

Course-Section: THTR 100 0101  
 Title INTRO THEATRE SCENOGRP  
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1523  
 JAN 19, 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	12	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	415/1556	4.60	4.59	4.25	4.06	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	662/1557	4.40	4.47	4.21	4.13	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	0	2	0	6	7	4.20	840/1335	4.20	4.63	4.24	4.13	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	0	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	1136/1510	3.87	4.54	4.19	4.07	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	454/1479	4.33	4.41	3.97	3.90	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	3	2	6	2	3.36	1269/1424	3.36	4.18	4.08	3.91	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	0	2	3	5	5	3.87	1135/1537	3.87	4.13	4.15	4.12	3.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	843/1553	4.80	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	359/1536	4.50	4.46	4.07	3.91	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	1024/1487	4.33	4.55	4.44	4.37	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	655/1489	4.47	4.53	4.27	4.18	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	425/1481	4.67	4.61	4.28	4.18	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	10	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1246	****	4.32	3.93	3.78	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	****/1411	****	4.50	4.00	3.78	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/1413	****	4.49	4.23	3.96	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/1408	****	4.56	4.27	4.03	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 856	****	4.69	4.00	3.87	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	51/ 244	4.57	4.79	4.07	3.82	4.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	120/ 258	4.29	4.43	4.10	3.94	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 236	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.31	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	35/ 238	4.86	4.95	4.26	4.00	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 214	****	****	4.08	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	27	Non-major	23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: THTR 104 0101  
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME  
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1524  
 JAN 19, 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	2	4	11	4.53	512/1556	4.53	4.59	4.25	4.06	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	559/1557	4.47	4.47	4.21	4.13	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	77/1335	4.94	4.63	4.24	4.13	4.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	118/1510	4.88	4.54	4.19	4.07	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	409/1479	4.38	4.41	3.97	3.90	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	486/1424	4.38	4.18	4.08	3.91	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	386/1537	4.59	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	4.00	1453/1553	4.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	520/1536	4.38	4.46	4.07	3.91	4.38
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	858/1487	4.47	4.55	4.44	4.37	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	726/1489	4.41	4.53	4.27	4.18	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	236/1481	4.82	4.61	4.28	4.18	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	249/1246	4.50	4.32	3.93	3.78	4.50
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	1	4	5	3.77	931/1411	3.77	4.50	4.00	3.78	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	2	3	2	4	3.31	1256/1413	3.31	4.49	4.23	3.96	3.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	1	2	2	6	3.69	1153/1408	3.69	4.56	4.27	4.03	3.69
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 856	****	4.69	4.00	3.87	****
-----														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 244	****	4.79	4.07	3.82	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 258	****	4.43	4.10	3.94	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 236	****	5.00	4.36	4.31	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 238	****	4.95	4.26	4.00	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 214	****	****	4.08	4.02	****
-----														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 102	****	5.00	4.50	3.92	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.39	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 110 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTION TO ACTING  
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1525  
 JAN 19, 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	13	4.80	204/1556	4.80	4.59	4.25	4.06	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	170/1557	4.90	4.47	4.21	4.13	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	9	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1335	4.88	4.63	4.24	4.13	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	304/1510	4.53	4.54	4.19	4.07	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	239/1479	4.57	4.41	3.97	3.90	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	458/1424	4.52	4.18	4.08	3.91	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	532/1537	4.48	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1553	4.89	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	150/1536	4.71	4.46	4.07	3.91	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	409/1487	4.79	4.55	4.44	4.37	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	270/1489	4.75	4.53	4.27	4.18	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	487/1481	4.61	4.61	4.28	4.18	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1246	5.00	4.32	3.93	3.78	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1411	4.94	4.50	4.00	3.78	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1413	5.00	4.49	4.23	3.96	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1408	5.00	4.56	4.27	4.03	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 856	5.00	4.69	4.00	3.87	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 110 0201  
 Title INTRODUCTION TO ACTING  
 Instructor: Marino, Christo  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1526  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	204/1556	4.80	4.59	4.25	4.06	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1557	4.90	4.47	4.21	4.13	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	223/1335	4.88	4.63	4.24	4.13	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	560/1510	4.53	4.54	4.19	4.07	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	0	11	4.54	281/1479	4.57	4.41	3.97	3.90	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	218/1424	4.52	4.18	4.08	3.91	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	476/1537	4.48	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	867/1553	4.89	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	216/1536	4.71	4.46	4.07	3.91	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	316/1487	4.79	4.55	4.44	4.37	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	315/1489	4.75	4.53	4.27	4.18	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	500/1481	4.61	4.61	4.28	4.18	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1246	5.00	4.32	3.93	3.78	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	137/1411	4.94	4.50	4.00	3.78	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1413	5.00	4.49	4.23	3.96	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1408	5.00	4.56	4.27	4.03	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 856	5.00	4.69	4.00	3.87	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	10	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
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				
				?	2						

Course-Section: THTR 120 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTION TO THEATR  
 Instructor: McCULLY, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1527  
 JAN 19, 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	3	0	0	2	10	8	6	3.69	1333/1556	3.69	4.59	4.25	4.06	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	3	14	7	4.00	1065/1557	4.00	4.47	4.21	4.13	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	11	1	1	5	3	5	3.67	1128/1335	3.67	4.63	4.24	4.13	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	7	6	12	4.12	907/1510	4.12	4.54	4.19	4.07	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	9	7	9	3.92	836/1479	3.92	4.41	3.97	3.90	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	7	8	9	3.88	931/1424	3.88	4.18	4.08	3.91	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	4	3	6	6	7	3.35	1386/1537	3.35	4.13	4.15	4.12	3.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	18	7	4.28	1290/1553	4.28	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.28
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	0	6	12	1	3.74	1153/1536	3.74	4.46	4.07	3.91	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	2	5	10	4	3.76	1333/1487	3.76	4.55	4.44	4.37	3.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	738/1491	4.82	4.90	4.70	4.61	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	7	10	4	3.77	1234/1489	3.77	4.53	4.27	4.18	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	3	4	6	10	4.00	1070/1481	4.00	4.61	4.28	4.18	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	2	0	6	4	10	3.91	711/1246	3.91	4.32	3.93	3.78	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	4	6	10	4.09	703/1411	4.09	4.50	4.00	3.78	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	3	4	14	4.41	679/1413	4.41	4.49	4.23	3.96	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	4	2	14	4.27	811/1408	4.27	4.56	4.27	4.03	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	2	12	6	4.05	406/ 856	4.05	4.69	4.00	3.87	4.05

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 202 0101  
 Title INTRO DRAMA LITERATURE  
 Instructor: HARRISON, JEANN  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1528  
 JAN 19, 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	1	0	2	8	18	4.45	635/1556	4.45	4.59	4.25	4.33	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	6	16	4.21	897/1557	4.21	4.47	4.21	4.30	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	2	3	6	14	4.15	875/1335	4.15	4.63	4.24	4.37	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	11	12	4.10	919/1510	4.10	4.54	4.19	4.23	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	23	4.78	144/1479	4.78	4.41	3.97	3.88	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	3	8	14	4.35	515/1424	4.35	4.18	4.08	4.04	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	2	5	4	14	3.96	1040/1537	3.96	4.13	4.15	4.17	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	879/1553	4.78	4.68	4.69	4.69	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	5	8	14	4.25	659/1536	4.25	4.46	4.07	4.13	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	0	8	18	4.46	872/1487	4.46	4.55	4.44	4.47	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	410/1491	4.93	4.90	4.70	4.75	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	3	20	4.43	712/1489	4.43	4.53	4.27	4.32	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	7	18	4.43	746/1481	4.43	4.61	4.28	4.37	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	139/1246	4.74	4.32	3.93	4.02	4.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	267/1411	4.65	4.50	4.00	4.05	4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	2	5	17	4.42	658/1413	4.42	4.49	4.23	4.28	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	1	22	4.65	460/1408	4.65	4.56	4.27	4.31	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	7	5	9	4.10	396/ 856	4.10	4.69	4.00	3.92	4.10

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: THTR 210 0101  
 Title HISTORY OF THEATRE I  
 Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1529  
 JAN 19, 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	5	0	1	1	5	10	13	4.10	1045/1556	4.10	4.59	4.25	4.33	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	2	0	2	12	14	4.20	907/1557	4.20	4.47	4.21	4.30	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	1	3	7	18	4.45	569/1335	4.45	4.63	4.24	4.37	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	1	7	8	13	4.14	883/1510	4.14	4.54	4.19	4.23	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	0	5	7	12	3.82	928/1479	3.82	4.41	3.97	3.88	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	1	3	5	8	10	3.85	954/1424	3.85	4.18	4.08	4.04	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	1	2	5	19	4.56	420/1537	4.56	4.13	4.15	4.17	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	19	9	4.32	1262/1553	4.32	4.68	4.69	4.69	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	486/1536	4.41	4.46	4.07	4.13	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	0	1	3	24	4.57	746/1487	4.57	4.55	4.44	4.47	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	1	0	5	23	4.60	1080/1491	4.60	4.90	4.70	4.75	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	1	3	11	13	4.07	1065/1489	4.07	4.53	4.27	4.32	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	0	1	6	21	4.59	527/1481	4.59	4.61	4.28	4.37	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	16	4	0	5	1	4	3.07	1106/1246	3.07	4.32	3.93	4.02	3.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	3	0	5	4	8	3.70	967/1411	3.70	4.50	4.00	4.05	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	4	1	6	3	7	3.38	1231/1413	3.38	4.49	4.23	4.28	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	2	6	3	8	3.75	1130/1408	3.75	4.56	4.27	4.31	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	14	13	3	0	3	0	2	2.75	****/ 856	****	4.69	4.00	3.92	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	4.79	4.07	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 258	****	4.43	4.10	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 236	****	5.00	4.36	4.53	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 238	****	4.95	4.26	4.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 214	****	****	4.08	4.45	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 102	****	5.00	4.50	3.88	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.39	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.36	3.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	5.00	4.49	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.03	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	5.00	3.92	3.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 60	****	5.00	3.86	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.31	3.97	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.09	3.69	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.09	3.93	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	4.00	3.84	3.19	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	30	****	5.00	4.01	4.07	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	32	****	****	4.18	3.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.36	4.15	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	4.65	****

Course-Section: THTR 210 0101  
 Title HISTORY OF THEATRE I  
 Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1529  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 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	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	35	Non-major	23
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	10	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 220 0101  
 Title CRAFT OF ACTING I  
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1530  
 JAN 19, 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	144/1556	4.91	4.59	4.25	4.33	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	515/1557	4.44	4.47	4.21	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1335	****	4.63	4.24	4.37	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	260/1510	4.52	4.54	4.19	4.23	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	551/1479	4.22	4.41	3.97	3.88	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	250/1424	4.15	4.18	4.08	4.04	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	936/1537	3.75	4.13	4.15	4.17	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	680/1553	4.91	4.68	4.69	4.69	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	216/1536	4.65	4.46	4.07	4.13	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	700/1487	4.60	4.55	4.44	4.47	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	467/1489	4.80	4.53	4.27	4.32	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	500/1481	4.68	4.61	4.28	4.37	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1246	****	4.32	3.93	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	137/1411	4.87	4.50	4.00	4.05	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	328/1413	4.89	4.49	4.23	4.28	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	653/1408	4.57	4.56	4.27	4.31	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	103/ 856	4.79	4.69	4.00	3.92	4.89

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 220 0201  
 Title CRAFT OF ACTING I  
 Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1531  
 JAN 19, 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	1	12	4.92	115/1556	4.91	4.59	4.25	4.33	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	686/1557	4.44	4.47	4.21	4.30	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1335	****	4.63	4.24	4.37	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	658/1510	4.52	4.54	4.19	4.23	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1479	4.22	4.41	3.97	3.88	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	5	4	3.69	1091/1424	4.15	4.18	4.08	4.04	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	1	1	4	1	3	3.40	1367/1537	3.75	4.13	4.15	4.17	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	612/1553	4.91	4.68	4.69	4.69	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	243/1536	4.65	4.46	4.07	4.13	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	700/1487	4.60	4.55	4.44	4.47	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	4.80	4.53	4.27	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	315/1481	4.68	4.61	4.28	4.37	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1246	****	4.32	3.93	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	158/1411	4.87	4.50	4.00	4.05	4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1413	4.89	4.49	4.23	4.28	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	424/1408	4.57	4.56	4.27	4.31	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	153/ 856	4.79	4.69	4.00	3.92	4.70
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 102	****	5.00	4.50	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	5.00	4.49	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.03	4.14	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.31	3.97	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.09	3.69	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	10

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

Course-Section: THTR 222 0101  
 Title VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I  
 Instructor: WATSON, LYNN  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1532  
 JAN 19, 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	2	9	4.82	198/1556	4.87	4.59	4.25	4.33	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	461/1557	4.69	4.47	4.21	4.30	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	172/1335	4.83	4.63	4.24	4.37	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	313/1510	4.73	4.54	4.19	4.23	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	427/1479	4.22	4.41	3.97	3.88	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	496/1424	4.22	4.18	4.08	4.04	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	757/1537	3.99	4.13	4.15	4.17	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	600/1536	4.47	4.46	4.07	4.13	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	181/1487	4.95	4.55	4.44	4.47	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	462/1481	4.82	4.61	4.28	4.37	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	504/1246	4.59	4.32	3.93	4.02	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	473/1411	4.47	4.50	4.00	4.05	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	753/1413	4.56	4.49	4.23	4.28	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	700/1408	4.52	4.56	4.27	4.31	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	146/ 856	4.73	4.69	4.00	3.92	4.71
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 102	****	5.00	4.50	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	5.00	4.49	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.03	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 222 0201  
 Title VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I  
 Instructor: Marino, Christo  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1533  
 JAN 19, 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	1	11	4.92	129/1556	4.87	4.59	4.25	4.33	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	155/1557	4.69	4.47	4.21	4.30	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	162/1335	4.83	4.63	4.24	4.37	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	142/1510	4.73	4.54	4.19	4.23	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	685/1479	4.22	4.41	3.97	3.88	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	751/1424	4.22	4.18	4.08	4.04	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1229/1537	3.99	4.13	4.15	4.17	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	243/1536	4.47	4.46	4.07	4.13	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1487	4.95	4.55	4.44	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1481	4.82	4.61	4.28	4.37	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1246	4.59	4.32	3.93	4.02	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	339/1411	4.47	4.50	4.00	4.05	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	280/1413	4.56	4.49	4.23	4.28	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	478/1408	4.52	4.56	4.27	4.31	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	134/ 856	4.73	4.69	4.00	3.92	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 229 0101  
 Title MOVEMENT FOR THE ACTOR  
 Instructor: ROMITA, NANCY  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1534  
 JAN 19, 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	1	0	3	9	4.54	500/1556	4.64	4.59	4.25	4.33	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	368/1557	4.64	4.47	4.21	4.30	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1335	4.80	4.63	4.24	4.37	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	599/1510	4.54	4.54	4.19	4.23	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1479	****	4.41	3.97	3.88	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	5	2	3.62	1149/1424	4.17	4.18	4.08	4.04	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1111/1537	4.05	4.13	4.15	4.17	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	1	4.08	1417/1553	4.04	4.68	4.69	4.69	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	8	2	3.91	1024/1536	4.25	4.46	4.07	4.13	3.91
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1487	4.71	4.55	4.44	4.47	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1489	4.71	4.53	4.27	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1481	4.57	4.61	4.28	4.37	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	452/1246	4.32	4.32	3.93	4.02	4.25
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	292/1411	4.71	4.50	4.00	4.05	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	158/1413	4.91	4.49	4.23	4.28	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	357/1408	4.78	4.56	4.27	4.31	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	216/ 856	4.69	4.69	4.00	3.92	4.50
-----														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 102	****	5.00	4.50	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	5.00	4.49	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.03	4.14	****
-----														
Field Work														
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.09	3.69	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	10

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

Course-Section: THTR 229 0201  
 Title MOVEMENT FOR THE ACTOR  
 Instructor: ROMITA, NANCY  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1535  
 JAN 19, 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	9	4.75	257/1556	4.64	4.59	4.25	4.33	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	308/1557	4.64	4.47	4.21	4.30	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	177/1335	4.80	4.63	4.24	4.37	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	260/1510	4.54	4.54	4.19	4.23	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1479	****	4.41	3.97	3.88	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	161/1424	4.17	4.18	4.08	4.04	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	843/1537	4.05	4.13	4.15	4.17	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	0	4.00	1453/1553	4.04	4.68	4.69	4.69	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	270/1536	4.25	4.46	4.07	4.13	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	506/1487	4.71	4.55	4.44	4.47	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	326/1489	4.71	4.53	4.27	4.32	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	541/1481	4.57	4.61	4.28	4.37	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	337/1246	4.32	4.32	3.93	4.02	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	180/1411	4.71	4.50	4.00	4.05	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	198/1413	4.91	4.49	4.23	4.28	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	319/1408	4.78	4.56	4.27	4.31	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	103/ 856	4.69	4.69	4.00	3.92	4.89

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: THTR 230 0101  
 Title DRAWING FOR THEATRE  
 Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1536  
 JAN 19, 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	1	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	476/1556	4.56	4.59	4.25	4.33	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	994/1557	4.11	4.47	4.21	4.30	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	309/1335	4.67	4.63	4.24	4.37	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	118/1510	4.89	4.54	4.19	4.23	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1424	****	4.18	4.08	4.04	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	0	0	3	3	3.63	1275/1537	3.63	4.13	4.15	4.17	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1253/1553	4.33	4.68	4.69	4.69	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	460/1536	4.43	4.46	4.07	4.13	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	595/1487	4.67	4.55	4.44	4.47	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	563/1491	4.89	4.90	4.70	4.75	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	683/1489	4.44	4.53	4.27	4.32	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	569/1481	4.56	4.61	4.28	4.37	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	858/1246	3.67	4.32	3.93	4.02	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	286/1411	4.63	4.50	4.00	4.05	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	225/1413	4.88	4.49	4.23	4.28	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	367/1408	4.75	4.56	4.27	4.31	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	216/ 856	4.50	4.69	4.00	3.92	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	10	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 233 0101  
 Title COSTUME DESIGN  
 Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1537  
 JAN 19, 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	6	5.00	1/1556	5.00	4.59	4.25	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	155/1557	4.83	4.47	4.21	4.30	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	484/1335	4.50	4.63	4.24	4.37	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	157/1510	4.80	4.54	4.19	4.23	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1479	****	4.41	3.97	3.88	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1424	****	4.18	4.08	4.04	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	843/1537	4.20	4.13	4.15	4.17	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	121/1536	4.80	4.46	4.07	4.13	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1487	5.00	4.55	4.44	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	741/1489	4.40	4.53	4.27	4.32	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.37	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	392/1246	4.33	4.32	3.93	4.02	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	367/1411	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.05	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	574/1413	4.50	4.49	4.23	4.28	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1408	5.00	4.56	4.27	4.31	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 856	****	4.69	4.00	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1538  
 JAN 19, 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	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1556	5.00	4.59	4.25	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	380/1557	4.60	4.47	4.21	4.30	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1335	****	4.63	4.24	4.37	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1510	5.00	4.54	4.19	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1479	****	4.41	3.97	3.88	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1424	****	4.18	4.08	4.04	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	476/1537	4.50	4.13	4.15	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	270/1536	4.60	4.46	4.07	4.13	4.60
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	429/1487	4.75	4.55	4.44	4.47	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	281/1489	4.75	4.53	4.27	4.32	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.37	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	249/1246	4.50	4.32	3.93	4.02	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 237 0101  
 Title SOUND DESIGN  
 Instructor: COBB, MILTON T.  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1539  
 JAN 19, 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	4	4.80	204/1556	4.80	4.59	4.25	4.33	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	170/1557	4.80	4.47	4.21	4.30	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1335	5.00	4.63	4.24	4.37	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	811/1510	4.20	4.54	4.19	4.23	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	239/1479	4.60	4.41	3.97	3.88	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	657/1424	4.20	4.18	4.08	4.04	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	364/1537	4.60	4.13	4.15	4.17	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	843/1553	4.80	4.68	4.69	4.69	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	270/1536	4.60	4.46	4.07	4.13	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1487	4.80	4.55	4.44	4.47	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	763/1491	4.80	4.90	4.70	4.75	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	225/1489	4.80	4.53	4.27	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.37	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	196/1246	4.60	4.32	3.93	4.02	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.05	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	353/1413	4.75	4.49	4.23	4.28	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1408	5.00	4.56	4.27	4.31	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 856	5.00	4.69	4.00	3.92	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 242 0101  
 Title PRESENTATION SKILLS  
 Instructor: WATSON, LYNN  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1540  
 JAN 19, 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	1	1	4	4	4.10	1045/1556	4.10	4.59	4.25	4.33	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	783/1557	4.30	4.47	4.21	4.30	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	787/1335	4.25	4.63	4.24	4.37	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	694/1510	4.30	4.54	4.19	4.23	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1099/1479	3.60	4.41	3.97	3.88	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	4	0	2.90	1381/1424	2.90	4.18	4.08	4.04	2.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	4	2	3.50	1325/1537	3.50	4.13	4.15	4.17	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	770/1536	4.14	4.46	4.07	4.13	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	928/1487	4.43	4.55	4.44	4.47	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	638/1491	4.86	4.90	4.70	4.75	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	506/1489	4.57	4.53	4.27	4.32	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	541/1481	4.57	4.61	4.28	4.37	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	430/1246	4.29	4.32	3.93	4.02	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	886/1411	3.83	4.50	4.00	4.05	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	730/1413	4.33	4.49	4.23	4.28	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	584/1408	4.50	4.56	4.27	4.31	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	185/ 856	4.60	4.69	4.00	3.92	4.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 250 0101  
 Title INTRO PRODUCTION TECH  
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1541  
 JAN 19, 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	2	4.67	352/1556	4.33	4.59	4.25	4.33	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	308/1557	4.50	4.47	4.21	4.30	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1335	5.00	4.63	4.24	4.37	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1510	5.00	4.54	4.19	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1479	5.00	4.41	3.97	3.88	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1537	5.00	4.13	4.15	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1000/1553	4.33	4.68	4.69	4.69	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	216/1536	4.67	4.46	4.07	4.13	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1487	4.50	4.55	4.44	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1491	4.50	4.90	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.50	4.53	4.27	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	4.50	4.61	4.28	4.37	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	600/1246	4.00	4.32	3.93	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.05	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	947/1413	4.00	4.49	4.23	4.28	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1408	4.50	4.56	4.27	4.31	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 856	5.00	4.69	4.00	3.92	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 244	5.00	4.79	4.07	4.30	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 258	4.50	4.43	4.10	4.32	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 236	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.53	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 238	5.00	4.95	4.26	4.59	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 102	5.00	5.00	4.50	3.88	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	5.00	4.39	3.00	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	5.00	4.36	3.60	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.29	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	5.00	4.03	4.14	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 61	5.00	5.00	3.92	3.31	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 60	5.00	5.00	3.86	3.96	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.31	3.97	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	28/ 47	4.00	4.00	4.09	3.69	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.09	3.93	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	23/ 39	4.00	4.00	3.84	3.19	4.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	5.00	4.01	4.07	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 16	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.15	5.00

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

2 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 16 5.00 5.00 4.51 4.65 5.00

Course-Section: THTR 250 0101  
 Title INTRO PRODUCTION TECH  
 Instructor: KAPLAN, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1541  
 JAN 19, 2005  
 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	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 250 0102  
 Title INTRO PRODUCTION TECH  
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1542  
 JAN 19, 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	1	1	4.00	1121/1556	4.33	4.59	4.25	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	746/1557	4.50	4.47	4.21	4.30	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1537	5.00	4.13	4.15	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1453/1553	4.33	4.68	4.69	4.69	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	216/1536	4.67	4.46	4.07	4.13	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1231/1487	4.50	4.55	4.44	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1399/1491	4.50	4.90	4.70	4.75	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1090/1489	4.50	4.53	4.27	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1070/1481	4.50	4.61	4.28	4.37	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	739/1411	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.05	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	947/1413	4.00	4.49	4.23	4.28	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	981/1408	4.50	4.56	4.27	4.31	4.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	154/ 258	4.50	4.43	4.10	4.32	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 236	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.53	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 238	5.00	4.95	4.26	4.59	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 324 0101  
 Title CRAFT OF ACTING III  
 Instructor: Marino, Christo  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1543  
 JAN 19, 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	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	1052/1556	4.09	4.59	4.25	4.27	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	588/1557	4.45	4.47	4.21	4.21	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1335	5.00	4.63	4.24	4.21	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	1214/1510	3.75	4.54	4.19	4.20	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	1	5	3.73	1015/1479	3.73	4.41	3.97	3.95	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	524/1424	4.33	4.18	4.08	4.08	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	4	0	4	3.60	1287/1537	3.60	4.13	4.15	4.13	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	680/1553	4.91	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	460/1536	4.43	4.46	4.07	4.07	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1487	****	4.55	4.44	4.43	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1491	****	4.90	4.70	4.69	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1489	****	4.53	4.27	4.27	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1481	****	4.61	4.28	4.25	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	473/1411	4.40	4.50	4.00	3.98	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	679/1413	4.40	4.49	4.23	4.23	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	584/1408	4.50	4.56	4.27	4.28	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	127/ 856	4.78	4.69	4.00	3.99	4.78

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 329 0101  
 Title MOVEMENT FOR ACTOR III  
 Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1544  
 JAN 19, 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	0	1	11	4.92	129/1556	4.92	4.59	4.25	4.27	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	368/1557	4.62	4.47	4.21	4.21	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	260/1335	4.71	4.63	4.24	4.21	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	137/1510	4.85	4.54	4.19	4.20	4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	382/1479	4.42	4.41	3.97	3.95	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	145/1424	4.75	4.18	4.08	4.08	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	324/1537	4.64	4.13	4.15	4.13	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	1363/1553	4.17	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1536	5.00	4.46	4.07	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1487	****	4.55	4.44	4.43	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1491	****	4.90	4.70	4.69	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1489	****	4.53	4.27	4.27	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1481	****	4.61	4.28	4.25	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1246	****	4.32	3.93	3.98	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	180/1411	4.80	4.50	4.00	3.98	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1413	5.00	4.49	4.23	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	216/1408	4.90	4.56	4.27	4.28	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 856	5.00	4.69	4.00	3.99	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: THTR 339 0101  
 Title ADV PRODUCTION TECHNQU  
 Instructor: COBB, MILTON T.  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1545  
 JAN 19, 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	0	4.00	1121/1556	4.00	4.59	4.25	4.27	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1065/1557	4.00	4.47	4.21	4.21	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1479	5.00	4.41	3.97	3.95	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.18	4.08	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	993/1537	4.00	4.13	4.15	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1536	5.00	4.46	4.07	4.07	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 345 0101  
 Title BUSINESS OF ACTING  
 Instructor: LANCISI, VINCEN  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1546  
 JAN 19, 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	0	2	5	7	4.36	773/1556	4.36	4.59	4.25	4.27	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	3	5	3.71	1308/1557	3.71	4.47	4.21	4.21	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	823/1335	4.21	4.63	4.24	4.21	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	423/1510	4.50	4.54	4.19	4.20	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	9	4.29	498/1479	4.29	4.41	3.97	3.95	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1424	****	4.18	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	4	3	2	3.00	1444/1537	3.00	4.13	4.15	4.13	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	761/1553	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	2	5	5	0	3.25	1396/1536	3.25	4.46	4.07	4.07	3.25
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	5	3	2	3.23	1428/1487	3.23	4.55	4.44	4.43	3.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	663/1491	4.85	4.90	4.70	4.69	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	4	3	3	3.46	1330/1489	3.46	4.53	4.27	4.27	3.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	3	4	3	3.54	1296/1481	3.54	4.61	4.28	4.25	3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	249/1246	4.50	4.32	3.93	3.98	4.50
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	3	4	3.69	972/1411	3.69	4.50	4.00	3.98	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	947/1413	4.00	4.49	4.23	4.23	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	0	4	2	5	3.62	1185/1408	3.62	4.56	4.27	4.28	3.62
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	336/ 856	4.25	4.69	4.00	3.99	4.25
-----														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.79	4.07	4.03	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 258	****	4.43	4.10	4.17	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 238	****	4.95	4.26	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 360 0101  
 Title MODERN THEATRE I  
 Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1547  
 JAN 19, 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	3	10	4.77	246/1556	4.77	4.59	4.25	4.27	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	474/1557	4.54	4.47	4.21	4.21	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	359/1335	4.62	4.63	4.24	4.21	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	137/1510	4.85	4.54	4.19	4.20	4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1479	5.00	4.41	3.97	3.95	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	320/1424	4.50	4.18	4.08	4.08	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	1	8	4.08	953/1537	4.08	4.13	4.15	4.13	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	891/1553	4.77	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	287/1536	4.58	4.46	4.07	4.07	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	409/1487	4.77	4.55	4.44	4.43	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.69	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	350/1489	4.69	4.53	4.27	4.27	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	217/1481	4.85	4.61	4.28	4.25	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	284/1246	4.46	4.32	3.93	3.98	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	241/1411	4.69	4.50	4.00	3.98	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	1	1	9	4.23	814/1413	4.23	4.49	4.23	4.23	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	560/1408	4.54	4.56	4.27	4.28	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	287/ 856	4.36	4.69	4.00	3.99	4.36

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	5
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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 390 0101  
 Title THEATRE IN PRODUCTION  
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1548  
 JAN 19, 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	5	4.83	186/1556	4.83	4.59	4.25	4.27	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1065/1557	4.00	4.47	4.21	4.21	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1335	5.00	4.63	4.24	4.21	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	423/1510	4.50	4.54	4.19	4.20	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	129/1479	4.80	4.41	3.97	3.95	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	806/1424	4.00	4.18	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	129/1537	4.83	4.13	4.15	4.13	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1093/1536	3.80	4.46	4.07	4.07	3.80

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	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	6	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: THTR 490 0101  
 Title PRODUCTION WORKSHOP  
 Instructor: MEHTA, XERXES J  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2004

Page 1549  
 JAN 19, 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	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1556	5.00	4.59	4.25	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1557	5.00	4.47	4.21	4.27	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	223/1335	4.75	4.63	4.24	4.31	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1510	5.00	4.54	4.19	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	204/1479	4.67	4.41	3.97	4.05	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1424	****	4.18	4.08	4.18	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	993/1537	4.00	4.13	4.15	4.22	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1536	5.00	4.46	4.07	4.20	5.00
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	174/1411	4.82	4.50	4.00	4.14	4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1413	5.00	4.49	4.23	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1408	5.00	4.56	4.27	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 856	5.00	4.69	4.00	4.20	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	0	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	5	Under-grad	12	Non-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						