```
Course-Section: MCS  101  1                   University of Maryland                                Page  958
Title          Multimedia Literacy La          Baltimore County                                    JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Snyder,Donald I (Instr. A)      Spring 2010                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    26
Questionnaires: 19                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                  Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 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  16  4.84   211/1447   4.84 4.61  4.31 4.18  4.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  3  16  4.84   162/1447   4.84 4.63  4.27 4.30  4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  13  0  0  0  2   4  4.67   380/1241   4.67 4.71  4.33 4.25  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2  0  0  1  8   8  4.41   603/1402   4.41 4.53  4.24 4.15  4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  17  0  0  0  1   1  4.50  ****/1358   **** 4.52  4.11 4.03  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 13  0  1  1  3   1  3.67  1050/1316  3.67 4.40  4.14 3.99  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   2  0  0  2  4  11  4.53   434/1427   4.53 4.36  4.19 4.24  4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   1  0  0  0  1  17  4.94   291/1447   4.94 4.78  4.69 4.68  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 12 1 0  0  0  4   2  4.33   540/1434   4.35 4.49  4.10 4.10  4.35

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        12   0  0  0  0  3   4  4.57   698/1387   4.68 4.75  4.46 4.46  4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   13   0  0  0  0  0   6  5.00     1/1387   5.00 4.95  4.73 4.71  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 13  0  0  0  1  1   4  4.50   607/1386   4.57 4.60  4.32 4.32  4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     13   0  0  0  0  2   4  4.67   463/1380   4.73 4.66  4.32 4.31  4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 11 0 0  0  0  0   8  5.00     1/1193   5.00 4.70  4.02 3.99  5.00

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  1  3   5  4.44   428/1172   4.44 4.48  4.15 3.95  4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  0  0  3  0   6  4.33   691/1182   4.33 4.70  4.35 4.18  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0  0  0  1   8  4.89   243/1170   4.89 4.81  4.38 4.17  4.89
4. Were special techniques successful                  10   0  0  0  2  2   5  4.33   290/ 800   4.33 4.03  4.06 3.95  4.33

                                     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     Graduate      0       Major        15
  28-55     2        1.00-1.99    0        B    2
  56-83     2        2.00-2.99    2        C    0        General               1     Under-grad   19       Non-major     4
  84-150    2        3.00-3.49    5        D    0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    3        F    0        Electives             9     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                 1
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MCS  101  1                   University of Maryland                            Page  959
Title          Multimedia Literacy La          Baltimore County                               JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Iwancio,Paul J  (Instr. B)      Spring 2010                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    26
Questionnaires: 19                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                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  16  4.84   211/1447  4.84  4.61  4.31  4.18  4.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  3  16  4.84   162/1447  4.84  4.63  4.27  4.30  4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  13  0  0  0  2   4  4.67   380/1241  4.67  4.71  4.33  4.25  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2  0  0  1  8   8  4.41   603/1402  4.41  4.53  4.24  4.15  4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  17  0  0  0  1   1  4.50  ****/1358  ****  4.52  4.11  4.03  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 13  0  1  1  3   1  3.67  1050/1316  3.67  4.40  4.14  3.99  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   2  0  0  2  4  11  4.53   434/1427  4.53  4.36  4.19  4.24  4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   1  0  0  0  1  17  4.94   291/1447  4.94  4.78  4.69  4.68  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5  0  0  0  0  9   5  4.36   516/1434  4.35  4.49  4.10  4.10  4.35


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         5   0  0  0  0  3  11  4.79   383/1387  4.68  4.75  4.46  4.46  4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    5   0  0  0  0  0  14  5.00     1/1387  5.00  4.95  4.73  4.71  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5   0  0  0  1  3  10  4.64   457/1386  4.57  4.60  4.32  4.32  4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      5   0  0  0  1  1  12  4.79   299/1380  4.73  4.66  4.32  4.31  4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6  0  0  0  0  0  13  5.00     1/1193  5.00  4.70  4.02  3.99  5.00


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  1  3   5  4.44   428/1172  4.44  4.48  4.15  3.95  4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  0  0  3  0   6  4.33   691/1182  4.33  4.70  4.35  4.18  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0  0  0  0  1   8  4.89   243/1170  4.89  4.81  4.38  4.17  4.89
4. Were special techniques successful                   10  0  0  0  2  2   5  4.33   290/ 800  4.33  4.03  4.06  3.95  4.33

                              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     Graduate     0       Major       15
  28-55      2       1.00-1.99   0      B    2
  56-83      2       2.00-2.99   2      C    0        General               1     Under-grad  19       Non-major    4
  84-150     2       3.00-3.49   5      D    0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   3      F    0        Electives             9     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                 1
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MCS  222  01              University of Maryland                              Page  960
Title        Media & Comm. Studies            Baltimore County                           JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Adelman,Rebecca                  Spring 2010                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    31
Questionnaires: 22                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 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   3   5  14  4.50   585/1447  4.48  4.61  4.31  4.31  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   6  16  4.73   281/1447  4.62  4.63  4.27  4.23  4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  12   0   0   0   3   7  4.70   345/1241  4.57  4.71  4.33  4.35  4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   3  19  4.86   121/1402  4.65  4.53  4.24  4.24  4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   2   4  16  4.64   258/1358  4.61  4.52  4.11  4.12  4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   3   3  16  4.59   302/1316  4.54  4.40  4.14  4.08  4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   7  14  4.59   349/1427  4.57  4.36  4.19  4.14  4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0  16   6  4.27  1240/1447  4.60  4.78  4.69  4.70  4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6   0   0   0   0   6  10  4.63   262/1434  4.56  4.49  4.10  3.97  4.63


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   0   2  19  4.90   200/1387  4.82  4.75  4.46  4.42  4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   1  20  4.95   264/1387  4.94  4.95  4.73  4.71  4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   0   0   5  16  4.76   303/1386  4.66  4.60  4.32  4.24  4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   0   0   2  19  4.90   159/1380  4.67  4.66  4.32  4.30  4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1   0   0   0   0   4  17  4.81   100/1193  4.67  4.70  4.02  4.04  4.81


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8   0   0   0   1   3  10  4.64   295/1172  4.49  4.48  4.15  4.12  4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8   0   0   0   1   3  10  4.64   450/1182  4.74  4.70  4.35  4.30  4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8   0   0   0   0   1  13  4.93   178/1170  4.94  4.81  4.38  4.32  4.93
4. Were special techniques successful                  8   2   0   2   3   2   5  3.83   547/ 800  3.72  4.03  4.06  4.01  3.83

                                  Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      5     0.00-0.99   0      A   13        Required for Majors  9       Graduate     0       Major        4
  28-55      3     1.00-1.99   0      B    6
  56-83      2     2.00-2.99   1      C    1        General              6       Under-grad  22       Non-major   18
  84-150     0     3.00-3.49   2      D    0
  Grad.      0     3.50-4.00  10      F    0        Electives            4       #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                      I    0        Other                0
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MCS  222  02                University of Maryland                              Page  961
Title        Media & Comm. Studies            Baltimore County                              JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Adelman,Rebecca                   Spring 2010                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     35
Questionnaires:  27                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   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  3  8 16  4.48  612/1447  4.48  4.61  4.31 4.31  4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  4 22  4.78  228/1447  4.62  4.63  4.27 4.23  4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   9  0  1  1  4 12  4.50  541/1241  4.57  4.71  4.33 4.35  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  0  0  6 20  4.63  358/1402  4.65  4.53  4.24 4.24  4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  1  0  0  3 22  4.73  187/1358  4.61  4.52  4.11 4.12  4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 2  3 20  4.58  322/1316  4.54  4.40  4.14 4.08  4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  0  0  5 21  4.67  283/1427  4.57  4.36  4.19 4.14  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0 10 17  4.63  998/1447  4.60  4.78  4.69 4.70  4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 2  8 10  4.40  454/1434  4.56  4.49  4.10 3.97  4.40


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  2 24  4.85  276/1387  4.82  4.75  4.46 4.42  4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  1 26  4.96  211/1387  4.94  4.95  4.73 4.71  4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  6 20  4.70  379/1386  4.66  4.60  4.32 4.24  4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  2  6 18  4.62  534/1380  4.67  4.66  4.32 4.30  4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 1  4 20  4.76  124/1193  4.67  4.70  4.02 4.04  4.76


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  1  2  2  2 13  4.20  619/1172  4.49  4.48  4.15 4.12  4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  0  0  0  1 19  4.95  119/1182  4.74  4.70  4.35 4.30  4.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0  2 18  4.90  223/1170  4.94  4.81  4.38 4.32  4.90
4. Were special techniques successful                  7   2  0  0  7  4  7  4.00  423/ 800  3.72  4.03  4.06 4.01  4.00


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 26   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 189  ****  ****  4.34 4.47  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 26 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 192  ****  ****  4.34 4.38  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 26 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 186  ****  ****  4.48 4.57  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          26   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 187  ****  ****  4.33 4.46  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 24 0 0 0 0 1  2  4.67 ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58 4.43  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 25 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/  62  ****  ****  4.56 4.28  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 24 0 0 0 0 1  2  4.67 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.41 3.79  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   24   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.42 4.36  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               24   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  64  ****  ****  4.09 3.70  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     6      0.00-0.99   0       A   16        Required for Majors  13    Graduate      1      Major       9
 28-55     1      1.00-1.99   1       B    6                                   Under-grad   26
 56-83     3      2.00-2.99   3       C    3        General               8    Under-grad   26      Non-major  18
 84-150    3      3.00-3.49   4       D    0
 Grad.     1      3.50-4.00   7       F    0        Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                      I    0        Other                 2
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MCS  222  03              University of Maryland                        Page  962
Title      Media & Comm. Studies              Baltimore County                      JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Ali,Asim                          Spring 2010                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    33
Questionnaires:  11                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank       Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  2  2  7  4.45   654/1447   4.48  4.61  4.31  4.31  4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  2  3  6  4.36   728/1447   4.62  4.63  4.27  4.23  4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  5  0  0  1  1  4  4.50   541/1241   4.57  4.71  4.33  4.35  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  2  2  7  4.45   555/1402   4.65  4.53  4.24  4.24  4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  2  2  7  4.45   398/1358   4.61  4.52  4.11  4.12  4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  1  4  6  4.45   444/1316   4.54  4.40  4.14  4.08  4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  2  2  7  4.45   527/1427   4.57  4.36  4.19  4.14  4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90   485/1447   4.60  4.78  4.69  4.70  4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  5  0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67   230/1434   4.56  4.49  4.10  3.97  4.67


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1  0  0  0  1  1  8  4.70   521/1387   4.82  4.75  4.46  4.42  4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90   528/1387   4.94  4.95  4.73  4.71  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1  0  0  0  0  5  5  4.50   607/1386   4.66  4.60  4.32  4.24  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  0  0  0  0  5  5  4.50   659/1380   4.67  4.66  4.32  4.30  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  2  0  0  0  1  3  5  4.44   340/1193   4.67  4.70  4.02  4.04  4.44


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  3  0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63   309/1172   4.49  4.48  4.15  4.12  4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3  0  0  0  1  1  6  4.63   470/1182   4.74  4.70  4.35  4.30  4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  3  0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00     1/1170   4.94  4.81  4.38  4.32  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 3  5  1  0  0  1  1  3.33   701/ 800   3.72  4.03  4.06  4.01  3.33

                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MCS  333  01                       University of Maryland                            Page  963
Title         Hist & Theory Of MCS                    Baltimore County                              JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Snyder,Donald I                          Spring 2010                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    34
Questionnaires: 25                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                   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  11  13  4.48   612/1447  4.48  4.61  4.31  4.32  4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0   0   2   3  11   8  4.04  1029/1447  4.04  4.63  4.27  4.23  4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1  21   0   0   0   3   0  4.00  ****/1241  ****  4.71  4.33  4.33  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   1   0   0   5   9   9  4.17   845/1402  4.17  4.53  4.24  4.24  4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   0   7  17  4.71   209/1358  4.71  4.52  4.11  4.10  4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0   0   2   8  14  4.50   392/1316  4.50  4.40  4.14  4.13  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           2   0   1   1   5   8   8  3.91  1066/1427  3.91  4.36  4.19  4.15  3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0   0   0   0   3  21  4.88   565/1447  4.88  4.78  4.69  4.65  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0   1   2   6  15  4.46   397/1434  4.46  4.49  4.10  4.09  4.46


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0   0   0   1   7  15  4.61   656/1387  4.61  4.75  4.46  4.44  4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0   0   0   0   2  21  4.91   475/1387  4.91  4.95  4.73  4.71  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0  0   0   0   8  15  4.65   444/1386  4.65  4.60  4.32  4.30  4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0   0   0   0   5  19  4.79   286/1380  4.79  4.66  4.32  4.32  4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0  0   1   0   2  20  4.78   112/1193  4.78  4.70  4.02  4.05  4.78


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0  0   2   1   4  13  4.40   463/1172  4.40  4.48  4.15  4.24  4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0  0   0   2   3  15  4.65   440/1182  4.65  4.70  4.35  4.42  4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0   0   0   3  17  4.85   275/1170  4.85  4.81  4.38  4.49  4.85
4. Were special techniques successful                 5   6   1   2   5   2   4  3.43   677/ 800  3.43  4.03  4.06  4.12  3.43
```

```
                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons                  Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0     A   11        Required for Majors  22   Graduate     0      Major       18
  28-55      1       1.00-1.99    0     B   11
  56-83      2       2.00-2.99    0     C    1        General               0   Under-grad  25      Non-major    7
  84-150     4       3.00-3.49    7     D    0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    5     F    0        Electives             0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other                 0
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MCS  370  01              University of Maryland                        Page  964
Title        Special Topics In MCS          Baltimore County                           JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Adelman,Rebecca                Spring 2010                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:  19
Questionnaires: 15               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               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  4  11  4.73  331/1447  4.73  4.61  4.31  4.32  4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2  13  4.87  145/1447  4.87  4.63  4.27  4.23  4.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   8  0  0  0  1   6  4.86  186/1241  4.86  4.71  4.33  4.33  4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2  13  4.87  121/1402  4.87  4.53  4.24  4.24  4.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  1  13  4.80  137/1358  4.80  4.52  4.11  4.10  4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  1  3  11  4.67  239/1316  4.67  4.40  4.14  4.13  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  2  12  4.73  219/1427  4.73  4.36  4.19  4.15  4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1  14  4.93  339/1447  4.93  4.78  4.69  4.65  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0  0  0  6   7  4.54  322/1434  4.54  4.49  4.10  4.09  4.54


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  2  13  4.87  261/1387  4.87  4.75  4.46  4.44  4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  1  14  4.93  369/1387  4.93  4.95  4.73  4.71  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  2  12  4.86  194/1386  4.86  4.60  4.32  4.30  4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  3  12  4.80  273/1380  4.80  4.66  4.32  4.32  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0  0  0  3  12  4.80  100/1193  4.80  4.70  4.02  4.05  4.80


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  1  0  3   7  4.45  420/1172  4.45  4.48  4.15  4.24  4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  0  0  0  11  5.00    1/1182  5.00  4.70  4.35  4.42  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0  0  1  0  10  4.82  316/1170  4.82  4.81  4.38  4.49  4.82
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   0  0  0  1  2   7  4.60  159/ 800  4.60  4.03  4.06  4.12  4.60


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type               Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A   8      Required for Majors  6      Graduate     0      Major        13
28-55      1      1.00-1.99    0      B   5                                                      
56-83      2      2.00-2.99    1      C   1      General              1      Under-grad   15     Non-major     2
84-150     2      3.00-3.49    2      D   0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    5      F   0      Electives            7      #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I   0      Other                0
                                      ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: MCS  377  01                     University of Maryland                              Page  965
Title          Desktop Publishing and            Baltimore County                                   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Custen,Calvin R                   Spring 2010                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    16
Questionnaires: 11                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                         Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                     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   1  0  0  2  7  4.40   723/1447   4.40   4.61  4.31 4.32  4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   1  0  0  2  7  4.40   677/1447   4.40   4.63  4.27 4.23  4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   6   0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1241   5.00   4.71  4.33 4.33  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   2   0  0  2  1  5  4.38   645/1402   4.38   4.53  4.24 4.24  4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  5   0  1  0  1  2  4.00   799/1358   4.00   4.52  4.11 4.10  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 7  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1316   ****   4.40  4.14 4.13  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   1  0  4  0  4  3.67  1201/1427   3.67   4.36  4.19 4.15  3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0   0  0  0  1  8  4.89   538/1447   4.89   4.78  4.69 4.65  4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 1  0  0  4  5  4.20   701/1434   4.20   4.49  4.10 4.09  4.20


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0  0  1  2  6  4.56   727/1387   4.56   4.75  4.46 4.44  4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0  0  0  1  8  4.89   579/1387   4.89   4.95  4.73 4.71  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   1  0  2  1  5  4.00  1047/1386   4.00   4.60  4.32 4.30  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   0  1  1  2  5  4.22   915/1380   4.22   4.66  4.32 4.32  4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67   186/1193   4.67   4.70  4.02 4.05  4.67


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0   0  0  1  2  1  4.00   710/1172   4.00   4.48  4.15 4.24  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0   0  0  0  1  3  4.75   347/1182   4.75   4.70  4.35 4.42  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0  0  0  2  0  2  4.00   864/1170   4.00   4.81  4.38 4.49  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  7   3   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 800   ****   4.03  4.06 4.12  ****


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  10  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 189   ****   ****  4.34 4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 192   ****   ****  4.34 4.20  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 186   ****   ****  4.48 4.36  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           10  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 187   ****   ****  4.33 4.11  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 10  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 168   ****   ****  4.20 4.02  ****


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  66   ****   ****  4.58 4.17  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  62   ****   ****  4.56 4.21  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  58   ****   ****  4.41 2.87  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    10  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  65   ****   ****  4.42 4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                10  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  64   ****   ****  4.09 3.38  ****


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  38   ****   ****  4.49 4.73  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  36   ****   ****  4.25 3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       10  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  28   ****   ****  4.52 4.46  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   10  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  30   ****   ****  4.30 4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  27   ****   ****  4.43 4.50  ****


                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31   ****   ****  4.72 5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    10  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  21   ****   ****  4.57 5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      10  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31   ****   ****  4.64 5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       10  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  20   ****   ****  4.60 5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     10  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  15   ****   ****  4.61 5.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MCS  499  01              University of Maryland                      Page  966
Title           Capstone Senior Semina     Baltimore County                       JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:     Snyder,Donald                  Spring 2010                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     17
Questionnaires: 11                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	243/1447	4.66	4.61	4.31	4.43	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	187/1447	4.70	4.63	4.27	4.31	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	231/1241	4.73	4.71	4.33	4.41	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	655/1402	4.56	4.53	4.24	4.34	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	672/1358	4.42	4.52	4.11	4.15	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	265/1316	4.73	4.40	4.14	4.27	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	527/1427	4.27	4.36	4.19	4.20	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	988/1447	4.69	4.78	4.69	4.72	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	341/1434	4.68	4.49	4.10	4.17	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	353/1387	4.81	4.75	4.46	4.48	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	528/1387	4.95	4.95	4.73	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	392/1386	4.67	4.60	4.32	4.34	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	549/1380	4.66	4.66	4.32	4.34	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	455/1193	4.39	4.70	4.02	4.00	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	247/1172	4.80	4.48	4.15	4.25	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	250/1182	4.87	4.70	4.35	4.49	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	275/1170	4.93	4.81	4.38	4.51	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	250/ 800	4.20	4.03	4.06	4.19	4.40
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.61	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.62	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.60	****

Title   Capstone Senior Semina   Baltimore County   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor: Snyder,Donald   Spring 2010   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 11   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MCS  499  02                  University of Maryland                            Page  967
Title          Capstone Senior Semina           Baltimore County                              JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Loviglio,Jason                     Spring 2010                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    14
Questionnaires: 12                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   2   2   8  4.50   585/1447   4.66  4.61  4.31  4.43  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   1   3   8  4.58   447/1447   4.70  4.63  4.27  4.31  4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   6   0   0   0   2   4  4.67   380/1241   4.73  4.71  4.33  4.41  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   3   9  4.75   217/1402   4.56  4.53  4.24  4.34  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   1   2   9  4.67   237/1358   4.42  4.52  4.11  4.15  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   1   0  11  4.83   112/1316   4.73  4.40  4.14  4.27  4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   1   0   3   1   7  4.08   925/1427   4.27  4.36  4.19  4.20  4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   3   9  4.75   836/1447   4.69  4.78  4.69  4.72  4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  0   0   0   1   6  4.86   102/1434   4.68  4.49  4.10  4.17  4.86


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   0   0   0   2   9  4.82   337/1387   4.81  4.75  4.46  4.48  4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0   0   0   0  11  5.00     1/1387   4.95  4.95  4.73  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   0   0   4   7  4.64   470/1386   4.67  4.60  4.32  4.34  4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   0   0   1   1   9  4.73   379/1380   4.66  4.66  4.32  4.34  4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  6   0   0   1   0   3  4.50   288/1193   4.39  4.70  4.02  4.00  4.50


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0   0   0   0   1   8  4.89   135/1172   4.80  4.48  4.15  4.25  4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0   0   0   0   1   8  4.89   219/1182   4.87  4.70  4.35  4.49  4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0   0   0   0   0   9  5.00     1/1170   4.93  4.81  4.38  4.51  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   3   3   0   1   1   1   3  4.00   423/ 800   4.20  4.03  4.06  4.19  4.00
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27        0        0.00-0.99    0        A    4        Required for Majors  11      Graduate     0       Major        7
28-55        0        1.00-1.99    0        B    5                                                         
56-83        0        2.00-2.99    3        C    2        General               0      Under-grad  12       Non-major    5
84-150       4        3.00-3.49    1        D    0
Grad.        0        3.50-4.00    4        F    0        Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                             P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                             I    0        Other                 0
                                             ?    0
```