

Course-Section: THTR 100 0101
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1472
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	6	6	10	4.18	972/1504	4.18	4.64	4.27	4.13	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	10	7	4.05	1027/1503	4.05	4.40	4.20	4.16	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	6	7	3.86	1038/1290	3.86	4.61	4.28	4.19	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	7	8	4.05	979/1453	4.05	4.53	4.21	4.11	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	10	6	4	3.55	1090/1421	3.55	4.53	4.00	3.91	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	7	6	4	3.32	1232/1365	3.32	4.32	4.08	3.96	3.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	7	3	9	3.86	1116/1485	3.86	4.16	4.16	4.13	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	830/1504	4.81	4.74	4.69	4.66	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	5	6	5	3.82	1072/1483	3.82	4.42	4.06	3.97	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	2	7	10	4.00	1165/1425	4.00	4.59	4.41	4.36	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	0	20	4.82	714/1426	4.82	4.87	4.69	4.56	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	3	10	6	3.86	1115/1418	3.86	4.51	4.25	4.20	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	7	10	4.18	929/1416	4.18	4.56	4.26	4.21	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	4	8	2	4	3.21	1015/1199	3.21	4.26	3.97	3.82	3.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/1312	****	4.53	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1303	****	4.71	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1299	****	4.46	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 758	****	4.57	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 244	****	3.00	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 227	****	5.00	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 207	****	5.00	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	4.50	4.60	4.48	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: THTR 100 0101
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1472
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	22	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: THTR 104 0102
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1473
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	18	4.89	138/1504	4.89	4.64	4.27	4.13	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	346/1503	4.63	4.40	4.20	4.16	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	220/1290	4.79	4.61	4.28	4.19	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	208/1453	4.74	4.53	4.21	4.11	4.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	9	6	4.06	712/1421	4.06	4.53	4.00	3.91	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	333/1365	4.47	4.32	4.08	3.96	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	270/1485	4.68	4.16	4.16	4.13	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	760/1504	4.84	4.74	4.69	4.66	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	322/1483	4.50	4.42	4.06	3.97	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	194/1425	4.88	4.59	4.41	4.36	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	860/1426	4.74	4.87	4.69	4.56	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	219/1418	4.89	4.51	4.25	4.20	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	85/1416	4.97	4.56	4.26	4.21	4.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	230/1199	4.12	4.26	3.97	3.82	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	870/1312	3.82	4.53	4.00	3.69	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	764/1303	4.30	4.71	4.24	3.93	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	678/1299	4.40	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 758	****	4.57	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 244	****	3.00	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 227	****	5.00	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	5.00	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	4.50	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: THTR 104 0102
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1473
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	19	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: THTR 104 0102
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1474
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	18	4.89	138/1504	4.89	4.64	4.27	4.13	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	346/1503	4.63	4.40	4.20	4.16	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	220/1290	4.79	4.61	4.28	4.19	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	208/1453	4.74	4.53	4.21	4.11	4.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	9	6	4.06	712/1421	4.06	4.53	4.00	3.91	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	333/1365	4.47	4.32	4.08	3.96	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	270/1485	4.68	4.16	4.16	4.13	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	760/1504	4.84	4.74	4.69	4.66	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	385/1483	4.50	4.42	4.06	3.97	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	255/1425	4.88	4.59	4.41	4.36	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	825/1426	4.74	4.87	4.69	4.56	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1418	4.89	4.51	4.25	4.20	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1416	4.97	4.56	4.26	4.21	4.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	1	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	860/1199	4.12	4.26	3.97	3.82	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	870/1312	3.82	4.53	4.00	3.69	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	764/1303	4.30	4.71	4.24	3.93	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	678/1299	4.40	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 758	****	4.57	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 244	****	3.00	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 227	****	5.00	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	5.00	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	4.50	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: THTR 104 0102
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1474
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	19	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: THTR 211 0101
 Title HISTORY OF THEATRE II
 Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1475
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	0	7	13	4.52	522/1504	4.52	4.64	4.27	4.26	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	678/1503	4.38	4.40	4.20	4.18	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	166/1290	4.86	4.61	4.28	4.27	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	222/1453	4.71	4.53	4.21	4.20	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	2	14	4.33	479/1421	4.33	4.53	4.00	3.90	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	159/1365	4.71	4.32	4.08	4.00	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	150/1485	4.81	4.16	4.16	4.15	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	8	4.38	1186/1504	4.38	4.74	4.69	4.68	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	167/1483	4.72	4.42	4.06	4.02	4.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	270/1425	4.84	4.59	4.41	4.40	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	301/1426	4.95	4.87	4.69	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.51	4.25	4.22	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	153/1416	4.89	4.56	4.26	4.24	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	0	4	1	9	3.94	714/1199	3.94	4.26	3.97	3.95	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	337/1312	4.55	4.53	4.00	3.98	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	4	0	7	4.27	783/1303	4.27	4.71	4.24	4.23	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	714/1299	4.36	4.46	4.25	4.21	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	354/ 758	4.14	4.57	4.01	3.89	4.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: THTR 221 0101
 Title CRAFT OF ACTING II
 Instructor: Marino, Christo
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1476
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	3	8	4.73	295/1504	4.71	4.64	4.27	4.26	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	106/1503	4.55	4.40	4.20	4.18	4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1290	4.14	4.61	4.28	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	300/1453	4.47	4.53	4.21	4.20	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	4.45	4.53	4.00	3.90	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	645/1365	4.24	4.32	4.08	4.00	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	727/1485	3.96	4.16	4.16	4.15	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	4.95	4.74	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	187/1483	4.46	4.42	4.06	4.02	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1425	4.67	4.59	4.41	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	4.86	4.87	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1418	4.50	4.51	4.25	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1416	4.40	4.56	4.26	4.24	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	****	4.26	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	364/1312	4.65	4.53	4.00	3.98	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1303	4.80	4.71	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1299	4.70	4.46	4.25	4.21	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 758	4.69	4.57	4.01	3.89	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	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	4
84-150	1	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	10				
				?	2						

Course-Section: THTR 221 0201
 Title CRAFT OF ACTING II
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1477
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	7	4.70	327/1504	4.71	4.64	4.27	4.26	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	919/1503	4.55	4.40	4.20	4.18	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	866/1290	4.14	4.61	4.28	4.27	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	718/1453	4.47	4.53	4.21	4.20	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	365/1421	4.45	4.53	4.00	3.90	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	558/1365	4.24	4.32	4.08	4.00	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	1234/1485	3.96	4.16	4.16	4.15	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	657/1504	4.95	4.74	4.69	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	668/1483	4.46	4.42	4.06	4.02	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	971/1425	4.67	4.59	4.41	4.40	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	895/1426	4.86	4.87	4.69	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1013/1418	4.50	4.51	4.25	4.22	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	754/1416	4.40	4.56	4.26	4.24	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1199	****	4.26	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	164/1312	4.65	4.53	4.00	3.98	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	507/1303	4.80	4.71	4.24	4.23	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	678/1299	4.70	4.46	4.25	4.21	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	255/ 758	4.69	4.57	4.01	3.89	4.38

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	4
84-150	0	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 223 0101
 Title VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I
 Instructor: Marino, Christo
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1478
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	3	7	4.70	327/1504	4.66	4.64	4.27	4.26	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	279/1503	4.57	4.40	4.20	4.18	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	344/1290	4.83	4.61	4.28	4.27	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	532/1453	4.56	4.53	4.21	4.20	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	212/1421	4.40	4.53	4.00	3.90	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	493/1365	4.00	4.32	4.08	4.00	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	914/1485	4.25	4.16	4.16	4.15	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	4.67	4.74	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	187/1483	4.35	4.42	4.06	4.02	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	572/1425	4.76	4.59	4.41	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	967/1426	4.76	4.87	4.69	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.51	4.25	4.22	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	446/1416	4.55	4.56	4.26	4.24	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1199	****	4.26	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	297/1312	4.80	4.53	4.00	3.98	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	299/1303	4.84	4.71	4.24	4.23	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	504/1299	4.36	4.46	4.25	4.21	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	273/ 758	4.60	4.57	4.01	3.89	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	1	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	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: THTR 223 0201
 Title VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I
 Instructor: WATSON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1479
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	396/1504	4.66	4.64	4.27	4.26	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	587/1503	4.57	4.40	4.20	4.18	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1290	4.83	4.61	4.28	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	270/1453	4.56	4.53	4.21	4.20	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	642/1421	4.40	4.53	4.00	3.90	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1065/1365	4.00	4.32	4.08	4.00	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	625/1485	4.25	4.16	4.16	4.15	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1221/1504	4.67	4.74	4.69	4.68	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	6	2	4.00	850/1483	4.35	4.42	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	255/1425	4.76	4.59	4.41	4.40	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	620/1426	4.76	4.87	4.69	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.51	4.25	4.22	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	727/1416	4.55	4.56	4.26	4.24	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1199	****	4.26	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1312	4.80	4.53	4.00	3.98	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	227/1303	4.84	4.71	4.24	4.23	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	883/1299	4.36	4.46	4.25	4.21	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	73/ 758	4.60	4.57	4.01	3.89	4.86

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	1	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	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: THTR 234 0101
 Title MAKE-UP FOR THE STAGE
 Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1480
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	262/1504	4.75	4.64	4.27	4.26	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	6	0	3.75	1207/1503	3.75	4.40	4.20	4.18	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	331/1453	4.60	4.53	4.21	4.20	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	3	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1176/1485	3.75	4.16	4.16	4.15	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.42	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1165/1425	4.00	4.59	4.41	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	895/1426	4.71	4.87	4.69	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1232/1418	3.57	4.51	4.25	4.22	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1122/1416	3.86	4.56	4.26	4.24	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	4.26	3.97	3.95	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1312	****	4.53	4.00	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1303	****	4.71	4.24	4.23	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1299	****	4.46	4.25	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors			

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 239 0101
 Title MOVEMENT FOR/ACTOR II
 Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1481
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	9	5.00	1/1504	4.95	4.64	4.27	4.26	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	312/1503	4.73	4.40	4.20	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	459/1290	4.58	4.61	4.28	4.27	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	112/1453	4.59	4.53	4.21	4.20	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	235/1421	4.56	4.53	4.00	3.90	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	581/1365	4.38	4.32	4.08	4.00	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	5	2	3.88	1104/1485	3.94	4.16	4.16	4.15	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1274/1504	4.28	4.74	4.69	4.68	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	211/1483	4.69	4.42	4.06	4.02	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1425	4.86	4.59	4.41	4.40	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1426	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.71	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1418	5.00	4.51	4.25	4.22	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1416	4.86	4.56	4.26	4.24	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	4.67	4.26	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	196/1312	4.88	4.53	4.00	3.98	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.71	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1299	4.86	4.46	4.25	4.21	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	304/ 758	4.43	4.57	4.01	3.89	4.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 239 0201
 Title MOVEMENT FOR/ACTOR II
 Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1482
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	9	4.90	131/1504	4.95	4.64	4.27	4.26	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	171/1503	4.73	4.40	4.20	4.18	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	412/1290	4.58	4.61	4.28	4.27	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	718/1453	4.59	4.53	4.21	4.20	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	320/1421	4.56	4.53	4.00	3.90	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	297/1365	4.38	4.32	4.08	4.00	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	990/1485	3.94	4.16	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	1242/1504	4.28	4.74	4.69	4.68	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	173/1483	4.69	4.42	4.06	4.02	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	255/1425	4.86	4.59	4.41	4.40	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.51	4.25	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1416	4.86	4.56	4.26	4.24	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	177/1199	4.67	4.26	3.97	3.95	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1312	4.88	4.53	4.00	3.98	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.71	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	395/1299	4.86	4.46	4.25	4.21	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	154/ 758	4.43	4.57	4.01	3.89	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 250 0101
 Title INTRO PRODUCTION TECH
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1483
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1504	4.88	4.64	4.27	4.26	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	848/1503	4.63	4.40	4.20	4.18	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1001/1453	4.50	4.53	4.21	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.16	4.16	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	891/1504	4.88	4.74	4.69	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	338/1483	4.75	4.42	4.06	4.02	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	71/ 233	4.50	4.50	4.09	4.30	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	224/ 244	3.00	3.00	4.09	4.24	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 227	5.00	5.00	4.40	4.58	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	5.00	4.23	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 207	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.22	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	5.00	4.53	4.44	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	27/ 36	4.50	4.50	4.60	4.13	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Course-Section: THTR 250 0201
 Title INTRO PRODUCTION TECH
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1484
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	5.00	1/1504	4.88	4.64	4.27	4.26	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	4.63	4.40	4.20	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	4.50	4.53	4.21	4.20	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.53	4.00	3.90	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.32	4.08	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.16	4.16	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	4.88	4.74	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1483	4.75	4.42	4.06	4.02	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.59	4.41	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.51	4.25	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.56	4.26	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.26	3.97	3.95	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.53	4.00	3.98	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.71	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.46	4.25	4.21	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.57	4.01	3.89	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	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	4	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 321 0101
 Title SCRIPT ANALYSIS
 Instructor: McCULLY, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1485
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	455/1504	4.58	4.64	4.27	4.27	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	780/1503	4.32	4.40	4.20	4.22	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1290	****	4.61	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	385/1453	4.56	4.53	4.21	4.23	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	93/1421	4.89	4.53	4.00	4.01	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	175/1365	4.68	4.32	4.08	4.08	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	3	3	6	5	3.76	1170/1485	3.76	4.16	4.16	4.17	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	3	4.16	1345/1504	4.16	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	591/1483	4.29	4.42	4.06	4.08	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	649/1425	4.61	4.59	4.41	4.43	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	301/1426	4.94	4.87	4.69	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.51	4.25	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	366/1416	4.72	4.56	4.26	4.27	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	0	2	3	8	4.00	636/1199	4.00	4.26	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	196/1312	4.75	4.53	4.00	4.09	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	138/1303	4.94	4.71	4.24	4.27	4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	142/1299	4.94	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	343/ 758	4.17	4.57	4.01	4.00	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: THTR 325 0101
 Title VOCAL TRAINING ACTOR I
 Instructor: WATSON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1486
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	7	4.70	327/1504	4.70	4.64	4.27	4.27	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.40	4.20	4.22	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	180/1290	4.83	4.61	4.28	4.31	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	844/1453	4.20	4.53	4.21	4.23	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	439/1421	4.38	4.53	4.00	4.01	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	1	6	3.90	903/1365	3.90	4.32	4.08	4.08	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	98/1485	4.90	4.16	4.16	4.17	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	772/1483	4.13	4.42	4.06	4.08	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.59	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	549/1426	4.89	4.87	4.69	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.51	4.25	4.26	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	806/1416	4.33	4.56	4.26	4.27	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.26	3.97	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	572/1312	4.29	4.53	4.00	4.09	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	248/1303	4.86	4.71	4.24	4.27	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	395/1299	4.71	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	114/ 758	4.71	4.57	4.01	4.00	4.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 332 0101
 Title ADV SCENE/COSTUME DESI
 Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1487
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	7	4.88	153/1504	4.88	4.64	4.27	4.27	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.40	4.20	4.22	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.61	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	331/1453	4.60	4.53	4.21	4.23	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.53	4.00	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.32	4.08	4.08	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	866/1485	4.17	4.16	4.16	4.17	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.42	4.06	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	255/1425	4.86	4.59	4.41	4.43	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	158/1418	4.86	4.51	4.25	4.26	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.56	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.26	3.97	4.02	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	164/1312	4.80	4.53	4.00	4.09	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.71	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	354/1299	4.75	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.57	4.01	4.00	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	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 337 0101
 Title ADVANCED SOUND DESIGN
 Instructor: COBB, MILTON T.
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1488
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.64	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.40	4.20	4.22	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.53	4.21	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	158/1421	4.75	4.53	4.00	4.01	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.32	4.08	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1284/1485	3.50	4.16	4.16	4.17	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	891/1504	4.75	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.42	4.06	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.59	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1418	4.75	4.51	4.25	4.26	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.56	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.26	3.97	4.02	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.53	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.71	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.57	4.01	4.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 361 0101
 Title MODERN THEATRE II
 Instructor: McCULLY, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1489
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	813/1504	4.32	4.64	4.27	4.27	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	6	8	4.16	946/1503	4.16	4.40	4.20	4.22	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1050/1290	3.83	4.61	4.28	4.31	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	563/1453	4.42	4.53	4.21	4.23	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	54/1421	4.95	4.53	4.00	4.01	4.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	10	6	4.11	726/1365	4.11	4.32	4.08	4.08	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	9	6	3	3.58	1257/1485	3.58	4.16	4.16	4.17	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	6	4.33	1221/1504	4.33	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	493/1483	4.38	4.42	4.06	4.08	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	8	5	4.06	1147/1425	4.06	4.59	4.41	4.43	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	301/1426	4.94	4.87	4.69	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	808/1418	4.29	4.51	4.25	4.26	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	662/1416	4.47	4.56	4.26	4.27	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	394/1199	4.38	4.26	3.97	4.02	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	208/1312	4.73	4.53	4.00	4.09	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	401/1303	4.71	4.71	4.24	4.27	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	142/1299	4.93	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	2	1	2	7	4.17	343/ 758	4.17	4.57	4.01	4.00	4.17
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	5.00	4.09	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	19	Non-major	11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 421 0101
 Title ACTING SHAKESPEARE
 Instructor: WATSON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1490
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	4	6	4.23	914/1504	4.23	4.64	4.27	4.33	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.40	4.20	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1290	****	4.61	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	878/1453	4.17	4.53	4.21	4.22	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	290/1421	4.55	4.53	4.00	4.02	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	681/1365	4.15	4.32	4.08	4.09	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1222/1485	3.67	4.16	4.16	4.14	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	635/1483	4.25	4.42	4.06	4.11	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	649/1425	4.62	4.59	4.41	4.38	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	808/1426	4.77	4.87	4.69	4.72	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	799/1418	4.31	4.51	4.25	4.25	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	829/1416	4.31	4.56	4.26	4.26	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	310/1199	4.46	4.26	3.97	4.05	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	502/1312	4.36	4.53	4.00	4.07	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	288/1303	4.82	4.71	4.24	4.34	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	786/1299	4.27	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	143/ 758	4.64	4.57	4.01	4.17	4.64

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 490 0101
 Title PRODUCTION WORKSHOP
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1491
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	9	6	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.64	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	8	7	2	3.47	1317/1503	3.47	4.40	4.20	4.18	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1290	****	4.61	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1453	****	4.53	4.21	4.22	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	119/1421	4.82	4.53	4.00	4.02	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	614/1365	4.22	4.32	4.08	4.09	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1122/1485	3.85	4.16	4.16	4.14	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	394/1504	4.95	4.74	4.69	4.73	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	4	8	5	1	3.17	1352/1483	3.86	4.42	4.06	4.11	3.86

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1356/1425	3.20	4.59	4.41	4.38	3.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1225/1418	3.60	4.51	4.25	4.25	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	1268/1416	3.40	4.56	4.26	4.26	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1199	****	4.26	3.97	4.05	****

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	845/1312	3.86	4.53	4.00	4.07	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	863/1303	4.14	4.71	4.24	4.34	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1184/1299	3.14	4.46	4.25	4.38	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	243/ 758	4.40	4.57	4.01	4.17	4.40

Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.50	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	19	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: THTR 490 0101
 Title PRODUCTION WORKSHOP
 Instructor: WATSON, LYNN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1492
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	9	6	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.64	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	8	7	2	3.47	1317/1503	3.47	4.40	4.20	4.18	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1290	****	4.61	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1453	****	4.53	4.21	4.22	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	119/1421	4.82	4.53	4.00	4.02	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	614/1365	4.22	4.32	4.08	4.09	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1122/1485	3.85	4.16	4.16	4.14	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	394/1504	4.95	4.74	4.69	4.73	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	298/1483	3.86	4.42	4.06	4.11	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1425	3.20	4.59	4.41	4.38	3.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1426	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1418	3.60	4.51	4.25	4.25	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1416	3.40	4.56	4.26	4.26	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1199	****	4.26	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	845/1312	3.86	4.53	4.00	4.07	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	863/1303	4.14	4.71	4.24	4.34	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1184/1299	3.14	4.46	4.25	4.38	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	243/ 758	4.40	4.57	4.01	4.17	4.40
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.50	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	19	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						