

Course-Section: MCS 222 0101  
 Title MEDIA & COMM. STUDIES  
 Instructor: SNYDER, DONALD  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1119  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	19	4.69	395/1649	4.66	4.64	4.28	4.29	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	475/1648	4.50	4.51	4.23	4.25	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	593/1375	4.58	4.65	4.27	4.37	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	227/1595	4.67	4.70	4.20	4.22	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	280/1533	4.62	4.74	4.04	4.04	4.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	156/1512	4.83	4.84	4.10	4.14	4.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	210/1623	4.65	4.56	4.16	4.21	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	14	4.56	1139/1646	4.38	4.53	4.69	4.63	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	12	12	4.44	456/1621	4.40	4.51	4.06	4.01	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	9	16	4.64	667/1568	4.56	4.51	4.43	4.39	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	640/1572	4.89	4.93	4.70	4.73	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	550/1564	4.51	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	318/1559	4.69	4.65	4.29	4.33	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	247/1352	4.61	4.31	3.98	4.07	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	310/1384	4.51	4.61	4.08	3.99	4.68	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	585/1382	4.44	4.53	4.29	4.19	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	306/1368	4.73	4.79	4.30	4.21	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	389/ 948	3.89	3.51	3.95	3.89	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/ 555	4.64	4.82	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	1	2	1	3	0	2.86	243/ 288	3.14	3.14	3.68	3.65	2.86	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	1	1	1	7	0	3.40	232/ 312	3.03	3.03	3.68	3.59	3.40	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: MCS 222 0101  
 Title MEDIA & COMM. STUDIES  
 Instructor: SNYDER, DONALD  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1119  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	15	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	26	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MCS 222 0301  
 Title MEDIA & COMM. STUDIES  
 Instructor: SNYDER, DONALD  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1120  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	497/1649	4.66	4.64	4.28	4.29	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	672/1648	4.50	4.51	4.23	4.25	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	370/1375	4.58	4.65	4.27	4.37	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	417/1595	4.67	4.70	4.20	4.22	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	280/1533	4.62	4.74	4.04	4.04	4.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	133/1512	4.83	4.84	4.10	4.14	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	480/1623	4.65	4.56	4.16	4.21	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	15	5	4.19	1440/1646	4.38	4.53	4.69	4.63	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	571/1621	4.40	4.51	4.06	4.01	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	891/1568	4.56	4.51	4.43	4.39	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	591/1572	4.89	4.93	4.70	4.73	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	754/1564	4.51	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	618/1559	4.69	4.65	4.29	4.33	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	240/1352	4.61	4.31	3.98	4.07	4.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	613/1384	4.51	4.61	4.08	3.99	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	774/1382	4.44	4.53	4.29	4.19	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	579/1368	4.73	4.79	4.30	4.21	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	661/ 948	3.89	3.51	3.95	3.89	3.64	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	277/ 555	4.64	4.82	4.29	4.33	4.64	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	2	0	5	0	3.43	199/ 288	3.14	3.14	3.68	3.65	3.43	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	4	0	2	0	2.67	275/ 312	3.03	3.03	3.68	3.59	2.67	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	21	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MCS 333 0101  
 Title HIST & THEORY OF MCS  
 Instructor: LOVIGLIO, JASON  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1121  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	497/1649	4.62	4.64	4.28	4.27	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	521/1648	4.54	4.51	4.23	4.18	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375	4.80	4.65	4.27	4.22	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	236/1595	4.75	4.70	4.20	4.21	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.74	4.04	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	137/1512	4.85	4.84	4.10	4.11	4.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	659/1623	4.38	4.56	4.16	4.08	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	765/1646	4.85	4.53	4.69	4.67	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	185/1621	4.73	4.51	4.06	4.02	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	969/1568	4.42	4.51	4.43	4.39	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.93	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	767/1564	4.42	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	607/1559	4.58	4.65	4.29	4.23	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	950/1352	3.70	4.31	3.98	3.97	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	201/1384	4.80	4.61	4.08	4.11	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	455/1382	4.70	4.53	4.29	4.37	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	264/1368	4.90	4.79	4.30	4.39	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	894/ 948	2.75	3.51	3.95	4.00	2.75	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.82	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.14	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.03	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: MCS 499 0101  
 Title Capstone Senior Seminar  
 Instructor: Snyder, Donald  
 Enrollment: 0  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 18  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	247/1649	****	4.52	4.28	4.11	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	999/1648	****	4.35	4.23	4.16	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.10	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	321/1595	****	4.38	4.20	4.03	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	137/1533	****	4.01	4.04	3.87	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	522/1512	****	4.35	4.10	3.86	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1347/1623	****	4.22	4.16	4.08	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1103/1646	****	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1345/1621	****	4.07	4.06	3.96	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	731/1568	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	****	4.82	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	780/1564	****	4.29	4.28	4.20	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	318/1559	****	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1323/1352	****	3.91	3.98	3.86	2.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	437/1384	****	4.39	4.08	3.86	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	****	4.49	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1368	****	4.43	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	****	4.24	3.95	3.75	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	458/ 555	****	4.01	4.29	4.14	3.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	55/ 88	****	4.75	4.54	4.31	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	46/ 85	****	4.38	4.47	4.30	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 81	****	4.67	4.43	4.39	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	81/ 92	****	4.13	4.35	4.01	3.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	3	0	1	0	2.50	253/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.54	2.50	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.81	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.83	****	

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	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						