

Course-Section: MCS 222 2
 Title Media & Comm. Studies
 Instructor: Ali,Asim
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1015
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	10	3	3.82	1273/1509	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.34	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	8	2	3.53	1363/1509	4.12	4.30	4.26	4.32	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1287	4.42	4.47	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	902/1459	4.39	4.40	4.22	4.30	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	5	5	3.76	1038/1406	4.35	4.44	4.09	4.09	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	10	5	4.18	693/1384	4.35	4.39	4.11	4.09	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	906/1489	4.45	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	1098/1506	4.69	4.56	4.67	4.61	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	668/1463	4.18	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	5	5	5	3.81	1294/1438	4.53	4.43	4.46	4.48	3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	968/1421	4.80	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	5	6	3.94	1116/1411	4.48	4.40	4.31	4.37	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	4	6	3.81	1172/1405	4.41	4.42	4.32	4.39	3.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	607/1236	4.47	4.45	4.00	4.11	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	4	6	3.93	832/1260	4.46	4.48	4.14	4.19	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	665/1255	4.54	4.64	4.33	4.37	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	721/1258	4.67	4.76	4.38	4.44	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	1	0	4	2	0	3.00	801/ 873	3.82	4.16	4.03	4.04	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MCS 222 3
 Title Media & Comm. Studies
 Instructor: Adelman, Rebecca
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1016
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	13	13	4.34	789/1509	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.34	4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	8	15	4.36	753/1509	4.12	4.30	4.26	4.32	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	708/1287	4.42	4.47	4.30	4.35	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	10	16	4.50	454/1459	4.39	4.40	4.22	4.30	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	9	18	4.61	269/1406	4.35	4.44	4.09	4.09	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	12	14	4.38	479/1384	4.35	4.39	4.11	4.09	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	9	17	4.48	485/1489	4.45	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	8	20	4.71	896/1506	4.69	4.56	4.67	4.61	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	15	6	4.13	774/1463	4.18	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	396/1438	4.53	4.43	4.46	4.48	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	898/1421	4.80	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	8	18	4.63	469/1411	4.48	4.40	4.31	4.37	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	549/1405	4.41	4.42	4.32	4.39	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	248/1236	4.47	4.45	4.00	4.11	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	244/1260	4.46	4.48	4.14	4.19	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	402/1255	4.54	4.64	4.33	4.37	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	212/1258	4.67	4.76	4.38	4.44	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	5	7	11	4.17	383/ 873	3.82	4.16	4.03	4.04	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 18	Graduate 0	Major 11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B 12			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 6	Under-grad 29	Non-major 18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MCS 222 4
 Title Media & Comm. Studies
 Instructor: Adelman, Rebecca
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1017
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	528/1509	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.34	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	14	4.48	574/1509	4.12	4.30	4.26	4.32	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	519/1287	4.42	4.47	4.30	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	389/1459	4.39	4.40	4.22	4.30	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	20	4.68	215/1406	4.35	4.44	4.09	4.09	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	8	15	4.48	367/1384	4.35	4.39	4.11	4.09	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	183/1489	4.45	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	622/1506	4.69	4.56	4.67	4.61	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	13	6	4.19	690/1463	4.18	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1438	4.53	4.43	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	269/1421	4.80	4.86	4.73	4.76	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	169/1411	4.48	4.40	4.31	4.37	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	251/1405	4.41	4.42	4.32	4.39	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	3	20	4.75	126/1236	4.47	4.45	4.00	4.11	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	294/1260	4.46	4.48	4.14	4.19	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	575/1255	4.54	4.64	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	493/1258	4.67	4.76	4.38	4.44	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	317/ 873	3.82	4.16	4.03	4.04	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 9
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 4	C 2	General 4	Under-grad 25 Non-major 16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MCS 333 1
 Title Hist & Theory Of MCS
 Instructor: Snyder, Donald I
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1018
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	6	5	8	3.86	1251/1509	4.04	4.26	4.31	4.32	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	6	8	3.95	1125/1509	4.26	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	15	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	****/1287	4.55	4.47	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	686/1459	4.40	4.40	4.22	4.26	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	366/1406	4.58	4.44	4.09	4.12	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	5	11	4.24	639/1384	4.45	4.39	4.11	4.15	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	8	8	4.05	958/1489	4.06	4.08	4.17	4.14	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	14	5	4.14	1325/1506	4.15	4.56	4.67	4.67	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	1029/1463	4.02	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	1	13	4	3.95	1235/1438	4.34	4.43	4.46	4.43	3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	881/1421	4.88	4.86	4.73	4.73	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	13	2	3.75	1204/1411	4.17	4.40	4.31	4.29	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	896/1405	4.53	4.42	4.32	4.32	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	274/1236	4.65	4.45	4.00	4.07	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	344/1260	4.74	4.48	4.14	4.22	4.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	321/1255	4.70	4.64	4.33	4.37	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	324/1258	4.88	4.76	4.38	4.42	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	283/ 873	4.52	4.16	4.03	4.08	4.35
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****

Course-Section: MCS 333 1
 Title Hist & Theory Of MCS
 Instructor: Snyder, Donald I
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1018
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	6
84-150	2	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	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MCS 333 2
 Title Hist & Theory Of MCS
 Instructor: Snyder, Donald I
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1019
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	0	10	13	4.23	901/1509	4.04	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	16	4.58	459/1509	4.26	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	481/1287	4.55	4.47	4.30	4.33	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	10	15	4.46	520/1459	4.40	4.40	4.22	4.26	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	200/1406	4.58	4.44	4.09	4.12	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	19	4.65	234/1384	4.45	4.39	4.11	4.15	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	11	10	4.08	937/1489	4.06	4.08	4.17	4.14	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	22	4	4.15	1320/1506	4.15	4.56	4.67	4.67	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	13	6	4.19	690/1463	4.02	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	497/1438	4.34	4.43	4.46	4.43	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1421	4.88	4.86	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	508/1411	4.17	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	273/1405	4.53	4.42	4.32	4.32	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	100/1236	4.65	4.45	4.00	4.07	4.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	157/1260	4.74	4.48	4.14	4.22	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	484/1255	4.70	4.64	4.33	4.37	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	212/1258	4.88	4.76	4.38	4.42	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	143/ 873	4.52	4.16	4.03	4.08	4.68

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 16						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 0						

Course-Section: MCS 377 1
 Title Desktop Publishing and
 Instructor: Custen, Calvin R
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1020
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	303/1509	4.75	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	141/1509	4.88	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.47	4.30	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	586/1459	4.43	4.40	4.22	4.26	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.39	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	1403/1489	3.00	4.08	4.17	4.14	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.56	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	726/1463	4.17	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1001/1438	4.33	4.43	4.46	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	496/1411	4.60	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	940/1405	4.20	4.42	4.32	4.32	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.45	4.00	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.48	4.14	4.22	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	287/1255	4.80	4.64	4.33	4.37	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1258	4.80	4.76	4.38	4.42	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	4.16	4.03	4.08	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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