

Course-Section: MCS 222 0101
 Title MEDIA & COMM. STUDIES
 Instructor: SNYDER, DONALD
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1093
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	7	5	14	4.11	1162/1670	4.05	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	10	12	4.18	1059/1666	4.09	4.20	4.27	4.27	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	1	3	5	15	4.15	956/1406	4.05	4.34	4.32	4.39	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	7	15	4.14	990/1615	4.24	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	6	16	4.11	790/1566	4.25	4.48	4.07	4.00	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	4	7	13	4.04	881/1528	4.30	4.46	4.12	4.11	4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	6	8	11	3.96	1192/1650	4.28	4.18	4.22	4.20	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	20	7	4.21	1395/1667	4.39	4.55	4.67	4.64	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	11	9	4.21	786/1626	4.05	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	9	11	4.35	1082/1559	4.44	4.60	4.46	4.40	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	803/1560	4.87	4.91	4.72	4.73	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	1	10	10	4.22	1010/1549	4.21	4.54	4.31	4.25	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	1	8	11	4.13	1079/1546	4.21	4.49	4.32	4.30	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	1	2	7	13	4.39	431/1323	4.63	4.42	4.00	4.08	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	5	4	14	4.25	670/1384	4.30	4.50	4.10	4.07	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	7	2	13	4.04	954/1378	4.25	4.59	4.29	4.25	4.04
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	4	18	4.63	570/1378	4.71	4.78	4.31	4.26	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	3	1	2	9	3	3.44	743/ 904	3.42	3.70	4.03	4.01	3.44
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.50	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.50	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 80	****	4.00	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: MCS 222 0101
 Title MEDIA & COMM. STUDIES
 Instructor: SNYDER, DONALD
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1093
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
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	21				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	2	6	8	10	4.00	1216/1670	4.05	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	1	4	6	12	4.00	1199/1666	4.09	4.20	4.27	4.27	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	2	1	1	6	8	3.94	1101/1406	4.05	4.34	4.32	4.39	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	1	4	5	14	4.33	775/1615	4.24	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	5	16	4.40	491/1566	4.25	4.48	4.07	4.00	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	376/1528	4.30	4.46	4.12	4.11	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	429/1650	4.28	4.18	4.22	4.20	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	1112/1667	4.39	4.55	4.67	4.64	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	1	6	6	6	3.89	1133/1626	4.05	4.29	4.11	4.06	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	846/1559	4.44	4.60	4.46	4.40	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	536/1560	4.87	4.91	4.72	4.73	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	5	9	10	4.21	1019/1549	4.21	4.54	4.31	4.25	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	4	9	11	4.29	956/1546	4.21	4.49	4.32	4.30	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	130/1323	4.63	4.42	4.00	4.08	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	589/1384	4.30	4.50	4.10	4.07	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	672/1378	4.25	4.59	4.29	4.25	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	386/1378	4.71	4.78	4.31	4.26	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	3	2	4	3	6	3.39	766/ 904	3.42	3.70	4.03	4.01	3.39
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.50	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General	5	Under-grad	28	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	12	
?	0			

Course-Section: MCS 333 0101
 Title HIST & THEORY OF MCS
 Instructor: LOVIGLIO, JASON
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1095
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	9	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	350/1670	4.76	4.29	4.31	4.24	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	0	2	7	16	4.56	542/1666	4.56	4.20	4.27	4.18	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	11	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	153/1406	4.92	4.34	4.32	4.22	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	1	0	5	19	4.68	368/1615	4.68	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	165/1566	4.84	4.48	4.07	4.04	4.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	173/1528	4.80	4.46	4.12	4.07	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	1	4	7	13	4.28	867/1650	4.28	4.18	4.22	4.12	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	873/1667	4.79	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	116/1626	4.90	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	821/1559	4.57	4.60	4.46	4.40	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	298/1560	4.96	4.91	4.72	4.67	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	500/1549	4.65	4.54	4.31	4.25	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	2	18	4.65	532/1546	4.65	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	3	0	0	5	3	12	4.35	465/1323	4.35	4.42	4.00	3.99	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	215/1384	4.82	4.50	4.10	4.12	4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.78	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	11	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	361/ 904	4.27	3.70	4.03	4.03	4.27

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	34	Non-major	16
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	9	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	23				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MCS 370 0101
 Title SPECIAL TOPICS IN MCS
 Instructor: JACQUELINE, REG
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1096
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	6	0	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	1183/1670	4.07	4.29	4.31	4.24	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	955/1666	4.27	4.20	4.27	4.18	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	12	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1406	****	4.34	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	606/1615	4.47	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	354/1566	4.57	4.48	4.07	4.04	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	580/1528	4.38	4.46	4.12	4.07	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	4	0	2	9	4.07	1101/1650	4.07	4.18	4.22	4.12	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	12	3	4.20	1409/1667	4.20	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	831/1626	4.17	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	858/1559	4.53	4.60	4.46	4.40	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	699/1560	4.87	4.91	4.72	4.67	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	562/1549	4.60	4.54	4.31	4.25	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	849/1546	4.40	4.49	4.32	4.24	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	663/1323	4.08	4.42	4.00	3.99	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	2	1	8	4.08	803/1384	4.08	4.50	4.10	4.12	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	649/1378	4.46	4.59	4.29	4.30	4.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	692/1378	4.46	4.78	4.31	4.33	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	2	1	2	2	6	3.69	657/ 904	3.69	3.70	4.03	4.03	3.69
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.50	4.65	4.30	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors		1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General		8	Under-grad	21	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		5				
				?	1							

Course-Section: MCS 499 0101
 Title CAPSTONE SENIOR SEMINA
 Instructor: LOVIGLIO, JASON
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1097
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.29	4.31	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.20	4.27	4.35	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.42	4.24	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.48	4.07	4.17	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.46	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.18	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.55	4.67	4.73	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.60	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.49	4.32	4.43	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.78	4.31	4.60	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	65/ 87	4.50	4.50	4.65	4.80	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.60	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	48/ 75	4.50	4.50	4.57	4.56	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	45/ 79	4.50	4.50	4.45	4.53	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	37/ 80	4.00	4.00	3.97	3.67	4.00

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