 4.80 | 4.51   | 4.17 | 3.96 | 4.80  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1270     | 5.00 | 4.50   | 4.35 | 4.09 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1269     | 5.00 | 4.36   | 4.35 | 4.09 | 5.00  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 8           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 8  | 5.00 | 1/ 878     | 5.00 | 4.48   | 4.05 | 3.91 | 5.00  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 14          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 4  | 5.00 | ****/ 379  | **** | 4.94   | 4.20 | 4.15 | ****  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 16          | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 3.50 | ****/ 52   | **** | ****   | 4.48 | 4.20 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 16          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2  | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 48   | **** | ****   | 4.40 | 4.11 | ****  |      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 16          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 44   | **** | ****   | 4.73 | 4.71 | ****  |      |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 16          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0  | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 45   | **** | ****   | 4.57 | 4.72 | ****  |      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors  |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|---|
| 00-27          | 1        | 0.00-0.99       | 0       | A 12 | Required for Majors 4   |
| 28-55          | 6        | 1.00-1.99       | 0       | B 5  | Graduate 0  |
| 56-83          | 3        | 2.00-2.99       | 2       | C 0  | General 5   |
| 84-150         | 1        | 3.00-3.49       | 3       | D 0  | Under-grad 18   |
| Grad.          | 0        | 3.50-4.00       | 2       | F 0  | Non-major 17  |
|                |          |                 |         | P 0  | Electives 1   |
|                |          |                 |         | I 0  | Other 5   |
|                |          |                 |         | ? 0  | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |

Course-Section: THTR 202 0101  
 Title INTRO DRAMA LITERATURE  
 Instructor: KALEBA, CASEY  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1559  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |   |    |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 4.71 | 347/1576   | 4.71 | 4.47   | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.71  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 13 | 4.43 | 728/1576   | 4.43 | 4.48   | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.43  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 3           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 4.69 | 381/1342   | 4.69 | 4.53   | 4.32 | 4.41 | 4.69  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 1           | 4  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 9  | 4.44 | 631/1520   | 4.44 | 4.42   | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.44  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 4.86 | 148/1465   | 4.86 | 4.25   | 4.12 | 4.09 | 4.86  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2           | 6  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8  | 4.46 | 448/1434   | 4.46 | 4.17   | 4.14 | 4.06 | 4.46  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 1  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 9  | 4.10 | 971/1547   | 4.10 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.22 | 4.10  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 4.60 | 1003/1574  | 4.60 | 4.68   | 4.64 | 4.62 | 4.60  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 4.81 | 155/1554   | 4.81 | 4.44   | 4.10 | 4.05 | 4.81  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 4.86 | 324/1488   | 4.86 | 4.60   | 4.47 | 4.44 | 4.86  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 5.00 | 1/1493     | 5.00 | 4.90   | 4.73 | 4.75 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 4.76 | 325/1486   | 4.76 | 4.51   | 4.32 | 4.29 | 4.76  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 4.95 | 97/1489    | 4.95 | 4.55   | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.95  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 1           | 3  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 4.41 | 394/1277   | 4.41 | 4.31   | 4.03 | 4.01 | 4.41  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 5.00 | 1/1279     | 5.00 | 4.51   | 4.17 | 4.14 | 5.00  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 4.94 | 182/1270   | 4.94 | 4.50   | 4.35 | 4.30 | 4.94  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 5.00 | 1/1269     | 5.00 | 4.36   | 4.35 | 4.29 | 5.00  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 5           | 11 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3  | 4.00 | ****/ 878  | **** | 4.48   | 4.05 | 3.92 | ****  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 19          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 234  | **** | 4.50   | 4.23 | 4.44 | ****  |      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 19          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 4.50 | ****/ 240  | **** | 4.00   | 4.35 | 4.47 | ****  |      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 19          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 229  | **** | 4.00   | 4.51 | 4.65 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 19          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 232  | **** | 5.00   | 4.29 | 4.38 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 14          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5  | 4.83 | 34/ 379    | 4.83 | 4.94   | 4.20 | 4.29 | 4.83  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 18          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3  | 5.00 | ****/ 85   | **** | ****   | 4.72 | 4.78 | ****  |      |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 18          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3  | 5.00 | ****/ 79   | **** | ****   | 4.69 | 4.72 | ****  |      |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 18          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2  | 4.67 | ****/ 72   | **** | ****   | 4.64 | 4.83 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 18          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3  | 5.00 | ****/ 80   | **** | ****   | 4.61 | 4.80 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 14          | 0  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2  | 3.57 | 206/ 375   | 3.57 | 3.29   | 4.01 | 4.21 | 3.57  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 19          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2  | 5.00 | ****/ 52   | **** | ****   | 4.48 | 4.74 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 19          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1  | 4.00 | ****/ 48   | **** | ****   | 4.40 | 4.71 | ****  |      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 19          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 44   | **** | ****   | 4.73 | 4.69 | ****  |      |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 19          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1  | 4.00 | ****/ 45   | **** | ****   | 4.57 | 4.64 | ****  |      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 15          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2  | 3.80 | ****/ 326  | **** | 3.34   | 4.03 | 4.43 | ****  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 18          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2  | 4.33 | ****/ 40   | **** | ****   | 4.60 | 5.00 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 18          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1  | 3.67 | ****/ 24   | **** | ****   | 4.83 | 5.00 | ****  |      |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 18          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2  | 4.67 | ****/ 35   | **** | ****   | 4.67 | 5.00 | ****  |      |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 18          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 4.50 | ****/ 28   | **** | ****   | 4.78 | 5.00 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 18          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2  | 5.00 | ****/ 382  | **** | 3.50   | 4.08 | 4.39 | ****  |      |

Course-Section: THTR 202 0101  
 Title INTRO DRAMA LITERATURE  
 Instructor: KALEBA, CASEY  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1559  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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               | 8 | Required for Majors | 6    | Graduate  | 0  | Major     | 8  |
| 28-55          | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 9 |                     |      |   |    |           |    |
| 56-83          | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C               | 0 | General             | 4    | Under-grad  | 21 | Non-major | 13 |
| 84-150         | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D               | 1 |                     |      |   |    |           |    |
| 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 |                     |      |   |    |           |    |

Course-Section: THTR 211 0101  
 Title HISTORY OF THEATRE II  
 Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1560  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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  | 18 | 4.74 | 324/1576   | 4.74 | 4.47   | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.74  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8  | 13 | 4.48 | 653/1576   | 4.48 | 4.48   | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.48  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4  | 18 | 4.74 | 321/1342   | 4.74 | 4.53   | 4.32 | 4.41 | 4.74  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 1           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6  | 11 | 4.33 | 768/1520   | 4.33 | 4.42   | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.33  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5  | 16 | 4.57 | 328/1465   | 4.57 | 4.25   | 4.12 | 4.09 | 4.57  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 6  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6  | 9  | 4.35 | 574/1434   | 4.35 | 4.17   | 4.14 | 4.06 | 4.35  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7  | 14 | 4.59 | 422/1547   | 4.59 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.22 | 4.59  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8  | 15 | 4.65 | 927/1574   | 4.65 | 4.68   | 4.64 | 4.62 | 4.65  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 8  | 4.29 | 682/1554   | 4.29 | 4.44   | 4.10 | 4.05 | 4.29  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4  | 15 | 4.70 | 624/1488   | 4.70 | 4.60   | 4.47 | 4.44 | 4.70  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2  | 18 | 4.90 | 557/1493   | 4.90 | 4.90   | 4.73 | 4.75 | 4.90  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5  | 14 | 4.65 | 484/1486   | 4.65 | 4.51   | 4.32 | 4.29 | 4.65  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 18 | 4.85 | 251/1489   | 4.85 | 4.55   | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.85  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 3           | 4  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3  | 9  | 4.31 | 480/1277   | 4.31 | 4.31   | 4.03 | 4.01 | 4.31  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 13          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2  | 8  | 4.80 | 219/1279   | 4.80 | 4.51   | 4.17 | 4.14 | 4.80  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 14          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 9  | 5.00 | 1/1270     | 5.00 | 4.50   | 4.35 | 4.30 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 14          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 9  | 5.00 | 1/1269     | 5.00 | 4.36   | 4.35 | 4.29 | 5.00  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 14          | 3  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 3  | 3.83 | 589/ 878   | 3.83 | 4.48   | 4.05 | 3.92 | 3.83  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 20          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 2  | 4.67 | ****/ 379  | **** | 4.94   | 4.20 | 4.29 | ****  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 21          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 0  | 3.50 | ****/ 375  | **** | 3.29   | 4.01 | 4.21 | ****  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 22          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 326  | **** | 3.34   | 4.03 | 4.43 | ****  |      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |                     |    |   |    |           |    |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27          | 1        | 0.00-0.99       | 0       | A    | 8      | Required for Majors | 0  | Graduate  | 0  | Major     | 9  |
| 28-55          | 3        | 1.00-1.99       | 0       | B    | 11     |                     |    |   |    |           |    |
| 56-83          | 1        | 2.00-2.99       | 1       | C    | 2      | General             | 1  | Under-grad  | 23 | Non-major | 14 |
| 84-150         | 5        | 3.00-3.49       | 5       | D    | 0      |                     |    |   |    |           |    |
| Grad.          | 0        | 3.50-4.00       | 8       | F    | 0      | Electives           | 1  | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |    |           |    |
|                |          |                 |         | P    | 0      |                     |    |   |    |           |    |
|                |          |                 |         | I    | 0      | Other               | 20 |   |    |           |    |
|                |          |                 |         | ?    | 0      |                     |    |   |    |           |    |

Course-Section: THTR 221 0101  
 Title CRAFT OF ACTING II  
 Instructor: MUSON, EVE  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1561  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |   |   |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1576     | 4.86 | 4.47   | 4.30 | 4.35 | 5.00  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 476/1576   | 4.73 | 4.48   | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.60  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 3           | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1342     | 5.00 | 4.53   | 4.32 | 4.41 | 5.00  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1520     | 4.79 | 4.42   | 4.25 | 4.26 | 5.00  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1465     | 4.86 | 4.25   | 4.12 | 4.09 | 5.00  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1434     | 4.43 | 4.17   | 4.14 | 4.06 | 5.00  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 3           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | 1041/1547  | 3.83 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.22 | 4.00  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4.20 | 1367/1574  | 4.60 | 4.68   | 4.64 | 4.62 | 4.20  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | 924/1554   | 4.20 | 4.44   | 4.10 | 4.05 | 4.00  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1488     | 4.88 | 4.60   | 4.47 | 4.44 | 5.00  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1493     | 4.88 | 4.90   | 4.73 | 4.75 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1486     | 4.75 | 4.51   | 4.32 | 4.29 | 5.00  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1489     | 4.63 | 4.55   | 4.32 | 4.31 | 5.00  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 5           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1277  | **** | 4.31   | 4.03 | 4.01 | ****  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1279     | 4.88 | 4.51   | 4.17 | 4.14 | 5.00  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1270     | 4.88 | 4.50   | 4.35 | 4.30 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1269     | 5.00 | 4.36   | 4.35 | 4.29 | 5.00  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 7           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 379  | **** | 4.94   | 4.20 | 4.29 | ****  |      |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 221 0201  
 Title CRAFT OF ACTING II  
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1562  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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 | 347/1576   | 4.86 | 4.47   | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.71  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 187/1576   | 4.73 | 4.48   | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.86  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1342     | 5.00 | 4.53   | 4.32 | 4.41 | 5.00  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 429/1520   | 4.79 | 4.42   | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.57  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 231/1465   | 4.86 | 4.25   | 4.12 | 4.09 | 4.71  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3.86 | 1033/1434  | 4.43 | 4.17   | 4.14 | 4.06 | 3.86  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3.67 | 1276/1547  | 3.83 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.22 | 3.67  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1574     | 4.60 | 4.68   | 4.64 | 4.62 | 5.00  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 532/1554   | 4.20 | 4.44   | 4.10 | 4.05 | 4.40  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 505/1488   | 4.88 | 4.60   | 4.47 | 4.44 | 4.75  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 908/1493   | 4.88 | 4.90   | 4.73 | 4.75 | 4.75  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 678/1486   | 4.75 | 4.51   | 4.32 | 4.29 | 4.50  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 955/1489   | 4.63 | 4.55   | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.25  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 3           | 3  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1277  | **** | 4.31   | 4.03 | 4.01 | ****  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 262/1279   | 4.88 | 4.51   | 4.17 | 4.14 | 4.75  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 412/1270   | 4.88 | 4.50   | 4.35 | 4.30 | 4.75  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1269     | 5.00 | 4.36   | 4.35 | 4.29 | 5.00  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 3           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.50 | 709/ 878   | 3.50 | 4.48   | 4.05 | 3.92 | 3.50  |      |

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

Course-Section: THTR 223 0101  
 Title: VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I  
 Instructor: WATSON, LYNN  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1563  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | NR | NA | Frequencies |   |   |   |    | Instructor |           | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
|   |    |    | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | Mean       | Rank      |             |           |           |            |           |
| -----   |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| General   |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6  | 4.33       | 861/1576  | 4.33        | 4.47      | 4.30      | 4.35       | 4.33      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7  | 4.50       | 608/1576  | 4.50        | 4.48      | 4.27      | 4.32       | 4.50      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0  | 4  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4  | 4.50       | 583/1342  | 4.50        | 4.53      | 4.32      | 4.41       | 4.50      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9  | 4.75       | 249/1520  | 4.75        | 4.42      | 4.25      | 4.26       | 4.75      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0  | 3  | 0           | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5  | 4.33       | 571/1465  | 4.33        | 4.25      | 4.12      | 4.09       | 4.33      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4  | 4.17       | 777/1434  | 4.17        | 4.17      | 4.14      | 4.06       | 4.17      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5  | 4.17       | 924/1547  | 4.17        | 4.21      | 4.19      | 4.22       | 4.17      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92       | 422/1574  | 4.92        | 4.68      | 4.64      | 4.62       | 4.92      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2  | 1  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 6 | 2  | 4.11       | 860/1554  | 4.11        | 4.44      | 4.10      | 4.05       | 4.11      |
| Lecture   |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 7  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3  | 4.60       | 750/1488  | 4.60        | 4.60      | 4.47      | 4.44       | 4.60      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 7  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5  | 5.00       | 1/1493    | 5.00        | 4.90      | 4.73      | 4.75       | 5.00      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 7  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2  | 4.20       | 1003/1486 | 4.20        | 4.51      | 4.32      | 4.29       | 4.20      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 7  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3  | 4.40       | 813/1489  | 4.40        | 4.55      | 4.32      | 4.31       | 4.40      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 7  | 3  | 0           | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 3.50       | ****/1277 | ****        | 4.31      | 4.03      | 4.01       | ****      |
| Discussion  |    |    |             |   |   |   |    |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 8  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3  | 4.75       | 262/1279  | 4.75        | 4.51      | 4.17      | 4.14       | 4.75      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 9  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3  | 5.00       | 1/1270    | 5.00        | 4.50      | 4.35      | 4.30       | 5.00      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 8  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2  | 4.50       | 644/1269  | 4.50        | 4.36      | 4.35      | 4.29       | 4.50      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 8  | 1  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3  | 5.00       | 1/ 878    | 5.00        | 4.48      | 4.05      | 3.92       | 5.00      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type                | Majors  |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27          | 1        | 0.00-0.99       | A 5     | Required for Majors | 0   |
| 28-55          | 1        | 1.00-1.99       | B 3     |                     | Graduate 0  |
| 56-83          | 2        | 2.00-2.99       | C 0     | General             | 0   |
| 84-150         | 0        | 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               | 9   |
|                |          |                 | ? 0     |                     |   |



Course-Section: THTR 231 0101  
 Title DRAFTING FOR THE THEAT  
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1564  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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 | 1/1576     | 5.00 | 4.47   | 4.30 | 4.35 | 5.00  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1576     | 5.00 | 4.48   | 4.27 | 4.32 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1342     | 5.00 | 4.53   | 4.32 | 4.41 | 5.00  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1520     | 5.00 | 4.42   | 4.25 | 4.26 | 5.00  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 148/1465   | 4.86 | 4.25   | 4.12 | 4.09 | 4.86  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1434  | **** | 4.17   | 4.14 | 4.06 | ****  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 141/1547   | 4.88 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.22 | 4.88  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 972/1574   | 4.63 | 4.68   | 4.64 | 4.62 | 4.63  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4.43 | 504/1554   | 4.43 | 4.44   | 4.10 | 4.05 | 4.43  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 589/1488   | 4.71 | 4.60   | 4.47 | 4.44 | 4.71  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1493     | 5.00 | 4.90   | 4.73 | 4.75 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 596/1486   | 4.57 | 4.51   | 4.32 | 4.29 | 4.57  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1489     | 5.00 | 4.55   | 4.32 | 4.31 | 5.00  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 1           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 309/1277   | 4.50 | 4.31   | 4.03 | 4.01 | 4.50  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 335/1279   | 4.67 | 4.51   | 4.17 | 4.14 | 4.67  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1270     | 5.00 | 4.50   | 4.35 | 4.30 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 535/1269   | 4.67 | 4.36   | 4.35 | 4.29 | 4.67  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 5           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 878  | **** | 4.48   | 4.05 | 3.92 | ****  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 7           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 382  | **** | 3.50   | 4.08 | 4.39 | ****  |      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type                | Majors     |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|------------|
| 00-27          | 0        | 0.00-0.99       | A 3     | Required for Majors | 0          |
| 28-55          | 1        | 1.00-1.99       | B 5     |                     | Graduate   |
| 56-83          | 1        | 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     |                     |            |
|                |          |                 | ? 0     |                     |            |

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: THTR 232 0101  
 Title SCENE DESIGN  
 Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1565  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | NR | NA | Frequencies |   |   |   |   | Instructor |           | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
|   |    |    | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean       | Rank      |             |           |           |            |           |
| General   |    |    |             |   |   |   |   |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course     | 0  | 0  | 1           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.17       | 1042/1576 | 4.17        | 4.47      | 4.30      | 4.35       | 4.17      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3.83       | 1275/1576 | 3.83        | 4.48      | 4.27      | 4.32       | 3.83      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0  | 5  | 0           | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.00       | ****/1342 | ****        | 4.53      | 4.32      | 4.41       | ****      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0  | 2  | 0           | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.25       | 1438/1520 | 3.25        | 4.42      | 4.25      | 4.26       | 3.25      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0  | 1  | 0           | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.20       | 708/1465  | 4.20        | 4.25      | 4.12      | 4.09       | 4.20      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0  | 1  | 0           | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3.40       | 1263/1434 | 3.40        | 4.17      | 4.14      | 4.06       | 3.40      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0  | 0  | 1           | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.17       | 1432/1547 | 3.17        | 4.21      | 4.19      | 4.22       | 3.17      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50       | 1079/1574 | 4.50        | 4.68      | 4.64      | 4.62       | 4.50      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4.17       | 805/1554  | 4.17        | 4.44      | 4.10      | 4.05       | 4.17      |
| Lecture   |    |    |             |   |   |   |   |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 4  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00       | 1/1488    | 5.00        | 4.60      | 4.47      | 4.44       | 5.00      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 4  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00       | 1/1493    | 5.00        | 4.90      | 4.73      | 4.75       | 5.00      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 4  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00       | 1101/1486 | 4.00        | 4.51      | 4.32      | 4.29       | 4.00      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 4  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50       | 1313/1489 | 3.50        | 4.55      | 4.32      | 4.31       | 3.50      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 4  | 1  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00       | ****/1277 | ****        | 4.31      | 4.03      | 4.01       | ****      |
| Discussion  |    |    |             |   |   |   |   |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 5  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00       | ****/1279 | ****        | 4.51      | 4.17      | 4.14       | ****      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 5  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00       | ****/1270 | ****        | 4.50      | 4.35      | 4.30       | ****      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 5  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00       | ****/1269 | ****        | 4.36      | 4.35      | 4.29       | ****      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 5  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00       | ****/ 878 | ****        | 4.48      | 4.05      | 3.92       | ****      |
| Seminar   |    |    |             |   |   |   |   |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 5  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00       | ****/ 375 | ****        | 3.29      | 4.01      | 4.21       | ****      |

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 1     |                     | Graduate   |
| 56-83          | 1        | 2.00-2.99       | C 0     | General             | 0          |
| 84-150         | 0        | 3.00-3.49       | D 0     |                     | Under-grad |
| Grad.          | 0        | 3.50-4.00       | F 0     | Electives           | 6          |
|                |          |                 | P 0     |                     |            |
|                |          |                 | I 0     |                     |            |
|                |          |                 | ? 0     |                     |            |
|                |          |                 |         |                     | 1          |

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: THTR 234 0101  
 Title MAKE-UP FOR THE STAGE  
 Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1566  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |   |   |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 235/1576   | 4.82 | 4.47   | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.82  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4.45 | 683/1576   | 4.45 | 4.48   | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.45  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 1           | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1342  | **** | 4.53   | 4.32 | 4.41 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 1           | 4  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4.29 | 826/1520   | 4.29 | 4.42   | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.29  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1           | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1434  | **** | 4.17   | 4.14 | 4.06 | ****  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 1           | 5  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 527/1547   | 4.50 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.22 | 4.50  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 4.73 | 813/1574   | 4.73 | 4.68   | 4.64 | 4.62 | 4.73  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 4.27 | 692/1554   | 4.27 | 4.44   | 4.10 | 4.05 | 4.27  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 324/1488   | 4.86 | 4.60   | 4.47 | 4.44 | 4.86  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 632/1493   | 4.88 | 4.90   | 4.73 | 4.75 | 4.88  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 678/1486   | 4.50 | 4.51   | 4.32 | 4.29 | 4.50  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 378/1489   | 4.75 | 4.55   | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.75  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 4           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 463/1277   | 4.33 | 4.31   | 4.03 | 4.01 | 4.33  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1279  | **** | 4.51   | 4.17 | 4.14 | ****  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1270  | **** | 4.50   | 4.35 | 4.30 | ****  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1269  | **** | 4.36   | 4.35 | 4.29 | ****  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 10          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 878  | **** | 4.48   | 4.05 | 3.92 | ****  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 11          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 379  | **** | 4.94   | 4.20 | 4.29 | ****  |      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |                     |   |   |    |           |   |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27          | 0        | 0.00-0.99       | 0       | A    | 9      | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate  | 0  | Major     | 5 |
| 28-55          | 1        | 1.00-1.99       | 0       | B    | 1      |                     |   |   |    |           |   |
| 56-83          | 1        | 2.00-2.99       | 0       | C    | 0      | General             | 1 | Under-grad  | 12 | Non-major | 7 |
| 84-150         | 3        | 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               | 9 |   |    |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | ?    | 1      |                     |   |   |    |           |   |

Course-Section: THTR 239 0101  
 Title MOVEMT II:ALEXANDER TE  
 Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1567  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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 | 11 | 4.85 | 211/1576   | 4.85 | 4.47   | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.85  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4.77 | 267/1576   | 4.77 | 4.48   | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.77  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 143/1342   | 4.92 | 4.53   | 4.32 | 4.41 | 4.92  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 124/1520   | 4.92 | 4.42   | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.92  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.75 | 206/1465   | 4.75 | 4.25   | 4.12 | 4.09 | 4.75  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 4.85 | 134/1434   | 4.85 | 4.17   | 4.14 | 4.06 | 4.85  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7  | 4.58 | 434/1547   | 4.58 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.22 | 4.58  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 4  | 4.31 | 1288/1574  | 4.31 | 4.68   | 4.64 | 4.62 | 4.31  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8  | 4.80 | 160/1554   | 4.80 | 4.44   | 4.10 | 4.05 | 4.80  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7  | 5.00 | 1/1488     | 5.00 | 4.60   | 4.47 | 4.44 | 5.00  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7  | 5.00 | 1/1493     | 5.00 | 4.90   | 4.73 | 4.75 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6  | 4.86 | 221/1486   | 4.86 | 4.51   | 4.32 | 4.29 | 4.86  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6  | 4.86 | 251/1489   | 4.86 | 4.55   | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.86  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 5           | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4  | 4.80 | 132/1277   | 4.80 | 4.31   | 4.03 | 4.01 | 4.80  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 7           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5  | 4.83 | 204/1279   | 4.83 | 4.51   | 4.17 | 4.14 | 4.83  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 7           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6  | 5.00 | 1/1270     | 5.00 | 4.50   | 4.35 | 4.30 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 7           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6  | 5.00 | 1/1269     | 5.00 | 4.36   | 4.35 | 4.29 | 5.00  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 7           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4  | 4.60 | 187/ 878   | 4.60 | 4.48   | 4.05 | 3.92 | 4.60  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1  | 4.33 | ****/ 379  | **** | 4.94   | 4.20 | 4.29 | ****  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 12          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 375  | **** | 3.29   | 4.01 | 4.21 | ****  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 12          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 52   | **** | ****   | 4.48 | 4.74 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 12          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 48   | **** | ****   | 4.40 | 4.71 | ****  |      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 12          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 44   | **** | ****   | 4.73 | 4.69 | ****  |      |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 12          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 45   | **** | ****   | 4.57 | 4.64 | ****  |      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0  | 3.38 | 196/ 326   | 3.38 | 3.34   | 4.03 | 4.43 | 3.38  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1  | 3.67 | ****/ 382  | **** | 3.50   | 4.08 | 4.39 | ****  |      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |                     |   |   |    |           |   |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27          | 1        | 0.00-0.99       | 0       | A    | 6      | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate  | 0  | Major     | 9 |
| 28-55          | 2        | 1.00-1.99       | 0       | B    | 1      |                     |   |   |    |           |   |
| 56-83          | 2        | 2.00-2.99       | 1       | C    | 0      | General             | 0 | Under-grad  | 13 | Non-major | 4 |
| 84-150         | 0        | 3.00-3.49       | 0       | D    | 0      |                     |   |   |    |           |   |
| Grad.          | 0        | 3.50-4.00       | 3       | F    | 0      | Electives           | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |    |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | P    | 0      |                     |   |   |    |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | I    | 0      | Other               | 9 |   |    |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | ?    | 0      |                     |   |   |    |           |   |

Course-Section: THTR 250 0101  
 Title INTRO PRODUCTION TECH  
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1568  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | NR | NA | Frequencies |   |   |   |   | 5    | Instructor Mean | Instructor Rank | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
|   |    |    | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 |   |      |                 |                 |             |           |           |            |           |
| General   |    |    |             |   |   |   |   |      |                 |                 |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course     | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1576          | 4.00            | 4.47        | 4.30      | 4.35      | 5.00       |           |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1576          | 4.25            | 4.48        | 4.27      | 4.32      | 5.00       |           |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0  | 5  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1342          | 5.00            | 4.53        | 4.32      | 4.41      | 5.00       |           |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0  | 1  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1547          | 4.25            | 4.21        | 4.19      | 4.22      | 5.00       |           |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 832/1574        | 4.86            | 4.68        | 4.64      | 4.62      | 4.71       |           |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1  | 1  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 160/1554        | 4.90            | 4.44        | 4.10      | 4.05      | 4.80       |           |
| Lecture   |    |    |             |   |   |   |   |      |                 |                 |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 6  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1488       | ****            | 4.60        | 4.47      | 4.44      | ****       |           |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 6  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1493       | ****            | 4.90        | 4.73      | 4.75      | ****       |           |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 6  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1486       | ****            | 4.51        | 4.32      | 4.29      | ****       |           |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 6  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1489       | ****            | 4.55        | 4.32      | 4.31      | ****       |           |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 6  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1277       | ****            | 4.31        | 4.03      | 4.01      | ****       |           |
| Discussion  |    |    |             |   |   |   |   |      |                 |                 |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 6  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1279       | ****            | 4.51        | 4.17      | 4.14      | ****       |           |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 6  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1270       | ****            | 4.50        | 4.35      | 4.30      | ****       |           |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 6  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1269       | ****            | 4.36        | 4.35      | 4.29      | ****       |           |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 6  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 878       | ****            | 4.48        | 4.05      | 3.92      | ****       |           |
| Laboratory  |    |    |             |   |   |   |   |      |                 |                 |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 6  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 234       | ****            | 4.50        | 4.23      | 4.44      | ****       |           |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 6  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 240       | ****            | 4.00        | 4.35      | 4.47      | ****       |           |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 6  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 229       | ****            | 4.00        | 4.51      | 4.65      | ****       |           |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 6  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 232       | ****            | 5.00        | 4.29      | 4.38      | ****       |           |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 250 0301  
 Title INTRO PRODUCTION TECH  
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1569  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | NR | NA | Frequencies |   |   |   |   | Instructor |           | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
|   |    |    | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean       | Rank      |             |           |           |            |           |
| -----   |    |    |             |   |   |   |   |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| General   |    |    |             |   |   |   |   |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course     | 0  | 0  | 1           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00       | 1539/1576 | 4.00        | 4.47      | 4.30      | 4.35       | 3.00      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50       | 1392/1576 | 4.25        | 4.48      | 4.27      | 4.32       | 3.50      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0  | 0  | 0           | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50       | 1347/1547 | 4.25        | 4.21      | 4.19      | 4.22       | 3.50      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00       | 1/1574    | 4.86        | 4.68      | 4.64      | 4.62       | 5.00      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00       | 1/1554    | 4.90        | 4.44      | 4.10      | 4.05       | 5.00      |
| Seminar   |    |    |             |   |   |   |   |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00       | 287/ 375  | 3.00        | 3.29      | 4.01      | 4.21       | 3.00      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|---|-----------|---|
| 00-27          | 0        | 0.00-0.99       | 0       | A    | 0      | 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    | 1      | General             | 0 | Under-grad  | 2 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150         | 1        | 3.00-3.49       | 1       | D    | 0      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
| Grad.          | 0        | 3.50-4.00       | 0       | F    | 0      | Electives           | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |   |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | P    | 0      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | I    | 0      | Other               | 2 |   |   |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | ?    | 0      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |

Course-Section: THTR 252 0101  
 Title THEATRE LAB  
 Instructor: COBB, MILTON T.  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1570  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   | Instructor |   | Course | Dept   | UMBC | Level | Sect |      |      |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|---|--------|--------|------|-------|------|------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4          | 5 | Mean   | Rank   | Mean | Mean  | Mean |      |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |            |   |        |        |      |       |      |      |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |            |   |        |        |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1 | 5.00   | 1/1576 | 5.00 | 4.47  | 4.30 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1 | 5.00   | 1/1576 | 5.00 | 4.48  | 4.27 | 4.32 | 5.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1 | 5.00   | 1/1547 | 5.00 | 4.21  | 4.19 | 4.22 | 5.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1 | 5.00   | 1/1574 | 5.00 | 4.68  | 4.64 | 4.62 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1 | 5.00   | 1/1554 | 5.00 | 4.44  | 4.10 | 4.05 | 5.00 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 321 0101  
 Title SCRIPT ANALYSIS  
 Instructor: MCCULLY, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1571  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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 | 6  | 12 | 4.38 | 808/1576   | 4.38 | 4.47   | 4.30 | 4.30 | 4.38  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5  | 12 | 4.38 | 785/1576   | 4.38 | 4.48   | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.38  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2  | 4  | 4.67 | 406/1342   | 4.67 | 4.53   | 4.32 | 4.30 | 4.67  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8  | 11 | 4.38 | 707/1520   | 4.38 | 4.42   | 4.25 | 4.25 | 4.38  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4  | 15 | 4.62 | 297/1465   | 4.62 | 4.25   | 4.12 | 4.09 | 4.62  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5  | 13 | 4.48 | 435/1434   | 4.48 | 4.17   | 4.14 | 4.15 | 4.48  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 1  | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8  | 6  | 3.95 | 1093/1547  | 3.95 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.21 | 3.95  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9  | 11 | 4.48 | 1115/1574  | 4.48 | 4.68   | 4.64 | 4.61 | 4.48  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 6  | 4.16 | 816/1554   | 4.16 | 4.44   | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.16  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6  | 13 | 4.68 | 638/1488   | 4.68 | 4.60   | 4.47 | 4.47 | 4.68  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2  | 17 | 4.89 | 582/1493   | 4.89 | 4.90   | 4.73 | 4.70 | 4.89  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5  | 9  | 4.28 | 944/1486   | 4.28 | 4.51   | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.28  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5  | 11 | 4.42 | 789/1489   | 4.42 | 4.55   | 4.32 | 4.34 | 4.42  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 2           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8  | 7  | 4.29 | 497/1277   | 4.29 | 4.31   | 4.03 | 4.11 | 4.29  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4  | 7  | 4.50 | 445/1279   | 4.50 | 4.51   | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.50  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1  | 8  | 4.42 | 726/1270   | 4.42 | 4.50   | 4.35 | 4.42 | 4.42  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2  | 8  | 4.50 | 644/1269   | 4.50 | 4.36   | 4.35 | 4.41 | 4.50  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 9           | 4  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 6  | 4.63 | 179/ 878   | 4.63 | 4.48   | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.63  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 18          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 2  | 4.67 | ****/ 379  | **** | 4.94   | 4.20 | 4.17 | ****  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 18          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0  | 1  | 3.67 | ****/ 382  | **** | 3.50   | 4.08 | 4.24 | ****  |      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |                     |    |   |    |           |    |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27          | 1        | 0.00-0.99       | 0       | A    | 13     | Required for Majors | 0  | Graduate  | 0  | Major     | 2  |
| 28-55          | 3        | 1.00-1.99       | 0       | B    | 6      |                     |    |   |    |           |    |
| 56-83          | 2        | 2.00-2.99       | 0       | C    | 1      | General             | 1  | Under-grad  | 21 | Non-major | 19 |
| 84-150         | 6        | 3.00-3.49       | 3       | D    | 0      |                     |    |   |    |           |    |
| Grad.          | 0        | 3.50-4.00       | 11      | F    | 0      | Electives           | 1  | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |    |           |    |
|                |          |                 |         | P    | 0      |                     |    |   |    |           |    |
|                |          |                 |         | I    | 0      | Other               | 17 |   |    |           |    |
|                |          |                 |         | ?    | 0      |                     |    |   |    |           |    |



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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1572  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |   |    |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4  | 4.20 | 1019/1576  | 4.20 | 4.47   | 4.30 | 4.30 | 4.20  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 2  | 4.00 | 1138/1576  | 4.00 | 4.48   | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.00  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 2  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2  | 3.63 | 1320/1520  | 3.63 | 4.42   | 4.25 | 4.25 | 3.63  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 2  | 3.80 | 1067/1465  | 3.80 | 4.25   | 4.12 | 4.09 | 3.80  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 5  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2  | 3.60 | 1172/1434  | 3.60 | 4.17   | 4.14 | 4.15 | 3.60  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 1  | 3.78 | 1231/1547  | 3.78 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.21 | 3.78  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1574     | 5.00 | 4.68   | 4.64 | 4.61 | 5.00  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1  | 3.88 | 1081/1554  | 3.88 | 4.44   | 4.10 | 4.09 | 3.88  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5  | 3.80 | 1343/1488  | 3.80 | 4.60   | 4.47 | 4.47 | 3.80  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1493     | 5.00 | 4.90   | 4.73 | 4.70 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3  | 3.50 | 1330/1486  | 3.50 | 4.51   | 4.32 | 4.32 | 3.50  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3  | 3.90 | 1192/1489  | 3.90 | 4.55   | 4.32 | 4.34 | 3.90  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 0           | 6  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1  | 4.00 | 692/1277   | 4.00 | 4.31   | 4.03 | 4.11 | 4.00  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 2  | 4.10 | 771/1279   | 4.10 | 4.51   | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.10  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 0           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3  | 3.90 | 1006/1270  | 3.90 | 4.50   | 4.35 | 4.42 | 3.90  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 0           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1  | 3.40 | 1142/1269  | 3.40 | 4.36   | 4.35 | 4.41 | 3.40  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 0           | 3  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3  | 4.14 | 425/ 878   | 4.14 | 4.48   | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.14  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 7           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3  | 5.00 | 1/ 379     | 5.00 | 4.94   | 4.20 | 4.17 | 5.00  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 375  | **** | 3.29   | 4.01 | 4.12 | ****  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1  | 4.00 | ****/ 382  | **** | 3.50   | 4.08 | 4.24 | ****  |      |

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          | 4        | 1.00-1.99       | B 1     |                     | Graduate 0  |
| 56-83          | 0        | 2.00-2.99       | C 0     | General             | 0   |
| 84-150         | 1        | 3.00-3.49       | D 0     |                     | Under-grad 10   |
| Grad.          | 0        | 3.50-4.00       | F 0     | Electives           | 0   |
|                |          |                 | P 0     |                     | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
|                |          |                 | I 0     | Other               | 10  |
|                |          |                 | ? 0     |                     |   |

Course-Section: THTR 329 0101  
 Title MOVEMENT FOR ACTOR III  
 Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1573  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |   |   |      | Instructor<br>Mean | Instructor<br>Rank | Course<br>Mean | Dept<br>Mean | UMBC<br>Mean | Level<br>Mean | Sect<br>Mean |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |      |                    |                    |                |              |              |               |              |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |                    |                    |                |              |              |               |              |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |                    |                    |                |              |              |               |              |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1576             | 5.00               | 4.47           | 4.30         | 4.30         | 5.00          |              |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1576             | 5.00               | 4.48           | 4.27         | 4.28         | 5.00          |              |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 1           | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1342             | 5.00               | 4.53           | 4.32         | 4.30         | 5.00          |              |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1520             | 5.00               | 4.42           | 4.25         | 4.25         | 5.00          |              |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1465             | 5.00               | 4.25           | 4.12         | 4.09         | 5.00          |              |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1434             | 5.00               | 4.17           | 4.14         | 4.15         | 5.00          |              |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1547             | 5.00               | 4.21           | 4.19         | 4.21         | 5.00          |              |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1574             | 5.00               | 4.68           | 4.64         | 4.61         | 5.00          |              |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1554             | 5.00               | 4.44           | 4.10         | 4.09         | 5.00          |              |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |                    |                    |                |              |              |               |              |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1488             | 5.00               | 4.60           | 4.47         | 4.47         | 5.00          |              |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1493             | 5.00               | 4.90           | 4.73         | 4.70         | 5.00          |              |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1486             | 5.00               | 4.51           | 4.32         | 4.32         | 5.00          |              |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1489             | 5.00               | 4.55           | 4.32         | 4.34         | 5.00          |              |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 1           | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1277          | ****               | 4.31           | 4.03         | 4.11         | ****          |              |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |                    |                    |                |              |              |               |              |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1279             | 5.00               | 4.51           | 4.17         | 4.20         | 5.00          |              |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1270             | 5.00               | 4.50           | 4.35         | 4.42         | 5.00          |              |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1269             | 5.00               | 4.36           | 4.35         | 4.41         | 5.00          |              |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/ 878             | 5.00               | 4.48           | 4.05         | 4.09         | 5.00          |              |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |                    |                    |                |              |              |               |              |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 379          | ****               | 4.94           | 4.20         | 4.17         | ****          |              |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |                    |                    |                |              |              |               |              |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 326          | ****               | 3.34           | 4.03         | 4.23         | ****          |              |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |                    |                    |                |              |              |               |              |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 382          | ****               | 3.50           | 4.08         | 4.24         | ****          |              |

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          | 3        | 1.00-1.99       | B 0     |                     | Graduate 0  |
| 56-83          | 0        | 2.00-2.99       | C 0     | General             | 0   |
| 84-150         | 1        | 3.00-3.49       | D 0     |                     | Under-grad 10   |
| Grad.          | 0        | 3.50-4.00       | F 0     | Electives           | 0   |
|                |          |                 | P 0     |                     | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
|                |          |                 | I 0     | Other               | 9   |
|                |          |                 | ? 0     |                     |   |

Course-Section: THTR 337 0101  
 Title ADVANCED SOUND DESIGN  
 Instructor: COBB, MILTON T.  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1574  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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 | 0 | 3 | 4.20 | 1019/1576  | 4.20 | 4.47   | 4.30 | 4.30 | 4.20  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 222/1576   | 4.80 | 4.48   | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.80  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 339/1520   | 4.67 | 4.42   | 4.25 | 4.25 | 4.67  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1547  | **** | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.21 | ****  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 665/1574   | 4.80 | 4.68   | 4.64 | 4.61 | 4.80  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 532/1554   | 4.40 | 4.44   | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.40  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 666/1488   | 4.67 | 4.60   | 4.47 | 4.47 | 4.67  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1493     | 5.00 | 4.90   | 4.73 | 4.70 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 891/1486   | 4.33 | 4.51   | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.33  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 888/1489   | 4.33 | 4.55   | 4.32 | 4.34 | 4.33  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 2           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 692/1277   | 4.00 | 4.31   | 4.03 | 4.11 | 4.00  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 445/1279   | 4.50 | 4.51   | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.50  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1270     | 5.00 | 4.50   | 4.35 | 4.42 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1269     | 5.00 | 4.36   | 4.35 | 4.41 | 5.00  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 185/ 382   | 4.00 | 3.50   | 4.08 | 4.24 | 4.00  |      |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 339 0101  
 Title ADV PRODUCTION TECHNQU  
 Instructor: SCHRAVEN, GREGG  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1575  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | NR | NA | Frequencies |   |   |   |   | Instructor |           | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
|   |    |    | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean       | Rank      |             |           |           |            |           |
| -----   |    |    |             |   |   |   |   |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| General   |    |    |             |   |   |   |   |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50       | 637/1576  | 4.50        | 4.47      | 4.30      | 4.30       | 4.50      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25       | 939/1576  | 4.25        | 4.48      | 4.27      | 4.28       | 4.25      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75       | 238/1547  | 4.75        | 4.21      | 4.19      | 4.21       | 4.75      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00       | 1/1574    | 5.00        | 4.68      | 4.64      | 4.61       | 5.00      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67       | 263/1554  | 4.67        | 4.44      | 4.10      | 4.09       | 4.67      |
| Seminar   |    |    |             |   |   |   |   |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 4  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00       | ****/ 375 | ****        | 3.29      | 4.01      | 4.12       | ****      |
| Field Work  |    |    |             |   |   |   |   |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 4  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00       | ****/ 326 | ****        | 3.34      | 4.03      | 4.23       | ****      |
| Self Paced  |    |    |             |   |   |   |   |            |           |             |           |           |            |           |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 4  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00       | ****/ 40  | ****        | ****      | 4.60      | 4.83       | ****      |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 4  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00       | ****/ 35  | ****        | ****      | 4.67      | 5.00       | ****      |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 4  | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00       | ****/ 28  | ****        | ****      | 4.78      | 5.00       | ****      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 3  | 1  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00       | ****/ 382 | ****        | 3.50      | 4.08      | 4.24       | ****      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type                | Majors  |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27          | 0        | 0.00-0.99       | A 5     | Required for Majors | 0   |
| 28-55          | 0        | 1.00-1.99       | B 0     |                     | Graduate 0  |
| 56-83          | 0        | 2.00-2.99       | C 0     | General             | 1   |
| 84-150         | 2        | 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               | 4   |
|                |          |                 | ? 0     |                     |   |

Course-Section: THTR 361 0101  
 Title MODERN THEATRE II  
 Instructor: MCCULLY, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1576  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |    |   |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|----|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5 | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |    |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3  | 8 | 4.73 | 335/1576   | 4.73 | 4.47   | 4.30 | 4.30 | 4.73  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6  | 4 | 4.27 | 920/1576   | 4.27 | 4.48   | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.27  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 8  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 2 | 4.33 | 770/1342   | 4.33 | 4.53   | 4.32 | 4.30 | 4.33  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5  | 5 | 4.36 | 731/1520   | 4.36 | 4.42   | 4.25 | 4.25 | 4.36  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4  | 7 | 4.64 | 284/1465   | 4.64 | 4.25   | 4.12 | 4.09 | 4.64  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3  | 6 | 4.50 | 398/1434   | 4.50 | 4.17   | 4.14 | 4.15 | 4.50  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2  | 6 | 4.27 | 816/1547   | 4.27 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.21 | 4.27  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 4.09 | 1427/1574  | 4.09 | 4.68   | 4.64 | 4.61 | 4.09  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7  | 2 | 4.22 | 742/1554   | 4.22 | 4.44   | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.22  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |    |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5  | 6 | 4.55 | 822/1488   | 4.55 | 4.60   | 4.47 | 4.47 | 4.55  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2  | 9 | 4.82 | 784/1493   | 4.82 | 4.90   | 4.73 | 4.70 | 4.82  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6  | 4 | 4.27 | 944/1486   | 4.27 | 4.51   | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.27  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4  | 7 | 4.64 | 539/1489   | 4.64 | 4.55   | 4.32 | 4.34 | 4.64  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 0           | 3  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3  | 4 | 4.25 | 533/1277   | 4.25 | 4.31   | 4.03 | 4.11 | 4.25  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |    |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1279     | 5.00 | 4.51   | 4.17 | 4.20 | 5.00  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1270     | 5.00 | 4.50   | 4.35 | 4.42 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1269     | 5.00 | 4.36   | 4.35 | 4.41 | 5.00  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 8           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 878  | **** | 4.48   | 4.05 | 4.09 | ****  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |    |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 375  | **** | 3.29   | 4.01 | 4.12 | ****  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |    |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 1 | 4.00 | 157/ 326   | 4.00 | 3.34   | 4.03 | 4.23 | 4.00  |      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |                     |    |   |    |           |   |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27          | 0        | 0.00-0.99       | 0       | A    | 6      | Required for Majors | 0  | Graduate  | 0  | Major     | 9 |
| 28-55          | 0        | 1.00-1.99       | 0       | B    | 5      |                     |    |   |    |           |   |
| 56-83          | 0        | 2.00-2.99       | 0       | C    | 0      | General             | 0  | Under-grad  | 11 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150         | 4        | 3.00-3.49       | 2       | D    | 0      |                     |    |   |    |           |   |
| Grad.          | 0        | 3.50-4.00       | 4       | F    | 0      | Electives           | 0  | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |    |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | P    | 0      |                     |    |   |    |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | I    | 0      | Other               | 11 |   |    |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | ?    | 0      |                     |    |   |    |           |   |

Course-Section: THTR 390 0101  
 Title THEATRE IN PRODUCTION  
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1577  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |   |    |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 1           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4.57 | 541/1576   | 4.57 | 4.47   | 4.30 | 4.30 | 4.57  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 4.64 | 420/1576   | 4.64 | 4.48   | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.64  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 1           | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3  | 4.75 | 298/1342   | 4.75 | 4.53   | 4.32 | 4.30 | 4.75  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 2           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.75 | 249/1520   | 4.75 | 4.42   | 4.25 | 4.25 | 4.75  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 1           | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5  | 4.71 | 231/1465   | 4.71 | 4.25   | 4.12 | 4.09 | 4.71  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1           | 4  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6  | 4.20 | 748/1434   | 4.20 | 4.17   | 4.14 | 4.15 | 4.20  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 1           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 6  | 4.38 | 708/1547   | 4.38 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.21 | 4.38  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9  | 4.69 | 866/1574   | 4.69 | 4.68   | 4.64 | 4.61 | 4.69  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5  | 4.36 | 584/1554   | 4.36 | 4.44   | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.36  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6  | 5.00 | 1/1488     | 5.00 | 4.60   | 4.47 | 4.47 | 5.00  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6  | 5.00 | 1/1493     | 5.00 | 4.90   | 4.73 | 4.70 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4  | 4.67 | 468/1486   | 4.67 | 4.51   | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.67  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4  | 4.67 | 500/1489   | 4.67 | 4.55   | 4.32 | 4.34 | 4.67  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 8           | 6  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 2.00 | ****/1277  | **** | 4.31   | 4.03 | 4.11 | ****  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 152/1279   | 4.92 | 4.51   | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.92  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1270     | 5.00 | 4.50   | 4.35 | 4.42 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1269     | 5.00 | 4.36   | 4.35 | 4.41 | 5.00  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 3           | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7  | 5.00 | 1/ 878     | 5.00 | 4.48   | 4.05 | 4.09 | 5.00  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 13          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 326  | **** | 3.34   | 4.03 | 4.23 | ****  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 12          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 4.00 | ****/ 382  | **** | 3.50   | 4.08 | 4.24 | ****  |      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |                     |   |   |    |           |    |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27          | 0        | 0.00-0.99       | 0       | A    | 13     | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate  | 0  | Major     | 3  |
| 28-55          | 1        | 1.00-1.99       | 0       | B    | 0      |                     |   |   |    |           |    |
| 56-83          | 1        | 2.00-2.99       | 0       | C    | 0      | General             | 1 | Under-grad  | 15 | Non-major | 12 |
| 84-150         | 2        | 3.00-3.49       | 3       | D    | 0      |                     |   |   |    |           |    |
| Grad.          | 0        | 3.50-4.00       | 7       | F    | 0      | Electives           | 2 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |    |           |    |
|                |          |                 |         | P    | 0      |                     |   |   |    |           |    |
|                |          |                 |         | I    | 0      | Other               | 9 |   |    |           |    |
|                |          |                 |         | ?    | 0      |                     |   |   |    |           |    |

Course-Section: THTR 490 0101  
 Title PRODUCTION WORKSHOP  
 Instructor: MUSON, EVE  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1578  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1576     | 5.00 | 4.47   | 4.30 | 4.46 | 5.00  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.83 | 201/1576   | 4.83 | 4.48   | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.83  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2  | 5.00 | ****/1342  | **** | 4.53   | 4.32 | 4.46 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 2  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9  | 4.60 | 395/1520   | 4.60 | 4.42   | 4.25 | 4.38 | 4.60  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1465     | 5.00 | 4.25   | 4.12 | 4.22 | 5.00  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 110/1434   | 4.91 | 4.17   | 4.14 | 4.30 | 4.91  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 3  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7  | 4.22 | 871/1547   | 4.22 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.22  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5  | 4.45 | 1140/1574  | 4.45 | 4.68   | 4.64 | 4.69 | 4.45  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9  | 4.90 | 116/1554   | 4.90 | 4.44   | 4.10 | 4.24 | 4.90  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 8           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3  | 4.25 | 1111/1488  | 4.25 | 4.60   | 4.47 | 4.55 | 4.25  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4  | 5.00 | 1/1493     | 5.00 | 4.90   | 4.73 | 4.80 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4  | 5.00 | 1/1486     | 5.00 | 4.51   | 4.32 | 4.41 | 5.00  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4  | 5.00 | 1/1489     | 5.00 | 4.55   | 4.32 | 4.38 | 5.00  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7  | 5.00 | 1/1279     | 5.00 | 4.51   | 4.17 | 4.31 | 5.00  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7  | 5.00 | 1/1270     | 5.00 | 4.50   | 4.35 | 4.53 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7  | 5.00 | 1/1269     | 5.00 | 4.36   | 4.35 | 4.55 | 5.00  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7  | 5.00 | 1/ 878     | 5.00 | 4.48   | 4.05 | 4.33 | 5.00  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 11          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 379  | **** | 4.94   | 4.20 | 4.19 | ****  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 11          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 52   | **** | ****   | 4.48 | 4.70 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 11          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 48   | **** | ****   | 4.40 | 4.30 | ****  |      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 11          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 44   | **** | ****   | 4.73 | 4.60 | ****  |      |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 11          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 45   | **** | ****   | 4.57 | 4.34 | ****  |      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 11          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 326  | **** | 3.34   | 4.03 | 3.97 | ****  |      |

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 0     |                     | Graduate  |
| 56-83          | 1        | 2.00-2.99       | C 0     | General             | 3   |
| 84-150         | 4        | 3.00-3.49       | D 0     |                     | Under-grad 12   |
| Grad.          | 0        | 3.50-4.00       | F 0     | Electives           | 2   |
|                |          |                 | P 0     |                     | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
|                |          |                 | I 0     | Other               | 6   |
|                |          |                 | ? 1     |                     |   |