Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MCS 101L 3		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 24				
Title:	Multimedia Literacy Lab									Questionnaires: 13				
Instructor:	Anchor,Kristen													

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	7	4.38	805/1542	4.41	4.45	4.33	4.18	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	578/1542	4.60	4.50	4.29	4.23	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1339	4.83	4.69	4.32	4.14	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	512/1498	4.66	4.59	4.26	4.08	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	985/1428	4.12	4.47	4.12	3.98	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	874/1407	4.50	4.54	4.15	3.92	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	1176/1521	4.24	4.38	4.20	4.09	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	551/1541	4.90	4.84	4.70	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	709/1518	4.06	4.27	4.11	4.00	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	817/1472	4.42	4.56	4.46	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	727/1475	4.83	4.89	4.72	4.63	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	637/1471	4.58	4.52	4.32	4.23	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	270/1470	4.83	4.57	4.33	4.21	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	99/1310	4.83	4.48	4.06	3.93	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	945/1210	4.23	4.45	4.18	3.91	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	863/1211	4.20	4.60	4.37	4.15	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	871/1207	4.20	4.71	4.41	4.12	4.14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MCS 101L 3	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title: Multimedia Literacy Lab		Questionnaires: 13
Instructor: Anchor,Kristen		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/859	4.00	4.37	4.08	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MCS 101L 4	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 13
Title:	Multimedia Literacy Lab			Questionnaires: 9
Instructor:	Ferrera,Christi			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	5	4.44	720/1542	4.41	4.45	4.33	4.18	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	416/1542	4.60	4.50	4.29	4.23	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	414/1339	4.83	4.69	4.32	4.14	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	228/1498	4.66	4.59	4.26	4.08	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	552/1428	4.12	4.47	4.12	3.98	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	4.50	4.54	4.15	3.92	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	382/1521	4.24	4.38	4.20	4.09	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	738/1541	4.90	4.84	4.70	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1071/1518	4.06	4.27	4.11	4.00	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	1022/1472	4.42	4.56	4.46	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	727/1475	4.83	4.89	4.72	4.63	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	463/1471	4.58	4.52	4.32	4.23	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	270/1470	4.83	4.57	4.33	4.21	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	99/1310	4.83	4.48	4.06	3.93	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	251/1210	4.23	4.45	4.18	3.91	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	796/1211	4.20	4.60	4.37	4.15	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	815/1207	4.20	4.71	4.41	4.12	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	478/859	4.00	4.37	4.08	3.95	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MCS 101L 4	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 13
Title: Multimedia Literacy Lab		Questionnaires: 9
Instructor: Ferrera,Christi		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/207	****	****	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/210	****	****	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	****	4.15	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MCS 222 01			Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 30			
Title:	Media & Comm. Studies										Questionnaires: 18			
Instructor:	Yang,Fan													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	461/1542	4.38	4.45	4.33	4.35	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	2	11	4.35	810/1542	4.36	4.50	4.29	4.29	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	739/1339	4.39	4.69	4.32	4.40	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	674/1498	4.36	4.59	4.26	4.31	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	421/1428	4.41	4.47	4.12	4.17	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	579/1407	4.26	4.54	4.15	4.14	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	2	10	4.29	795/1521	4.21	4.38	4.20	4.22	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	413/1541	4.74	4.84	4.70	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	2	7	3	3.79	1141/1518	4.07	4.27	4.11	4.12	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	452/1472	4.50	4.56	4.46	4.53	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	376/1475	4.91	4.89	4.72	4.79	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	346/1471	4.50	4.52	4.32	4.37	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	468/1470	4.24	4.57	4.33	4.40	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	105/1310	4.56	4.48	4.06	4.19	4.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	364/1210	4.59	4.45	4.18	4.18	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	620/1211	4.54	4.60	4.37	4.34	4.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	300/1207	4.81	4.71	4.41	4.40	4.85

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MCS 222 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 30			
Title:	Media & Comm. Studies										Questionnaires: 18			
Instructor:	Yang,Fan													

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	371/859	4.20	4.37	4.08	4.07	4.23

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MCS 222 02	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 31
Title:	Media & Comm. Studies			Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Yang,Fan			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	3	13	4.40	780/1542	4.38	4.45	4.33	4.35	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	754/1542	4.36	4.50	4.29	4.29	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	638/1339	4.39	4.69	4.32	4.40	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	618/1498	4.36	4.59	4.26	4.31	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	578/1428	4.41	4.47	4.12	4.17	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	740/1407	4.26	4.54	4.15	4.14	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	2	13	4.40	658/1521	4.21	4.38	4.20	4.22	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	853/1541	4.74	4.84	4.70	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	481/1518	4.07	4.27	4.11	4.12	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	644/1472	4.50	4.56	4.46	4.53	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	700/1475	4.91	4.89	4.72	4.79	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	833/1471	4.50	4.52	4.32	4.37	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	855/1470	4.24	4.57	4.33	4.40	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	186/1310	4.56	4.48	4.06	4.19	4.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	504/1210	4.59	4.45	4.18	4.18	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	580/1211	4.54	4.60	4.37	4.34	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	449/1207	4.81	4.71	4.41	4.40	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	427/859	4.20	4.37	4.08	4.07	4.14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MCS 222 02	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 31
Title:	Media & Comm. Studies			Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Yang,Fan			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	****	4.12	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/210	****	****	4.17	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.50	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.32	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	****	4.15	4.32	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.83	4.56	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.85	4.60	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.94	4.50	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.83	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.69	4.17	3.72	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.55	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.36	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.70	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.50	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MCS 222 02	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 31
Title: Media & Comm. Studies		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Yang,Fan		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MCS 222 03		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 34			
Title:	Media & Comm. Studies									Questionnaires: 20			
Instructor:	Turner,Rita J.												

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	1104/1542	4.38	4.45	4.33	4.35	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	8	9	4.32	855/1542	4.36	4.50	4.29	4.29	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	721/1339	4.39	4.69	4.32	4.40	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	1	5	10	4.22	885/1498	4.36	4.59	4.26	4.31	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	421/1428	4.41	4.47	4.12	4.17	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	2	4	10	4.22	717/1407	4.26	4.54	4.15	4.14	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	4	3	9	3.95	1101/1521	4.21	4.38	4.20	4.22	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	1149/1541	4.74	4.84	4.70	4.68	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	5	3	7	4.00	920/1518	4.07	4.27	4.11	4.12	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	3	2	10	4.12	1183/1472	4.50	4.56	4.46	4.53	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	376/1475	4.91	4.89	4.72	4.79	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	0	6	9	4.38	821/1471	4.50	4.52	4.32	4.37	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	4	1	0	1	9	3.67	1268/1470	4.24	4.57	4.33	4.40	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	1	2	2	10	4.19	642/1310	4.56	4.48	4.06	4.19	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	266/1210	4.59	4.45	4.18	4.18	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	451/1211	4.54	4.60	4.37	4.34	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	278/1207	4.81	4.71	4.41	4.40	4.87
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	1	1	2	9	4.21	382/859	4.20	4.37	4.08	4.07	4.21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MCS 222 03		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment:	34
Title:	Media & Comm. Studies					Questionnaires:	20
Instructor:	Turner,Rita J.						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/210	****	****	4.17	4.32	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	4.69	4.17	3.72	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	20	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MCS 333 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 29
Title: Hist & Theory Of MCS		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Loviglio,Jason		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	548/1542	4.58	4.45	4.33	4.37	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	391/1542	4.68	4.50	4.29	4.31	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	224/1339	4.83	4.69	4.32	4.36	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	275/1498	4.74	4.59	4.26	4.32	4.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	56/1428	4.95	4.47	4.12	4.15	4.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	201/1407	4.72	4.54	4.15	4.20	4.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	304/1521	4.68	4.38	4.20	4.23	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	1124/1541	4.50	4.84	4.70	4.71	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	227/1518	4.69	4.27	4.11	4.13	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	728/1472	4.58	4.56	4.46	4.46	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.89	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	894/1471	4.32	4.52	4.32	4.33	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	468/1470	4.68	4.57	4.33	4.35	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	616/1310	4.21	4.48	4.06	4.11	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	282/1210	4.71	4.45	4.18	4.27	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.60	4.37	4.45	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1207	5.00	4.71	4.41	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	10	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/859	****	4.37	4.08	4.13	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MCS 333 01		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	29
Title:	Hist & Theory Of MCS				Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Loviglio,Jason					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/210	****	****	4.17	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MCS 370 2		Term - Spring 2012						Enrollment:	16
Title:	Special Topics In MCS								Questionnaires:	14
Instructor:	Yang,Fan									

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	0	1	2	9	4.14	1069/1542	4.14	4.45	4.33	4.37	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	979/1542	4.21	4.50	4.29	4.31	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1339	****	4.69	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	822/1498	4.29	4.59	4.26	4.32	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	268/1428	4.64	4.47	4.12	4.15	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	335/1407	4.57	4.54	4.15	4.20	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	268/1521	4.71	4.38	4.20	4.23	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	1043/1518	3.92	4.27	4.11	4.13	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	452/1472	4.75	4.56	4.46	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	727/1475	4.83	4.89	4.72	4.74	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	0	2	8	4.33	870/1471	4.33	4.52	4.32	4.33	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	886/1470	4.33	4.57	4.33	4.35	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	140/1310	4.75	4.48	4.06	4.11	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	554/1210	4.36	4.45	4.18	4.27	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.60	4.37	4.45	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1207	5.00	4.71	4.41	4.51	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MCS 370 2	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	16
Title:	Special Topics In MCS			Questionnaires:	14
Instructor:	Yang,Fan				

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	250/859	4.44	4.37	4.08	4.13	4.44

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MCS 390 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 12				
Title:	Transcult Stud Global TV										Questionnaires: 7				
Instructor:	Larkey,Edward														

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**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	1	5	4.57	548/1542	4.57	4.45	4.33	4.37	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1243/1542	3.86	4.50	4.29	4.31	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1339	5.00	4.69	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	174/1498	4.83	4.59	4.26	4.32	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	598/1428	4.29	4.47	4.12	4.15	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	118/1407	4.86	4.54	4.15	4.20	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1046/1521	4.00	4.38	4.20	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	588/1518	4.33	4.27	4.11	4.13	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	1022/1472	4.33	4.56	4.46	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.89	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1104/1471	4.00	4.52	4.32	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	588/1470	4.60	4.57	4.33	4.35	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1310	5.00	4.48	4.06	4.11	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	667/1210	4.20	4.45	4.18	4.27	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	507/1211	4.60	4.60	4.37	4.45	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	722/1207	4.40	4.71	4.41	4.51	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	713/859	3.50	4.37	4.08	4.13	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MCS 390 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 12			
Title:	Transcult Stud Global TV										Questionnaires: 7			
Instructor:	Larkey,Edward													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/207	****	****	4.12	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/210	****	****	4.17	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/202	****	****	4.50	4.54	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/69	****	4.83	4.56	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	4.94	4.50	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	4.83	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/67	****	4.69	4.17	4.46	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/35	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	3.84	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.17	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	3.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	2.17	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	1.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MCS 390 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 12
Title:	Transcult Stud Global TV		Questionnaires: 7
Instructor:	Larkey,Edward		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	1.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MCS 404 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 36
Title: Internship		Questionnaires: 29
Instructor: Snyder,Donald I		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	1	0	4	9	15	4.28	940/1542	4.28	4.45	4.33	4.42	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	7	20	4.55	553/1542	4.55	4.50	4.29	4.33	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	465/1339	4.62	4.69	4.32	4.44	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	5	18	4.60	428/1498	4.60	4.59	4.26	4.35	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	494/1428	4.40	4.47	4.12	4.22	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	7	15	4.42	505/1407	4.42	4.54	4.15	4.30	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	8	18	4.41	644/1521	4.41	4.38	4.20	4.24	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	27	4.90	705/1541	4.90	4.84	4.70	4.72	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	11	10	4.35	575/1518	4.35	4.27	4.11	4.18	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	0	2	3	15	4.48	858/1472	4.48	4.56	4.46	4.50	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	1013/1475	4.68	4.89	4.72	4.74	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	0	0	5	15	4.57	567/1471	4.57	4.52	4.32	4.36	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	4	15	4.45	752/1470	4.45	4.57	4.33	4.38	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	270/1310	4.58	4.48	4.06	4.09	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	2	5	7	3.94	830/1210	3.94	4.45	4.18	4.34	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	706/1211	4.38	4.60	4.37	4.47	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	537/1207	4.63	4.71	4.41	4.53	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	13	6	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	97/859	4.80	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MCS 404 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment:	36		
Title:	Internship										Questionnaires:	29		
Instructor:	Snyder,Donald I													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.83	4.56	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.85	4.60	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	4.94	4.50	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.83	4.54	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.69	4.17	4.37	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.39	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.36	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.56	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.70	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	3.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MCS 404 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 36
Title:	Internship			Questionnaires: 29
Instructor:	Snyder,Donald I			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	8
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	11			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MCS 404 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 36
Title: Internship		Questionnaires: 29
Instructor: Loviglio,Jason		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	1	0	4	9	15	4.28	940/1542	4.28	4.45	4.33	4.42	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	7	20	4.55	553/1542	4.55	4.50	4.29	4.33	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	465/1339	4.62	4.69	4.32	4.44	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	5	18	4.60	428/1498	4.60	4.59	4.26	4.35	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	494/1428	4.40	4.47	4.12	4.22	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	7	15	4.42	505/1407	4.42	4.54	4.15	4.30	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	8	18	4.41	644/1521	4.41	4.38	4.20	4.24	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	27	4.90	705/1541	4.90	4.84	4.70	4.72	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1518	4.35	4.27	4.11	4.18	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	2	5	7	3.94	830/1210	3.94	4.45	4.18	4.34	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	706/1211	4.38	4.60	4.37	4.47	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	537/1207	4.63	4.71	4.41	4.53	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	13	6	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	97/859	4.80	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.83	4.56	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.85	4.60	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	4.94	4.50	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.83	4.54	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.69	4.17	4.37	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MCS 404 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 36
Title: Internship		Questionnaires: 29
Instructor: Loviglio,Jason		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.39	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.36	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.56	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.70	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	3.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	8
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	11			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MCS 499 1	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 16
Title:	Capstone Sen Sem			Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	Loviglio,Jason			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	5	9	4.53	596/1542	4.68	4.45	4.33	4.42	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	416/1542	4.81	4.50	4.29	4.33	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1339	5.00	4.69	4.32	4.44	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	357/1498	4.74	4.59	4.26	4.35	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	252/1428	4.65	4.47	4.12	4.22	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	252/1407	4.74	4.54	4.15	4.30	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	518/1521	4.53	4.38	4.20	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	994/1541	4.86	4.84	4.70	4.72	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	244/1518	4.55	4.27	4.11	4.18	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	598/1472	4.75	4.56	4.46	4.50	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1475	4.92	4.89	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	373/1471	4.78	4.52	4.32	4.36	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	399/1470	4.81	4.57	4.33	4.38	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	3	0	5	1	3	3.08	1213/1310	3.95	4.48	4.06	4.09	3.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	298/1210	4.81	4.45	4.18	4.34	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	497/1211	4.79	4.60	4.37	4.47	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	300/1207	4.92	4.71	4.41	4.53	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	458/859	4.66	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.08

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MCS 499 1	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	16
Title:	Capstone Sen Sem			Questionnaires:	15
Instructor:	Loviglio,Jason				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	4.83	4.83	4.56	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	4.85	4.85	4.60	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	4.94	4.94	4.50	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	4.83	4.83	4.54	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	4.69	4.69	4.17	4.37	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MCS 499 2	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 18
Title:	Capstone Sen Sem			Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Snyder,Donald			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	5	11	4.59	536/1542	4.68	4.45	4.33	4.42	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	283/1542	4.81	4.50	4.29	4.33	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1339	5.00	4.69	4.32	4.44	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	380/1498	4.74	4.59	4.26	4.35	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	536/1428	4.65	4.47	4.12	4.22	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	171/1407	4.74	4.54	4.15	4.30	4.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	430/1521	4.53	4.38	4.20	4.24	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1541	4.86	4.84	4.70	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	588/1518	4.55	4.27	4.11	4.18	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	303/1472	4.75	4.56	4.46	4.50	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	700/1475	4.92	4.89	4.72	4.74	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	425/1471	4.78	4.52	4.32	4.36	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	361/1470	4.81	4.57	4.33	4.38	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	414/1310	3.95	4.48	4.06	4.09	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	251/1210	4.81	4.45	4.18	4.34	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	352/1211	4.79	4.60	4.37	4.47	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	210/1207	4.92	4.71	4.41	4.53	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	82/859	4.66	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.89

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MCS 499 2	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 18
Title: Capstone Sen Sem		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Snyder,Donald		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	38/69	4.83	4.83	4.56	4.62	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	36/69	4.85	4.85	4.60	4.67	4.78
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	24/68	4.94	4.94	4.50	4.65	4.89
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	40/73	4.83	4.83	4.54	4.72	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	22/67	4.69	4.69	4.17	4.37	4.56

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	1	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	1			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MCS 499 3		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 16			
Title:	Capstone Sen Sem										Questionnaires: 14			
Instructor:	Snyder,Donald													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	13	4.93	135/1542	4.68	4.45	4.33	4.42	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1542	4.81	4.50	4.29	4.33	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1339	5.00	4.69	4.32	4.44	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	115/1498	4.74	4.59	4.26	4.35	4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	74/1428	4.65	4.47	4.12	4.22	4.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	156/1407	4.74	4.54	4.15	4.30	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	518/1521	4.53	4.38	4.20	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	551/1541	4.86	4.84	4.70	4.72	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	269/1518	4.55	4.27	4.11	4.18	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	452/1472	4.75	4.56	4.46	4.50	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	484/1475	4.92	4.89	4.72	4.74	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	146/1471	4.78	4.52	4.32	4.36	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	159/1470	4.81	4.57	4.33	4.38	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	465/1310	3.95	4.48	4.06	4.09	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1210	4.81	4.45	4.18	4.34	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1211	4.79	4.60	4.37	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1207	4.92	4.71	4.41	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/859	4.66	4.37	4.08	4.19	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MCS 499 3	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	16
Title:	Capstone Sen Sem			Questionnaires:	14
Instructor:	Snyder,Donald				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/69	4.83	4.83	4.56	4.62	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	25/69	4.85	4.85	4.60	4.67	4.92
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/68	4.94	4.94	4.50	4.65	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/73	4.83	4.83	4.54	4.72	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	12/67	4.69	4.69	4.17	4.37	4.83

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						