

Course-Section: THTR 100 01
 Title Intro Theatre Scenogrpr
 Instructor: Schraven,Greggo
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1415
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	6	2	3.73	1269/1447	3.41	4.52	4.31	4.18	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	604/1447	4.46	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	658/1241	4.31	4.62	4.33	4.25	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	916/1402	3.94	4.46	4.24	4.15	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	2	3.82	980/1358	3.79	4.49	4.11	4.03	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	6	3	3.91	910/1316	3.39	4.25	4.14	3.99	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	850/1427	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	485/1447	4.82	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	540/1434	4.20	4.40	4.10	4.10	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	941/1387	4.34	4.59	4.46	4.46	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	758/1387	4.87	4.88	4.73	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	607/1386	4.13	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	868/1380	3.98	4.50	4.32	4.31	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	612/1193	3.61	4.10	4.02	3.99	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	1090/1172	3.00	4.37	4.15	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	856/1182	4.13	4.61	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	864/1170	3.88	4.63	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	612/ 800	3.22	4.47	4.06	3.95	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 189	3.00	3.75	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	4.00	3.75	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	4.00	4.31	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	4.00	4.25	4.33	4.37	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	11	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: THTR 100 02
 Title Intro Theatre Scenogrp
 Instructor: Schraven,Greggo
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1416
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1411/1447	3.41	4.52	4.31	4.18	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.46	4.52	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	541/1241	4.31	4.62	4.33	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	494/1402	3.94	4.46	4.24	4.15	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1358	3.79	4.49	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	392/1316	3.39	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	971/1427	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.82	4.75	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	341/1434	4.20	4.40	4.10	4.10	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.34	4.59	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.87	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	4.13	4.52	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	3.98	4.50	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	652/1193	3.61	4.10	4.02	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1090/1172	3.00	4.37	4.15	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	856/1182	4.13	4.61	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	864/1170	3.88	4.63	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	423/ 800	3.22	4.47	4.06	3.95	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 100 03
 Title Intro Theatre Scenogrp
 Instructor: Schraven,Greggo
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1417
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1411/1447	3.41	4.52	4.31	4.18	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1053/1447	4.46	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	923/1241	4.31	4.62	4.33	4.25	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1264/1402	3.94	4.46	4.24	4.15	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1291/1358	3.79	4.49	4.11	4.03	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1299/1316	3.39	4.25	4.14	3.99	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	971/1427	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1447	4.82	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1238/1434	4.20	4.40	4.10	4.10	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1176/1387	4.34	4.59	4.46	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.87	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1328/1386	4.13	4.52	4.32	4.32	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1317/1380	3.98	4.50	4.32	4.31	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1177/1193	3.61	4.10	4.02	3.99	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1090/1172	3.00	4.37	4.15	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	856/1182	4.13	4.61	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	864/1170	3.88	4.63	4.38	4.17	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	189/ 189	3.00	3.75	4.34	4.18	2.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	183/ 192	4.00	3.75	4.34	4.31	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	181/ 186	4.00	4.31	4.48	4.46	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	176/ 187	4.00	4.25	4.33	4.37	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	167/ 168	3.00	3.83	4.20	4.29	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 100 04
 Title Intro Theatre Scenogrp
 Instructor: Schraven,Greggo
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1418
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	1	0	1	3.33	1369/1447	3.41	4.52	4.31	4.18	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	766/1447	4.46	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	717/1241	4.31	4.62	4.33	4.25	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1203/1402	3.94	4.46	4.24	4.15	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1231/1358	3.79	4.49	4.11	4.03	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1288/1316	3.39	4.25	4.14	3.99	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	680/1427	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	958/1447	4.82	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	230/1434	4.20	4.40	4.10	4.10	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1176/1387	4.34	4.59	4.46	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	982/1387	4.87	4.88	4.73	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1047/1386	4.13	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1198/1380	3.98	4.50	4.32	4.31	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	420/1193	3.61	4.10	4.02	3.99	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1090/1172	3.00	4.37	4.15	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	553/1182	4.13	4.61	4.35	4.18	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1070/1170	3.88	4.63	4.38	4.17	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	795/ 800	3.22	4.47	4.06	3.95	2.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	184/ 189	3.00	3.75	4.34	4.18	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	147/ 192	4.00	3.75	4.34	4.31	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	160/ 186	4.00	4.31	4.48	4.46	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	141/ 187	4.00	4.25	4.33	4.37	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 100 05
 Title Intro Theatre Scenogr
 Instructor: Schraven,Greggo
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1419
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1058/1447	3.41	4.52	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	532/1447	4.46	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1427	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.82	4.75	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	849/1434	4.20	4.40	4.10	4.10	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	140/ 189	3.00	3.75	4.34	4.18	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 192	4.00	3.75	4.34	4.31	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 186	4.00	4.31	4.48	4.46	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 187	4.00	4.25	4.33	4.37	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 01
 Title Intro To Costume
 Instructor: Ranney-Howes,M.
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1420
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	0	3	12	4.35	771/1447	4.74	4.52	4.31	4.18	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	6	8	4.06	1023/1447	4.63	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	782/1241	4.58	4.62	4.33	4.25	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	766/1402	4.57	4.46	4.24	4.15	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1125/1358	4.32	4.49	4.11	4.03	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	2	2	8	3.69	1038/1316	4.34	4.25	4.14	3.99	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	4	6	3.76	1160/1427	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	339/1447	4.80	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	540/1434	4.63	4.40	4.10	4.10	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	1	3	10	4.19	1092/1387	4.76	4.59	4.46	4.46	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	758/1387	4.83	4.88	4.73	4.71	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	3	8	4.06	1022/1386	4.59	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	3	10	4.19	946/1380	4.48	4.50	4.32	4.31	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	4	1	9	4.13	583/1193	4.49	4.10	4.02	3.99	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	496/1172	4.71	4.37	4.15	3.95	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	629/1182	4.73	4.61	4.35	4.18	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	480/1170	4.73	4.63	4.38	4.17	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 800	4.67	4.47	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 189	4.63	3.75	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 192	3.88	3.75	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 186	4.50	4.31	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 187	4.50	4.25	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 168	4.25	3.83	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 66	2.00	2.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	3.00	3.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	2.00	2.00	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	1.00	1.00	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 64	2.00	2.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	2.00	2.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	2.00	2.00	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	2.00	2.00	4.30	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	2.00	2.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	4.00	4.00	4.60	4.49	****

Course-Section: THTR 104 01
 Title Intro To Costume
 Instructor: Ranney-Howes,M.
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1420
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 104 02
 Title Intro To Costume
 Instructor: Ranney-Howes, M.
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1421
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	585/1447	4.74	4.52	4.31	4.18	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	766/1447	4.63	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	4.58	4.62	4.33	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1402	4.57	4.46	4.24	4.15	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	529/1358	4.32	4.49	4.11	4.03	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	4.34	4.25	4.14	3.99	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1201/1427	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	4.80	4.75	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	230/1434	4.63	4.40	4.10	4.10	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	307/1387	4.76	4.59	4.46	4.46	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	4.83	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	431/1386	4.59	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	659/1380	4.48	4.50	4.32	4.31	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	186/1193	4.49	4.10	4.02	3.99	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	282/1172	4.71	4.37	4.15	3.95	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	4.73	4.61	4.35	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	864/1170	4.73	4.63	4.38	4.17	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	612/ 800	4.67	4.47	4.06	3.95	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 189	4.63	3.75	4.34	4.18	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 192	3.88	3.75	4.34	4.31	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	177/ 186	4.50	4.31	4.48	4.46	3.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	98/ 187	4.50	4.25	4.33	4.37	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 168	4.25	3.83	4.20	4.29	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	2.00	2.00	4.58	3.95	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	3.00	3.00	4.56	4.08	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	2.00	2.00	4.41	3.88	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	1.00	1.00	4.42	3.78	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	2.00	2.00	4.09	3.75	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	2.00	2.00	4.49	3.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.26	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	2.00	2.00	4.52	3.84	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	2.00	2.00	4.30	3.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	3.00	3.00	4.43	3.73	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.72	4.50	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	2.00	2.00	4.57	4.38	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.64	4.65	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	4.00	4.00	4.60	4.49	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	4.00	4.00	4.61	4.31	****	

Course-Section: THTR 104 02
 Title Intro To Costume
 Instructor: Ranney-Howes, M.
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1421
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 3
 Title Intro To Costume
 Instructor: Ranney-Howes,M.
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1422
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1/1447	4.74	4.52	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1447	4.63	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	380/1241	4.58	4.62	4.33	4.25	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	685/1402	4.57	4.46	4.24	4.15	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1084/1358	4.32	4.49	4.11	4.03	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	812/1316	4.34	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	775/1427	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	1252/1447	4.80	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.63	4.40	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	4.76	4.59	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1229/1387	4.83	4.88	4.73	4.71	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1386	4.59	4.52	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	463/1380	4.48	4.50	4.32	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	186/1193	4.49	4.10	4.02	3.99	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1172	4.71	4.37	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	4.73	4.61	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	4.73	4.63	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 800	4.67	4.47	4.06	3.95	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	173/ 189	4.63	3.75	4.34	4.18	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	178/ 192	3.88	3.75	4.34	4.31	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	104/ 186	4.50	4.31	4.48	4.46	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	166/ 187	4.50	4.25	4.33	4.37	3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	150/ 168	4.25	3.83	4.20	4.29	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	66/ 66	2.00	2.00	4.58	3.95	2.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	58/ 62	3.00	3.00	4.56	4.08	3.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	58/ 58	2.00	2.00	4.41	3.88	2.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	65/ 65	1.00	1.00	4.42	3.78	1.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	63/ 64	2.00	2.00	4.09	3.75	2.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	38/ 38	2.00	2.00	4.49	3.83	2.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	24/ 36	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.26	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	27/ 28	2.00	2.00	4.52	3.84	2.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	30/ 30	2.00	2.00	4.30	3.64	2.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	26/ 27	3.00	3.00	4.43	3.73	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	30/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.72	4.50	3.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	21/ 21	2.00	2.00	4.57	4.38	2.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	28/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.64	4.65	3.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	17/ 20	4.00	4.00	4.60	4.49	4.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	13/ 15	4.00	4.00	4.61	4.31	4.00

Course-Section: THTR 104 3
 Title Intro To Costume
 Instructor: Ranney-Howes, M.
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1422
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 4
 Title Intro To Costume
 Instructor: Ranney-Howes,M.
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1423
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1/1447	4.74	4.52	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.63	4.52	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1241	4.58	4.62	4.33	4.25	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	314/1402	4.57	4.46	4.24	4.15	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	4.32	4.49	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	812/1316	4.34	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	775/1427	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.80	4.75	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	230/1434	4.63	4.40	4.10	4.10	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	4.76	4.59	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	4.83	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1386	4.59	4.52	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	463/1380	4.48	4.50	4.32	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1193	4.49	4.10	4.02	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	377/1172	4.71	4.37	4.15	3.95	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	553/1182	4.73	4.61	4.35	4.18	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	4.73	4.63	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	4.67	4.47	4.06	3.95	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 189	4.63	3.75	4.34	4.18	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	189/ 192	3.88	3.75	4.34	4.31	2.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 186	4.50	4.31	4.48	4.46	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 187	4.50	4.25	4.33	4.37	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 5
 Title Intro To Costume
 Instructor: Ranney-Howes, M.
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1424
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	222/1447	4.74	4.52	4.31	4.18	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	4.63	4.52	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	782/1241	4.58	4.62	4.33	4.25	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	380/1402	4.57	4.46	4.24	4.15	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1358	4.32	4.49	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	4.34	4.25	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	283/1427	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	341/1434	4.63	4.40	4.10	4.10	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	353/1387	4.76	4.59	4.46	4.46	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	4.83	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	927/1386	4.59	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	759/1380	4.48	4.50	4.32	4.31	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	652/1193	4.49	4.10	4.02	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1172	4.71	4.37	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	347/1182	4.73	4.61	4.35	4.18	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1170	4.73	4.63	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 800	4.67	4.47	4.06	3.95	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 189	4.63	3.75	4.34	4.18	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 192	3.88	3.75	4.34	4.31	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 186	4.50	4.31	4.48	4.46	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 187	4.50	4.25	4.33	4.37	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	4.25	3.83	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	3.00	3.00	4.56	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 110 01
 Title Introduction To Acting
 Instructor: Yates,Peggy
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1425
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	1	2	12	4.35	771/1447	4.35	4.52	4.31	4.18	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	376/1447	4.65	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1241	****	4.62	4.33	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	358/1402	4.63	4.46	4.24	4.15	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	7	6	3.88	931/1358	3.88	4.49	4.11	4.03	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	7	5	3.94	880/1316	3.94	4.25	4.14	3.99	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	2	11	4.29	727/1427	4.29	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	1296/1447	4.18	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	540/1434	4.33	4.40	4.10	4.10	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	1	10	4.36	951/1387	4.36	4.59	4.46	4.46	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	457/1386	4.64	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	299/1380	4.79	4.50	4.32	4.31	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1193	****	4.10	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	339/1172	4.57	4.37	4.15	3.95	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	250/1182	4.86	4.61	4.35	4.18	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	538/1170	4.57	4.63	4.38	4.17	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	114/ 800	4.71	4.47	4.06	3.95	4.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors		4	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2							
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		6	Under-grad	17	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives		4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		2				
				?	1							

Course-Section: THTR 202 01
 Title Intro Drama Literature
 Instructor: Kaleba, Casey
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1426
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	7	13	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.52	4.31	4.31	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	9	4.14	965/1447	4.14	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	646/1241	4.41	4.62	4.33	4.35	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	616/1402	4.40	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	194/1358	4.73	4.49	4.11	4.12	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	549/1316	4.33	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	5	6	8	3.95	1024/1427	3.95	4.18	4.19	4.14	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	16	5	4.18	1291/1447	4.18	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	3	10	6	4.16	744/1434	4.16	4.40	4.10	3.97	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	414/1387	4.76	4.59	4.46	4.42	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	264/1387	4.95	4.88	4.73	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	719/1386	4.43	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	477/1380	4.65	4.50	4.32	4.30	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	526/1193	4.20	4.10	4.02	4.04	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	648/1172	4.14	4.37	4.15	4.12	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	480/1182	4.62	4.61	4.35	4.30	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	352/1170	4.79	4.63	4.38	4.32	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	9	12	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 800	****	4.47	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 10	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 3	General	3	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	1				
				? 0						

Course-Section: THTR 221 01
 Title Craft Of Acting II
 Instructor: Muson,Eve B
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1427
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	148/1447	4.79	4.52	4.31	4.31	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1447	4.83	4.52	4.27	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	541/1241	4.38	4.62	4.33	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	217/1402	4.65	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	87/1358	4.84	4.49	4.11	4.12	4.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	76/1316	4.68	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	716/1427	4.32	4.18	4.19	4.14	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	727/1447	4.69	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	206/1434	4.41	4.40	4.10	3.97	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	566/1387	4.65	4.59	4.46	4.42	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	159/1386	4.82	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	312/1380	4.70	4.50	4.32	4.30	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	****	4.10	4.02	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	141/1172	4.94	4.37	4.15	4.12	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.61	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	254/1170	4.79	4.63	4.38	4.32	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.47	4.06	4.01	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 7
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: THTR 221 02
 Title Craft Of Acting II
 Instructor: Searls,Colette
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1428
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	408/1447	4.79	4.52	4.31	4.31	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	352/1447	4.83	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	782/1241	4.38	4.62	4.33	4.35	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	437/1402	4.65	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	158/1358	4.84	4.49	4.11	4.12	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	455/1316	4.68	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	680/1427	4.32	4.18	4.19	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1048/1447	4.69	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	775/1434	4.41	4.40	4.10	3.97	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	626/1387	4.65	4.59	4.46	4.42	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	316/1386	4.82	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	520/1380	4.70	4.50	4.32	4.30	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1193	****	4.10	4.02	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1172	4.94	4.37	4.15	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.61	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	440/1170	4.79	4.63	4.38	4.32	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.47	4.06	4.01	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 7	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6				
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 9	Non-major 2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 0				

Course-Section: THTR 223 01
 Title: Vocal Trng For Actor I
 Instructor: Watson,Janet L
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1429
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	309/1447	4.88	4.52	4.31	4.31	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	532/1447	4.75	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	855/1241	4.45	4.62	4.33	4.35	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	485/1358	4.47	4.49	4.11	4.12	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	738/1316	4.49	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	971/1427	4.25	4.18	4.19	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	6	1	3.88	1003/1434	4.35	4.40	4.10	3.97	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	698/1387	4.79	4.59	4.46	4.42	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	1081/1387	4.79	4.88	4.73	4.71	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	971/1386	4.57	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	582/1380	4.39	4.50	4.32	4.30	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1087/1193	3.00	4.10	4.02	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	163/1172	4.92	4.37	4.15	4.12	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.61	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	576/1170	4.75	4.63	4.38	4.32	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.47	4.06	4.01	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 223 02
 Title Vocal Trng For Actor I
 Instructor: Staley,Natasha
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1430
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	4.88	4.52	4.31	4.31	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	4.75	4.52	4.27	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1241	4.45	4.62	4.33	4.35	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	299/1358	4.47	4.49	4.11	4.12	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	102/1316	4.49	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	459/1427	4.25	4.18	4.19	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	108/1434	4.35	4.40	4.10	3.97	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	4.79	4.59	4.46	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	4.79	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1386	4.57	4.52	4.32	4.24	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	940/1380	4.39	4.50	4.32	4.30	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1193	3.00	4.10	4.02	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1172	4.92	4.37	4.15	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.61	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	4.75	4.63	4.38	4.32	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.47	4.06	4.01	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 230 01
 Title Drawing For Theatre
 Instructor: Zlotescu,Elena
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1431
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	5	2	4.00	1058/1447	4.00	4.52	4.31	4.31	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1154/1447	3.89	4.52	4.27	4.23	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	4.62	4.33	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1358	****	4.49	4.11	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	****	4.25	4.14	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1378/1427	2.75	4.18	4.19	4.14	2.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	538/1447	4.89	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.40	4.10	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	1282/1387	3.67	4.59	4.46	4.42	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1160/1386	3.83	4.52	4.32	4.24	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1138/1380	3.83	4.50	4.32	4.30	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	652/1193	4.00	4.10	4.02	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	999/1172	3.50	4.37	4.15	4.12	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	347/1182	4.75	4.61	4.35	4.30	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	390/1170	4.75	4.63	4.38	4.32	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.47	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Non-major 3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	0	
				? 1			

Course-Section: THTR 234 01
 Title Make-Up For The Stage
 Instructor: Zlotescu,Elena
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1432
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.52	4.31	4.31	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.52	4.27	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.62	4.33	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.49	4.11	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.25	4.14	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	154/1427	4.80	4.18	4.19	4.14	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	141/1434	4.78	4.40	4.10	3.97	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.52	4.32	4.24	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	131/1193	4.75	4.10	4.02	4.04	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1172	****	4.37	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1182	****	4.61	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1170	****	4.63	4.38	4.32	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.47	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0					
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major 11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	0			
				? 0					

Course-Section: THTR 239 01
 Title Movemt II:Alexander Te
 Instructor: Salkind,Wendy
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1433
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	118/1447	4.93	4.52	4.31	4.31	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	315/1447	4.74	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	282/1241	4.63	4.62	4.33	4.35	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	281/1402	4.60	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	117/1358	4.82	4.49	4.11	4.12	4.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	312/1316	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1117/1427	4.03	4.18	4.19	4.14	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	836/1447	4.84	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	158/1434	4.74	4.40	4.10	3.97	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	611/1387	4.68	4.59	4.46	4.42	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	353/1386	4.73	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	261/1380	4.86	4.50	4.32	4.30	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1193	4.67	4.10	4.02	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.37	4.15	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	347/1182	4.82	4.61	4.35	4.30	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	440/1170	4.86	4.63	4.38	4.32	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 800	4.94	4.47	4.06	4.01	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 239 02
 Title Movemt II:Alexander Te
 Instructor: Salkind,Wendy
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1434
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	118/1447	4.93	4.52	4.31	4.31	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	217/1447	4.74	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	541/1241	4.63	4.62	4.33	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	494/1402	4.60	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	151/1358	4.82	4.49	4.11	4.12	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	653/1316	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	823/1427	4.03	4.18	4.19	4.14	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	388/1447	4.84	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	182/1434	4.74	4.40	4.10	3.97	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	475/1387	4.68	4.59	4.46	4.42	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	353/1386	4.73	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	159/1380	4.86	4.50	4.32	4.30	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	186/1193	4.67	4.10	4.02	4.04	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.37	4.15	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	198/1182	4.82	4.61	4.35	4.30	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1170	4.86	4.63	4.38	4.32	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	81/ 800	4.94	4.47	4.06	4.01	4.89
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	3.75	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	3.75	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	4.31	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	****	4.25	4.33	4.46	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	2.00	4.58	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	2.00	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	2.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	2.00	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	2.00	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	3.00	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	2.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	4.00	4.60	****	****

Course-Section: THTR 239 02
 Title Movemt II:Alexander Te
 Instructor: Salkind,Wendy
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1434
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 244 01
 Title Script Analysis
 Instructor: McCully,Susan
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1435
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	5.00	1/1447	4.98	4.52	4.31	4.31	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1053/1447	4.42	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.96	4.46	4.24	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	4.98	4.49	4.11	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	4.96	4.25	4.14	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.80	4.18	4.19	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.96	4.75	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	849/1434	4.38	4.40	4.10	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.91	4.59	4.46	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.98	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.82	4.52	4.32	4.24	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	4.98	4.50	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	4.79	4.10	4.02	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	710/1172	4.43	4.37	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	4.93	4.61	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	4.97	4.63	4.38	4.32	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 244 01
 Title Script Analysis
 Instructor: McCully,Susan
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1436
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	59/1447	4.98	4.52	4.31	4.31	4.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	162/1447	4.42	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1241	****	4.62	4.33	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	83/1402	4.96	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	44/1358	4.98	4.49	4.11	4.12	4.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	61/1316	4.96	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	10	15	4.60	337/1427	4.80	4.18	4.19	4.14	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	436/1447	4.96	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	2	21	4.75	158/1434	4.38	4.40	4.10	3.97	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	322/1387	4.91	4.59	4.46	4.42	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	264/1387	4.98	4.88	4.73	4.71	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	470/1386	4.82	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	80/1380	4.98	4.50	4.32	4.30	4.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	243/1193	4.79	4.10	4.02	4.04	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	146/1172	4.43	4.37	4.15	4.12	4.87
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	240/1182	4.93	4.61	4.35	4.30	4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	156/1170	4.97	4.63	4.38	4.32	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	184/ 800	4.54	4.47	4.06	4.01	4.54

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0	Major 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 25	Non-major 14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: THTR 250 01
 Title Intro Production Tech
 Instructor: Murphy, Karen E
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1437
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	0	1	0	3.00	1411/1447	4.33	4.52	4.31	4.31	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1323/1447	4.26	4.52	4.27	4.23	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.13	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1349/1434	4.17	4.40	4.10	3.97	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	188/ 189	2.50	3.75	4.34	4.47	2.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	188/ 192	2.50	3.75	4.34	4.38	2.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	104/ 186	4.50	4.31	4.48	4.57	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	141/ 187	4.00	4.25	4.33	4.46	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 250 02
 Title Intro Production Tech
 Instructor: Schraven, Greggo
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1438
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	3	5.00	1/1447	4.33	4.52	4.31	4.31	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	352/1447	4.26	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.13	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	341/1434	4.17	4.40	4.10	3.97	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 250 3
 Title Intro Production Tech
 Instructor: Schraven, Greggo
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1439
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1447	4.33	4.52	4.31	4.31	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	426/1447	4.26	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1402	****	4.46	4.24	4.24	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1155/1447	4.13	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1434	4.17	4.40	4.10	3.97	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	316/1386	4.75	4.52	4.32	4.24	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	****	4.10	4.02	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	4.37	4.15	4.12	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	****	4.61	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	4.63	4.38	4.32	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	2.50	3.75	4.34	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	2.50	3.75	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	4.50	4.31	4.48	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	4.00	4.25	4.33	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 311 01
 Title History Of Theatre II
 Instructor: Kreizenbeck,Ala
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1440
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.52	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	187/1447	4.82	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.62	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	196/1402	4.78	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.49	4.11	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	150/1316	4.78	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	914/1427	4.10	4.18	4.19	4.15	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	454/1434	4.40	4.40	4.10	4.09	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	398/1387	4.78	4.59	4.46	4.44	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	579/1387	4.89	4.88	4.73	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	691/1386	4.44	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	193/1380	4.88	4.50	4.32	4.32	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	786/1193	3.86	4.10	4.02	4.05	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	323/1172	4.60	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	767/1182	4.20	4.61	4.35	4.42	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	290/ 800	4.33	4.47	4.06	4.12	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 11	Non-major 6
84-150	1	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 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: THTR 325 01
 Title: Vocal Training Actor I
 Instructor: Watson, Janet L
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1441
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.52	4.31	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.52	4.27	4.23	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.62	4.33	4.33	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	143/1402	4.83	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	452/1358	4.40	4.49	4.11	4.10	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	497/1316	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	200/1427	4.75	4.18	4.19	4.15	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.40	4.10	4.09	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.52	4.32	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.32	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	131/1193	4.75	4.10	4.02	4.05	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	4.37	4.15	4.24	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	****	4.61	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	4.63	4.38	4.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		5	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		0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: THTR 335 01
 Title Advanced Lighting Desi
 Instructor: Cobb,Milton T
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1442
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	869/1447	4.25	4.52	4.31	4.32	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1323/1447	3.50	4.52	4.27	4.23	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.62	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1251/1358	3.25	4.49	4.11	4.10	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1050/1316	3.67	4.25	4.14	4.13	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1388/1427	2.67	4.18	4.19	4.15	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1079/1447	4.50	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1088/1434	3.75	4.40	4.10	4.09	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1176/1387	4.00	4.59	4.46	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1220/1386	3.67	4.52	4.32	4.30	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1198/1380	3.67	4.50	4.32	4.32	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	895/1193	3.67	4.10	4.02	4.05	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	377/1172	4.50	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1140/1182	3.00	4.61	4.35	4.42	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	4.47	4.06	4.12	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 339 01
 Title Adv Production Technqu
 Instructor: Schraven, Greggo
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1443
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.52	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.52	4.27	4.23	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.40	4.10	4.09	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Graduate	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	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 345 01
 Title Business Of Acting
 Instructor: Lancisi,Vincent
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1444
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	10	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.52	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	112/1447	4.90	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.62	4.33	4.33	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	165/1402	4.80	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.49	4.11	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	212/1316	4.70	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	898/1427	4.13	4.18	4.19	4.15	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	230/1434	4.67	4.40	4.10	4.09	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	881/1387	4.43	4.59	4.46	4.44	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	366/1386	4.71	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1380	4.86	4.50	4.32	4.32	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1087/1193	3.00	4.10	4.02	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	181/1172	4.80	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1182	4.80	4.61	4.35	4.42	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	327/1170	4.80	4.63	4.38	4.49	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	133/ 800	4.67	4.47	4.06	4.12	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 9	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	0	Under-grad 10	Non-major 10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 0				

Course-Section: THTR 390 01
 Title Theatre In Production
 Instructor: Searls,Colette
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1445
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	169/1447	4.94	4.52	4.31	4.32	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	479/1447	4.71	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	5.00	4.62	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	314/1402	4.67	4.46	4.24	4.24	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	173/1358	4.88	4.49	4.11	4.10	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	617/1316	4.25	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	568/1427	4.21	4.18	4.19	4.15	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	538/1447	4.94	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	668/1434	4.47	4.40	4.10	4.09	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	1085/1387	4.60	4.59	4.46	4.44	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	431/1386	4.83	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	238/1380	4.92	4.50	4.32	4.32	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	420/1193	4.33	4.10	4.02	4.05	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	282/1172	4.83	4.37	4.15	4.24	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1182	4.92	4.61	4.35	4.42	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.47	4.06	4.12	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 4	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 9	Non-major 5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	3		
				? 0				

Course-Section: THTR 390 02
 Title Theatre In Production
 Instructor: Kreizenbeck,Ala
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1446
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	7	5.00	1/1447	4.94	4.52	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	154/1447	4.71	4.52	4.27	4.23	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.62	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1402	4.67	4.46	4.24	4.24	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1358	4.88	4.49	4.11	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	4.25	4.25	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	971/1427	4.21	4.18	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	4.94	4.75	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	190/1434	4.47	4.40	4.10	4.09	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.60	4.59	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.71	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	4.83	4.52	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	4.92	4.50	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	4.33	4.10	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1172	4.83	4.37	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	4.92	4.61	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	5.00	4.47	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General		
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		Under-grad 7	Non-major 5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives		
				P 0			
				I 0	Other		
				? 0			

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: THTR 411 01
 Title Modern Theatre II
 Instructor: McCully, Susan
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1447
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	133/1447	4.92	4.52	4.31	4.43	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.52	4.27	4.31	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.62	4.33	4.41	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	157/1402	4.82	4.46	4.24	4.34	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.49	4.11	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	61/1316	4.92	4.25	4.14	4.27	4.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	620/1427	4.38	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	114/1434	4.82	4.40	4.10	4.17	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	307/1387	4.83	4.59	4.46	4.48	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	122/1386	4.92	4.52	4.32	4.34	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	238/1380	4.83	4.50	4.32	4.34	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	58/1193	4.92	4.10	4.02	4.00	4.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.37	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.61	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.47	4.06	4.19	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 13	Graduate	0	Major	5	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	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	0				
				? 2						

Course-Section: THTR 432 01
 Title Design Seminar
 Instructor: Joyce, Shelley
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1448
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	8	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.52	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.52	4.27	4.31	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.62	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.34	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	****	4.25	4.14	4.27	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	836/1447	4.75	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.40	4.10	4.17	5.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.52	4.32	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.34	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 490 01
 Title Production Workshop
 Instructor: Muson,Eve B
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1449
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	11	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.52	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.52	4.27	4.31	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	****	4.62	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	196/1402	4.78	4.46	4.24	4.34	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	132/1358	4.82	4.49	4.11	4.15	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	342/1316	4.56	4.25	4.14	4.27	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	739/1427	4.29	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	885/1447	4.73	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.40	4.10	4.17	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	307/1387	4.83	4.59	4.46	4.48	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	217/1386	4.83	4.52	4.32	4.34	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	238/1380	4.83	4.50	4.32	4.34	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	224/1193	4.60	4.10	4.02	4.00	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.37	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.61	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.47	4.06	4.19	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			Non-major 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P 0			
				I 0	Other	0	
				? 0			