

Course-Section: THTR 104 0102
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1437
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1470	4.70	4.69	4.29	4.13	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1470	4.43	4.43	4.23	4.17	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1252	4.68	4.51	4.27	4.21	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	555/1413	4.43	4.55	4.24	4.12	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	380/1391	3.83	4.34	4.02	3.96	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	623/1347	4.20	4.33	4.10	4.01	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	324/1455	4.38	4.11	4.16	4.16	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1149/1469	4.60	4.60	4.70	4.65	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/1451	4.69	4.35	4.08	3.99	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	315/1407	4.32	4.40	4.43	4.40	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	693/1404	4.82	4.81	4.70	4.62	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	193/1401	4.68	4.51	4.28	4.22	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1398	4.82	4.58	4.27	4.21	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	343/1176	4.54	4.20	3.96	3.84	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1156/1276	3.58	4.41	4.06	3.81	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1242/1277	3.26	4.49	4.30	4.02	2.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	881/1271	3.75	4.46	4.28	4.02	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0103
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1438
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	539/1470	4.70	4.69	4.29	4.13	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	470/1470	4.43	4.43	4.23	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1252	4.68	4.51	4.27	4.21	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1413	4.43	4.55	4.24	4.12	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1364/1391	3.83	4.34	4.02	3.96	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	771/1347	4.20	4.33	4.10	4.01	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1455	4.38	4.11	4.16	4.16	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1070/1469	4.60	4.60	4.70	4.65	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1451	4.69	4.35	4.08	3.99	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	753/1407	4.32	4.40	4.43	4.40	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1404	4.82	4.81	4.70	4.62	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1401	4.68	4.51	4.28	4.22	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	4.82	4.58	4.27	4.21	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	253/1176	4.54	4.20	3.96	3.84	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	710/1276	3.58	4.41	4.06	3.81	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1111/1277	3.26	4.49	4.30	4.02	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1185/1271	3.75	4.46	4.28	4.02	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	421/ 763	4.17	4.28	4.06	3.92	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0104
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1439
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	187/1470	4.70	4.69	4.29	4.13	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	873/1470	4.43	4.43	4.23	4.17	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	590/1252	4.68	4.51	4.27	4.21	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	149/1413	4.43	4.55	4.24	4.12	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	380/1391	3.83	4.34	4.02	3.96	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	243/1347	4.20	4.33	4.10	4.01	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	576/1455	4.38	4.11	4.16	4.16	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1469	4.60	4.60	4.70	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	332/1451	4.69	4.35	4.08	3.99	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1161/1407	4.32	4.40	4.43	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1404	4.82	4.81	4.70	4.62	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	699/1401	4.68	4.51	4.28	4.22	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	226/1398	4.82	4.58	4.27	4.21	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	119/1176	4.54	4.20	3.96	3.84	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	875/1276	3.58	4.41	4.06	3.81	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1023/1277	3.26	4.49	4.30	4.02	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	881/1271	3.75	4.46	4.28	4.02	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	281/ 763	4.17	4.28	4.06	3.92	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 236	****	****	4.22	4.02	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 248	****	****	4.23	4.12	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	5.00	4.33	4.15	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	5.00	4.28	4.17	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	131/ 214	4.00	4.00	4.16	4.13	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 104 0105
 Title INTRO TO COSTUME
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1440
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	539/1470	4.70	4.69	4.29	4.13	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1020/1470	4.43	4.43	4.23	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	473/1252	4.68	4.51	4.27	4.21	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1305/1413	4.43	4.55	4.24	4.12	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	736/1391	3.83	4.34	4.02	3.96	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	771/1347	4.20	4.33	4.10	4.01	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	953/1455	4.38	4.11	4.16	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1070/1469	4.60	4.60	4.70	4.65	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	332/1451	4.69	4.35	4.08	3.99	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1161/1407	4.32	4.40	4.43	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1106/1404	4.82	4.81	4.70	4.62	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	553/1401	4.68	4.51	4.28	4.22	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	587/1398	4.82	4.58	4.27	4.21	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	253/1176	4.54	4.20	3.96	3.84	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1026/1276	3.58	4.41	4.06	3.81	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1201/1277	3.26	4.49	4.30	4.02	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	881/1271	3.75	4.46	4.28	4.02	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 110 0101
 Title INTRODUCTION TO ACTING
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1441
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	119/1470	4.89	4.69	4.29	4.13	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	175/1470	4.78	4.43	4.23	4.17	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1252	****	4.51	4.27	4.21	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	401/1413	4.53	4.55	4.24	4.12	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	736/1391	4.00	4.34	4.02	3.96	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	486/1347	4.33	4.33	4.10	4.01	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	4	1	13	4.50	437/1455	4.50	4.11	4.16	4.16	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	1000/1469	4.61	4.60	4.70	4.65	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	316/1451	4.53	4.35	4.08	3.99	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1407	****	4.40	4.43	4.40	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1404	****	4.81	4.70	4.62	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1401	****	4.51	4.28	4.22	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1398	****	4.58	4.27	4.21	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1176	****	4.20	3.96	3.84	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	76/1276	4.94	4.41	4.06	3.81	4.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	129/1277	4.94	4.49	4.30	4.02	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	122/1271	4.94	4.46	4.28	4.02	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	142/ 763	4.60	4.28	4.06	3.92	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 1		

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1442
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	127/1470	4.89	4.69	4.29	4.28	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	518/1470	4.47	4.43	4.23	4.22	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	473/1252	4.50	4.51	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	584/1413	4.39	4.55	4.24	4.24	4.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	102/1391	4.83	4.34	4.02	3.97	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	486/1347	4.33	4.33	4.10	4.01	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	1	6	9	4.22	779/1455	4.22	4.11	4.16	4.20	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	862/1469	4.78	4.60	4.70	4.73	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	285/1451	4.56	4.35	4.08	4.04	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	409/1407	4.75	4.40	4.43	4.41	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	531/1404	4.88	4.81	4.70	4.71	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	263/1401	4.75	4.51	4.28	4.26	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	165/1398	4.88	4.58	4.27	4.26	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	938/1176	3.43	4.20	3.96	3.99	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	76/1276	4.94	4.41	4.06	4.01	4.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	326/1277	4.78	4.49	4.30	4.25	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	122/1271	4.94	4.46	4.28	4.25	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	0	0	7	11	4.42	229/763	4.42	4.28	4.06	3.98	4.42	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 1	A 8	Required for Majors	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: THTR 211 0101
 Title HISTORY OF THEATRE II
 Instructor: McCULLY, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1443
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1080/1470	4.00	4.69	4.29	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1020/1470	4.00	4.43	4.23	4.22	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1252	****	4.51	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	313/1413	4.60	4.55	4.24	4.24	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	226/1391	4.60	4.34	4.02	3.97	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	243/1347	4.60	4.33	4.10	4.01	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	3	2	3	1	3.22	1338/1455	3.22	4.11	4.16	4.20	3.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	8	0	3.80	1441/1469	3.80	4.60	4.70	4.73	3.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1187/1451	3.57	4.35	4.08	4.04	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1306/1407	3.60	4.40	4.43	4.41	3.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	462/1404	4.90	4.81	4.70	4.71	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1022/1401	4.00	4.51	4.28	4.26	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	1143/1398	3.80	4.58	4.27	4.26	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	563/1176	4.11	4.20	3.96	3.99	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	529/1276	4.30	4.41	4.06	4.01	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	292/1277	4.80	4.49	4.30	4.25	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	401/1271	4.70	4.46	4.28	4.25	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	376/ 763	4.14	4.28	4.06	3.98	4.14	

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 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 11 Non-major 5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 1		

Course-Section: THTR 221 0101
 Title CRAFT OF ACTING II
 Instructor: MEHTA, XERXES J
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1444
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	1	16	4.83	164/1470	4.83	4.69	4.29	4.28	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	449/1470	4.53	4.43	4.23	4.22	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	590/1252	4.40	4.51	4.27	4.28	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	112/1413	4.88	4.55	4.24	4.24	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	15	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1391	****	4.34	4.02	3.97	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1347	****	4.33	4.10	4.01	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	357/1455	4.57	4.11	4.16	4.20	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.60	4.70	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	509/1451	4.36	4.35	4.08	4.04	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	148/1276	4.83	4.41	4.06	4.01	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.49	4.30	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	259/1271	4.83	4.46	4.28	4.25	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	77/ 763	4.87	4.28	4.06	3.98	4.87	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	27/ 45	4.87	4.68	4.42	4.72	4.87	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	7	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	18/ 34	4.50	4.50	4.48	4.34	4.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	27/ 43	4.60	4.37	4.62	4.78	4.60	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	6	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.50	4.71	4.88	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	8	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	19/ 23	4.14	4.14	4.66	4.66	4.14	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 1		

Course-Section: THTR 223 0101
 Title: VOCAL TRNG FOR ACTOR I
 Instructor: WATSON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1445
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	223/1470	4.84	4.69	4.29	4.28	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	419/1470	4.73	4.43	4.23	4.22	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	232/1252	4.52	4.51	4.27	4.28	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	368/1413	4.53	4.55	4.24	4.24	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	952/1391	4.14	4.34	4.02	3.97	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	715/1347	4.16	4.33	4.10	4.01	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	156/1455	4.89	4.11	4.16	4.20	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	1380/1469	4.05	4.60	4.70	4.73	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	426/1451	4.46	4.35	4.08	4.04	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	371/1407	4.89	4.40	4.43	4.41	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	235/1401	4.89	4.51	4.28	4.26	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	156/1398	4.94	4.58	4.27	4.26	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	843/1176	3.67	4.20	3.96	3.99	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	317/1276	4.78	4.41	4.06	4.01	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	230/1277	4.94	4.49	4.30	4.25	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	782/1271	4.56	4.46	4.28	4.25	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	136/ 763	4.70	4.28	4.06	3.98	4.63	

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
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Major 8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1446
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	112/1470	4.84	4.69	4.29	4.28	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	84/1470	4.73	4.43	4.23	4.22	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	669/1252	4.52	4.51	4.27	4.28	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	423/1413	4.53	4.55	4.24	4.24	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	279/1391	4.14	4.34	4.02	3.97	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	0	6	4.20	623/1347	4.16	4.33	4.10	4.01	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1455	4.89	4.11	4.16	4.20	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	1358/1469	4.05	4.60	4.70	4.73	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	332/1451	4.46	4.35	4.08	4.04	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1407	4.89	4.40	4.43	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1401	4.89	4.51	4.28	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1398	4.94	4.58	4.27	4.26	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1176	3.67	4.20	3.96	3.99	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1276	4.78	4.41	4.06	4.01	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1277	4.94	4.49	4.30	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	219/1271	4.56	4.46	4.28	4.25	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	93/ 763	4.70	4.28	4.06	3.98	4.78	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 1		

Course-Section: THTR 232 0101
 Title SCENE DESIGN
 Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1447
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	0	4	3.75	1256/1470	3.75	4.69	4.29	4.28	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1201/1470	3.75	4.43	4.23	4.22	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1084/1252	3.67	4.51	4.27	4.28	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	888/1413	4.14	4.55	4.24	4.24	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	622/1391	4.17	4.34	4.02	3.97	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	1204/1347	3.40	4.33	4.10	4.01	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	1317/1455	3.33	4.11	4.16	4.20	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.60	4.70	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	0	3	0	2.80	1409/1451	2.80	4.35	4.08	4.04	2.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1246/1407	3.83	4.40	4.43	4.41	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	1180/1404	4.43	4.81	4.70	4.71	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1262/1401	3.50	4.51	4.28	4.26	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	1120/1398	3.86	4.58	4.27	4.26	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	615/1176	4.00	4.20	3.96	3.99	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	621/1276	4.20	4.41	4.06	4.01	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	687/1277	4.40	4.49	4.30	4.25	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1034/1271	3.80	4.46	4.28	4.25	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	613/ 763	3.50	4.28	4.06	3.98	3.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 248	****	****	4.23	4.22	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.28	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 214	****	4.00	4.16	3.95	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.89	4.59	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.42	4.70	4.47	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.84	4.66	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 74	****	4.84	4.50	4.28	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 71	****	4.11	4.16	4.25	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 45	****	****	4.34	4.50	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.17	4.63	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.48	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.18	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.75	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 45	****	4.68	4.42	4.72	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.48	4.34	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	4.37	4.62	4.78	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	4.50	4.71	4.88	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 23	****	4.14	4.66	4.66	****	

Course-Section: THTR 232 0101
 Title SCENE DESIGN
 Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1447
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 234 0101
 Title MAKE-UP FOR THE STAGE
 Instructor: ZLOTESCU, ELENA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1448
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	680/1470	4.40	4.69	4.29	4.28	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	971/1470	4.10	4.43	4.23	4.22	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1252	****	4.51	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	599/1413	4.38	4.55	4.24	4.24	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1391	****	4.34	4.02	3.97	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1347	****	4.33	4.10	4.01	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1317/1455	3.33	4.11	4.16	4.20	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	833/1469	4.80	4.60	4.70	4.73	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	591/1451	4.29	4.35	4.08	4.04	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1017/1407	4.25	4.40	4.43	4.41	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	936/1404	4.67	4.81	4.70	4.71	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	862/1401	4.25	4.51	4.28	4.26	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	870/1398	4.22	4.58	4.27	4.26	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	555/1176	4.13	4.20	3.96	3.99	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1026/1276	3.50	4.41	4.06	4.01	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1012/1277	3.83	4.49	4.30	4.25	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1025/1271	3.83	4.46	4.28	4.25	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 763	****	4.28	4.06	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 239 0101
 Title MOVEMENT FOR/ACTOR II
 Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1449
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1470	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	113/1470	4.87	4.43	4.23	4.22	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1252	4.78	4.51	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	123/1413	4.71	4.55	4.24	4.24	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	241/1391	4.56	4.34	4.02	3.97	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	264/1347	4.35	4.33	4.10	4.01	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	209/1455	4.63	4.11	4.16	4.20	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1327/1469	4.13	4.60	4.70	4.73	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1451	4.79	4.35	4.08	4.04	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	4.89	4.40	4.43	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1404	4.94	4.81	4.70	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	156/1401	4.82	4.51	4.28	4.26	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1398	4.94	4.58	4.27	4.26	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	253/1176	4.58	4.20	3.96	3.99	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	142/1276	4.71	4.41	4.06	4.01	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1277	4.89	4.49	4.30	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.46	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	78/ 763	4.50	4.28	4.06	3.98	4.86	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 239 0201
 Title MOVEMENT FOR/ACTOR II
 Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1450
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1470	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	95/1470	4.87	4.43	4.23	4.22	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	421/1252	4.78	4.51	4.27	4.28	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	368/1413	4.71	4.55	4.24	4.24	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	252/1391	4.56	4.34	4.02	3.97	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	704/1347	4.35	4.33	4.10	4.01	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	380/1455	4.63	4.11	4.16	4.20	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1350/1469	4.13	4.60	4.70	4.73	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	278/1451	4.79	4.35	4.08	4.04	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	371/1407	4.89	4.40	4.43	4.41	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1404	4.94	4.81	4.70	4.71	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	235/1401	4.82	4.51	4.28	4.26	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	156/1398	4.94	4.58	4.27	4.26	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	164/1176	4.58	4.20	3.96	3.99	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	317/1276	4.71	4.41	4.06	4.01	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	326/1277	4.89	4.49	4.30	4.25	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.46	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	376/ 763	4.50	4.28	4.06	3.98	4.14	

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
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Major 1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: THTR 250 0301
 Title INTRO PRODUCTION TECH
 Instructor: JOYCE, SHELLEY
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1451
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	248/1470	4.75	4.69	4.29	4.28	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1470	5.00	4.43	4.23	4.22	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1252	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.28	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	260/1455	4.67	4.11	4.16	4.20	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.60	4.70	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1451	5.00	4.35	4.08	4.04	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: THTR 321 0101
 Title SCRIPT ANALYSIS
 Instructor: MEHTA, XERXES J
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1452
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	119/1470	4.89	4.69	4.29	4.31	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	470/1470	4.50	4.43	4.23	4.22	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1252	****	4.51	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	163/1413	4.79	4.55	4.24	4.27	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	77/1391	4.90	4.34	4.02	4.00	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	41/1347	4.94	4.33	4.10	4.11	4.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	7	7	4.05	929/1455	4.05	4.11	4.16	4.12	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	1057/1469	4.53	4.60	4.70	4.67	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	591/1451	4.29	4.35	4.08	4.07	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	516/1407	4.69	4.40	4.43	4.41	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	369/1404	4.92	4.81	4.70	4.69	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	345/1401	4.69	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	387/1398	4.69	4.58	4.27	4.25	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	478/1176	4.22	4.20	3.96	3.97	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	158/1276	4.80	4.41	4.06	4.10	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	511/1277	4.60	4.49	4.30	4.34	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	641/1271	4.42	4.46	4.28	4.33	4.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	11	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	99/ 763	4.75	4.28	4.06	4.07	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	29/ 73	4.89	4.89	4.59	4.39	4.89	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	58/ 73	4.42	4.42	4.70	4.60	4.42	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	35/ 64	4.84	4.84	4.66	4.85	4.84	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	29/ 74	4.84	4.84	4.50	4.64	4.84	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	1	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	39/ 71	4.11	4.11	4.16	4.34	4.11	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	20

Course-Section: THTR 325 0101
 Title: VOCAL TRAINING ACTOR I
 Instructor: WATSON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1453
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	127/1470	4.89	4.69	4.29	4.31	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	716/1470	4.33	4.43	4.23	4.22	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	368/1413	4.56	4.55	4.24	4.27	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	410/1391	4.38	4.34	4.02	4.00	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	592/1347	4.22	4.33	4.10	4.11	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	953/1455	4.00	4.11	4.16	4.12	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.60	4.70	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	240/1451	4.63	4.35	4.08	4.07	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.40	4.43	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1404	4.89	4.81	4.70	4.69	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1401	5.00	4.51	4.28	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	156/1398	4.89	4.58	4.27	4.25	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	436/1176	4.29	4.20	3.96	3.97	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	132/1276	4.89	4.41	4.06	4.10	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	230/1277	4.89	4.49	4.30	4.34	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	529/1271	4.56	4.46	4.28	4.33	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	75/ 763	4.88	4.28	4.06	4.07	4.88	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1454
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	359/1470	4.67	4.69	4.29	4.31	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	300/1470	4.67	4.43	4.23	4.22	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1252	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1413	5.00	4.55	4.24	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	191/1391	4.67	4.34	4.02	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	190/1347	4.67	4.33	4.10	4.11	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1317/1455	3.33	4.11	4.16	4.12	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.60	4.70	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	845/1451	4.00	4.35	4.08	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1370/1407	3.00	4.40	4.43	4.41	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1324/1404	4.00	4.81	4.70	4.69	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1022/1401	4.00	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1021/1398	4.00	4.58	4.27	4.25	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1034/1176	3.00	4.20	3.96	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1026/1276	3.50	4.41	4.06	4.10	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.49	4.30	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	569/1271	4.50	4.46	4.28	4.33	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	762/ 763	1.00	4.28	4.06	4.07	1.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 347 0101
 Title CHARACTER/SCENE STUDY
 Instructor: MEHTA, XERXES J
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1455
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	963/1470	4.17	4.69	4.29	4.31	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1156/1470	3.83	4.43	4.23	4.22	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1252	****	4.51	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	986/1413	4.00	4.55	4.24	4.27	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	3	3	3	0	2.64	1417/1455	2.64	4.11	4.16	4.12	2.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	587/1469	4.92	4.60	4.70	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	8	0	3.73	1112/1451	3.73	4.35	4.08	4.07	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	246/1276	4.67	4.41	4.06	4.10	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	589/1277	4.50	4.49	4.30	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	992/1271	3.92	4.46	4.28	4.33	3.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	335/ 763	4.22	4.28	4.06	4.07	4.22	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	29/ 45	4.50	4.68	4.42	4.58	4.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	3	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	34/ 43	4.14	4.37	4.62	4.53	4.14	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	6	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	26/ 31	4.00	4.50	4.71	4.57	4.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	9	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 23	****	4.14	4.66	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 361 0101
 Title MODERN THEATRE II
 Instructor: McCULLY, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1456
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	4	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	595/1470	4.46	4.69	4.29	4.31	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	1020/1470	4.00	4.43	4.23	4.22	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	8	0	2	2	1	3.80	1034/1252	3.80	4.51	4.27	4.27	3.80		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	390/1413	4.54	4.55	4.24	4.27	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	135/1391	4.77	4.34	4.02	4.00	4.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	439/1347	4.38	4.33	4.10	4.11	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	2	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1134/1455	3.82	4.11	4.16	4.12	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	1	8	3	4.00	1380/1469	4.00	4.60	4.70	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	602/1451	4.27	4.35	4.08	4.07	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1069/1407	4.18	4.40	4.43	4.41	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	669/1404	4.82	4.81	4.70	4.69	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	983/1401	4.09	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	1	1	7	4.18	903/1398	4.18	4.58	4.27	4.25	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	615/1176	4.00	4.20	3.96	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	206/1276	4.73	4.41	4.06	4.10	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	284/1277	4.82	4.49	4.30	4.34	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.46	4.28	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	124/ 763	4.67	4.28	4.06	4.07	4.67	

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	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: THTR 390 0101
 Title THEATRE IN PRODUCTION
 Instructor: SEARLS, COLETTE
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1457
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1470	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.31	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	300/1470	4.67	4.43	4.23	4.22	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1252	****	4.51	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1413	5.00	4.55	4.24	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	102/1391	4.83	4.34	4.02	4.00	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1347	5.00	4.33	4.10	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	745/1455	4.25	4.11	4.16	4.12	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.60	4.70	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	533/1451	4.33	4.35	4.08	4.07	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1407	****	4.40	4.43	4.41	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1404	****	4.81	4.70	4.69	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1401	****	4.51	4.28	4.27	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1398	****	4.58	4.27	4.25	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1176	****	4.20	3.96	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.41	4.06	4.10	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.49	4.30	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.46	4.28	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 763	5.00	4.28	4.06	4.07	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: THTR 432 0101
 Title DESIGN SEMINAR
 Instructor: COBB, MILTON T.
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1458
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1470	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1020/1470	4.00	4.43	4.23	4.25	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	904/1252	4.00	4.51	4.27	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	423/1413	4.50	4.55	4.24	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	953/1455	4.00	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.60	4.70	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	845/1451	4.00	4.35	4.08	4.17	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	558/1407	4.67	4.40	4.43	4.47	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	780/1401	4.33	4.51	4.28	4.32	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	783/1398	4.33	4.58	4.27	4.33	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1176	5.00	4.20	3.96	4.05	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.41	4.06	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.49	4.30	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.46	4.28	4.41	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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