

Course-Section: MCS 222 0101
 Title MEDIA & COMM. STUDIES
 Instructor: SNYDER, DONALD
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1080
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	9	10	4.26	940/1576	4.36	4.44	4.30	4.35	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	11	7	5	3.74	1318/1576	4.04	4.29	4.27	4.32	3.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/1342	****	4.93	4.32	4.41	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	9	5	7	3.82	1225/1520	4.05	4.25	4.25	4.26	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	9	9	4.13	768/1465	4.37	4.54	4.12	4.09	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	10	11	4.35	584/1434	4.42	4.55	4.14	4.06	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	2	5	6	7	3.64	1289/1547	3.93	4.21	4.19	4.22	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	12	9	4.30	1288/1574	3.99	4.29	4.64	4.62	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	5	7	2	3.79	1145/1554	4.01	4.25	4.10	4.05	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	11	8	4.13	1187/1488	4.33	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	1125/1493	4.67	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	11	7	4.14	1047/1486	4.27	4.44	4.32	4.29	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	13	4.35	877/1489	4.47	4.50	4.32	4.31	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	5	6	12	4.30	489/1277	4.34	4.40	4.03	4.01	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	373/1279	4.58	4.68	4.17	4.14	4.61	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	696/1270	4.55	4.69	4.35	4.30	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	535/1269	4.63	4.79	4.35	4.29	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	620/ 878	3.93	4.42	4.05	3.92	3.78	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.44	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 10
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B 8	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 1
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	
				? 0	Other 8

Course-Section: MCS 222 0201
 Title MEDIA & COMM. STUDIES
 Instructor: SNYDER, DONALD
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1081
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	1	2	7	16	4.46	697/1576	4.36	4.44	4.30	4.35	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	12	12	4.35	838/1576	4.04	4.29	4.27	4.32	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	****/1342	****	4.93	4.32	4.41	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	8	13	4.28	826/1520	4.05	4.25	4.25	4.26	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	297/1465	4.37	4.54	4.12	4.09	4.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	16	4.50	398/1434	4.42	4.55	4.14	4.06	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	7	14	4.23	860/1547	3.93	4.21	4.19	4.22	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	4	9	3	9	3.68	1544/1574	3.99	4.29	4.64	4.62	3.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	732/1554	4.01	4.25	4.10	4.05	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	846/1488	4.33	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	947/1493	4.67	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	8	14	4.40	821/1486	4.27	4.44	4.32	4.29	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	18	4.60	579/1489	4.47	4.50	4.32	4.31	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	6	4	16	4.38	421/1277	4.34	4.40	4.03	4.01	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	413/1279	4.58	4.68	4.17	4.14	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	514/1270	4.55	4.69	4.35	4.30	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	584/1269	4.63	4.79	4.35	4.29	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	449/ 878	3.93	4.42	4.05	3.92	4.08	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.39	****	

Course-Section: MCS 222 0201
 Title MEDIA & COMM. STUDIES
 Instructor: SNYDER, DONALD
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1081
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	26	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MCS 333 0101
 Title HIST & THEORY OF MCS
 Instructor: REGALES, JACQUE
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1082
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	952/1576	4.25	4.44	4.30	4.30	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	798/1576	4.38	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	209/1342	4.86	4.93	4.32	4.30	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	169/1465	4.81	4.54	4.12	4.09	4.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	12	4.56	353/1434	4.56	4.55	4.14	4.15	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	315/1547	4.69	4.21	4.19	4.21	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	1227/1574	4.38	4.29	4.64	4.61	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	504/1554	4.43	4.25	4.10	4.09	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	920/1488	4.47	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	271/1486	4.80	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	742/1489	4.47	4.50	4.32	4.34	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	0	1	11	4.43	385/1277	4.43	4.40	4.03	4.11	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	219/1279	4.80	4.68	4.17	4.20	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	182/1270	4.93	4.69	4.35	4.42	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.79	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.42	4.05	4.09	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MCS 499 0101
 Title CAPSTONE SENIOR SEMINA
 Instructor: SNYDER, DONALD
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1083
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	243/1576	4.80	4.44	4.30	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	350/1576	4.70	4.29	4.27	4.35	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.93	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	683/1520	4.40	4.25	4.25	4.38	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	304/1465	4.60	4.54	4.12	4.22	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	151/1434	4.80	4.55	4.14	4.30	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	784/1547	4.30	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	665/1574	4.80	4.29	4.64	4.69	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	355/1554	4.56	4.25	4.10	4.24	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	970/1488	4.43	4.39	4.47	4.55	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	683/1493	4.86	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	792/1486	4.43	4.44	4.32	4.41	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	614/1489	4.57	4.50	4.32	4.38	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.40	4.03	4.04	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	262/1279	4.75	4.68	4.17	4.31	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	412/1270	4.75	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	310/1269	4.88	4.79	4.35	4.55	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	125/ 878	4.83	4.42	4.05	4.33	4.83	

Frequency Distribution

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