

REPORT GENERATED ON 1/20/116

COM-15F EM847 Al Tme/ P; ce & Socdat
PROFESSOR Groshek

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 3
NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 4
PERCENT OF ENROLLED STUDENTS RESPONDING: 75.00

STATISTICS REFLECT FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

-----										MEAN	ST DEV		
1. My class year is:	NR	1	2	3	4	5							
	Freshman	0	0	0	0	0	3	Graduate		5.000	0.000		
2. My college/school is:	NR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	SEA	MEAN	ST DEV
	CAS	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.000	0.000
3. Primary reason for enrolling in course:	NR	1	2	3	4						MEAN	ST DEV	
	MAJOR/MINOR REQUIREMENT	0	3	0	0	0	OTHER					1.000	0.000

II. GENERAL EVALUATION OF COURSE:

-----										MEAN	ST DEV	
4. The overall course workload	NR	1	2	3	4	5						
	Not heavy	0	0	0	0	2	1	Very heavy		4.333	0.577	
5. The level of difficulty of the course	NR	1	2	3	4	5						
	Not difficult	0	0	0	0	0	3	Very difficult		5.000	0.000	
6. The overall course rating	NR	1	2	3	4	5						
	Poor	0	0	0	0	0	3	Superior		5.000	0.000	
7. The course syllabus was comprehensive and clear	NR	1	2	3	4	5						
	Disagree	0	0	0	0	1	2	Strongly agree		4.667	0.577	
8. The course syllabus stated the course objectives clearly	NR	1	2	3	4	5						
	Disagree	0	0	0	0	1	2	Strongly agree		4.667	0.577	
9. Would you recommend this course to your friends?	NR	1	2	3	4	5						
	Yes	0	2	1	0	0	0	Definitely not		1.333	0.577	
10. Compare course with similar courses taken at BU	NR	1	2	3	4	5	6				MEAN	ST DEV
	Higher quality	0	3	0	0	0	0	No comparison		1.000	0.000	
11. Grade I expect to receive	NR	1	2	3	4	5	6				MEAN	ST DEV
	A (3.6 or above)	0	2	1	0	0	0	Pass		1.333	0.577	

III. PROFESSOR/INSTRUCTOR EVALUATIONS:

-----										MEAN	ST DEV
12. The instructor's enthusiasm in teaching	NR	1	2	3	4	5					
	Poor	0	0	0	0	0	3	Superior		5.000	0.000
13. The instructor's effectiveness in explaining concepts	NR	1	2	3	4	5					
	Poor	0	0	0	0	0	3	Superior		5.000	0.000
14. The instructor's ability to stimulate interest in subject matter	NR	1	2	3	4	5					
	Poor	0	0	0	0	0	3	Superior		5.000	0.000
15. The instructor's availability to students outside of class	NR	1	2	3	4	5					
	Poor	0	0	0	0	0	3	Superior		5.000	0.000
16. The instructor's fairness in grading	NR	1	2	3	4	5					
	Poor	0	0	0	0	0	3	Superior		5.000	0.000
17. Overall rating of this instructor	NR	1	2	3	4	5					
	Poor	0	0	0	0	0	3	Superior		5.000	0.000

COM EM 847 Course Evaluations
Fall 2015

Instructor: Jacob Groshek

Section: A1

1. Comment on the PROFESSOR(S)/INSTRUCTOR(S) with regard to ability to communicate ideas, willingness to entertain debate, organization, attitude toward students, accessibility.

1. Dr. Groshek is an amazing professor. He was always available for questions; great attitude and advice given to students.
2. So helpful-the one-on-one meetings were so critical to clearer understanding of course concepts and making real progress on projects.
3. Dr. Groshek is terrific-organized, clear, patient enthusiastic. He cares about the material (extremely brilliant) and wants his students to succeed.

2. Comment on the COURSE with regard to pace, workload, level of difficulty, educational value, and topics covered integration of sections.

1. Really hard class but learned A LOT. Foundational for PhDs.
2. Really difficult in the beginning to establish foundation for stats understanding but crucial moving forward for building with more advanced statistical analysis.
3. The course is a huge challenge or at least it was for me! But Dr. Groshek's support makes it feasible and accessible.

3. In your opinion, what were some of the strengths of this course?

1. Pacing; one on one meetings; working on final project early. Class Size!!!
2. Small class size, one-on-one attention, individual projects that let us work with & become comfortable with one or tow exercises to learn concepts with already clean and clear data set.
3. The small class size was really helpful; we could converse easily about our questions. Dr. Groshek met with us individually several times to ensure personalized learning.

4. In your judgment, in what ways could this course be improved?

1. Data set selection; perhaps suggested reading of other work to get a sense of how to report data.
2. Not once a week for 3 hours but scheduling twice for 90 minutes. NOT SO LATE AT NIGHT. Really difficult time in terms of such math/stats-heavy content.
3. Perhaps a quick brief refresher or perhaps tell students to do that on their own prior of more basic statistics before jumping in. Also, it would be great if the hours were not late at night.

5. Provide a brief assessment of the quality of the instructor's presentation of the course content (lectures, readings, projects, guests, tests, etc.)

1. Good lectures. Overall awesome.
2. Awesome. Only used slides when needed in class exercises were critical for really learning and applying concepts.
3. Dr. Groshek's presentation of material was top notch he is an expert and communicates well with students.

REPORT GENERATED ON 1/20/116

COM-15F EM777 A1 Exgrppprojwrksem
PROFESSOR Groshek

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 20
NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 24
PERCENT OF ENROLLED STUDENTS RESPONDING: 83.33

STATISTICS REFLECT FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
1. My class year is:	Freshman	0	0	0	0	0	20 Graduate	5.000	0.000
2. My college/school is:	CAS	0	0	20	0	0	0 0 0 0 SEA	2.000	0.000
3. Primary reason for enrolling in course:	NR	1	2	3	4			MEAN	ST DEV
	MAJOR/MINOR REQUIREMENT	1	18	1	0	0	OTHER	1.053	0.229

II. GENERAL EVALUATION OF COURSE:

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
4. The overall course workload	Not heavy	0	0	0	6	11	3 Very heavy	3.850	0.671
5. The level of difficulty of the course	Not difficult	0	0	0	8	8	4 Very difficult	3.800	0.768
6. The overall course rating	Poor	0	0	0	6	13	1 Superior	3.750	0.550
7. The course syllabus was comprehensive and clear	Disagree	0	0	1	4	9	6 Strongly agree	4.000	0.858
8. The course syllabus stated the course objectives clearly	Disagree	0	0	1	4	10	5 Strongly agree	3.950	0.826
9. Would you recommend this course to your friends?	Yes	0	1	10	8	1	0 Definitely not	2.450	0.686
10. Compare course with similar courses taken at BU	NR	1	2	3	4	5	6	MEAN	ST DEV
	Higher quality	0	4	12	2	0	0 2 No comparison	2.300	1.380
11. Grade I expect to receive	A (3.6 or above)	0	15	5	0	0	0 0 Pass	1.250	0.444

III. PROFESSOR/INSTRUCTOR EVALUATIONS:

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
12. The instructor's enthusiasm in teaching	Poor	0	0	0	0	3	17 Superior	4.050	0.366
13. The instructor's effectiveness in explaining concepts	Poor	0	0	1	11	7	1 Superior	3.400	0.681
14. The instructor's ability to stimulate interest in subject matter	Poor	0	0	0	4	12	4 Superior	4.000	0.649
15. The instructor's availability to students outside of class	Poor	0	0	0	2	7	11 Superior	4.450	0.686
16. The instructor's fairness in grading	Poor	0	0	0	0	10	10 Superior	4.500	0.513
17. Overall rating of this instructor.	Poor	0	0	1	2	14	3 Superior	3.950	0.686

PrCOM EM 777 Course Evaluations
Fall 2015

Instructor: Jacob Groshek

Section: A1

1. Comment on the PROFESSOR(S)/INSTRUCTOR(S) with regard to ability to communicate ideas, willingness to entertain debate, organization, attitude toward students, accessibility.

1. Very enthusiastic about the subject matter but the in-class exercises did not contribute to my understanding of the material.
2. In class, Prof Groshek is nice and enthusiastic. However, the explanation of assignment is not clear enough.
3. Very good enthusiastic while teaching.
4. The Professor is enthusiastic in teaching. However, sometimes he failed to explicate himself upon some of the concepts clearly.
5. Some class concepts are not clearly explained. However, better explanation in office hour.
6. Professor Groshek is very enthusiastic and willing to share much resources with us.
7. Enthusiastic with material. Needs more organization and structure.
8. Statistics is never fun...Dr. Groshek does a swell job at approaching the material with clarity. It is apparent he cares about student sources.
9. Dr. Groshek is clearly passionate about research and statistical analysis, which stimulates interest. However his large knowledge base often leaves me feeling behind or lost.
10. Very willing to help outside of class, responsive to emails.
11. The professor was enthusiastic and clearly engaged with students' interests. The decision to switch to power point-free lectures mid-way through the course improved the flow and clarity of the class significantly.
12. Sometimes he may speak or teach too fast to catch the idea.
13. Professor Groshek is very enthusiastic about teaching but sometimes he rushed through concepts which can be a bit difficult as not everyone learns in the same capacity. At times he seems impatient too. As a student, I would find it easier to approach him if he were a bit more patient.
14. Active, motivated and engaging. Easier to entertain student questions.

15. Blank

16. You are very well versed in the subject matter and had good exercises and examples in class, perhaps move P.P presentations more organized, as well as labels on Dropbox, sometimes it is overwhelming and confusing.

17. I feel like professor Groshek was kind of rushed in explaining concepts that I often felt like I was unable to full comprehend the subject.

18. Have a hard time in understanding what the professor really wants us to do. Professor Groshek is really kind and supportive for all kinds of topic. But in the process of practice, we may need more professional assistance and clear directions instead of vague "you could have try".

19. The overall organization for this course is good but sometime it is not very clear for students to understand instructor's requirement.

20. Professor Groshek was great about making himself available outside of class for clarification or to answer questions about assignments.

2. Comment on the COURSE with regard to pace, workload, level of difficulty, educational value, and topics covered integration of sections.

1. Would have been much better to see instructional content on SPSS & statistical analysis techniques (i.e. ANOVA & hot to interpret) before jumping into exercises.

2. If you have statistic knowledge, it will be good. If you don't, it seems difficult and professor doesn't explain that much to you.

3. Pace is a bit too quick. Workload is just fine and the course is really practical for those who want to pursue or research oriented career.

4. The pace is good, the topic is useful and skills are learnt.

5. Hard work and sometimes, the instruction of work is not clear enough.

6. This class is well designed and I really learned a lot from this class.

7. More time should be allocated to understanding SPSS concepts, not just what to do in the program.

8. The methods section=great. The SPSS section=too fast. I'm still confused on some topics.

9. Work load was fine until last two weeks where it has become exorbitant.

10. Fair workload and appropriate difficulty. All valuable information.

11. Overall workload and level of difficulty was consistent and reasonable. I think the course suffered for largely shipping past statistical concepts on the way to teaching their application.

12. The pace is too fast, the workload and level of difficulty is fair.

13. The course is interesting but probably requires additional time for students that don't have a research background. The assignments were interesting but it would have been better had we started the final project earlier.

14. Workload was heavy but engaging for methodologies and light but obscure for analytic SPSS parts.

15. Blank

16. I understand the value of learning the quantitative and qualitative methods but I felt that it took a lot of time to get through this section and that still, some assignments were rushed. Wished we spent more time learning SPSS.

17. The pace was way too fast. I felt like I was trying to follow along with class exercises but wasn't actually learning. I have zero background in statistics and I had to spend a lot of time outside of class trying to understand it.

18. A little bit too fast, especially for the SPSS analysis part. I didn't absorb some mathematical concept thoroughly and the course went on for another math concept.

19. The course workload and level of difficulty are fair but do think the topics that covered cannot be explained clearly.

20. Coming away from the class, I understand how to input data and run tests in SPSS, but I don't feel confident in my overall understanding of concepts and real-world application of concepts and data.

3. In your opinion, what were some of the strengths of this course?

1. Professor's passion for the material.

2. Learn SPSS

3. Practical research methods & skills for people who are interested in research.

4. Learning SPSS is one of the most significant strength of this class. Other than that, learning some of the research method is also very useful.

5. Lead us go through SPSS and help us to analyze data.

6. The class introduced many effective methodologies which is really helpful for future research.
7. Ability to conduct original research.
8. Great course for learning the importance of research. Both practicing and academically.
9. I like the general structure and real world application involved in conducting original research.
10. Well-paced, fair grades, he's intelligent & kind.
11. Good survey of methodological approaches; I appreciate that we directly engaged with each unit in our work.
12. Teach us some very practical stuff=like how to do research, how to run SPSS.
13. The practical aspect, the assignments, the instructive style.
14. Wide survey of interesting methodologies. Amazing opportunity to do real research.
15. Blank
16. -learn research methods on a graduate level
-introduction to SPSS.
17. Professor Groshek is very knowledgeable and clearly has a passion for what he teaches. He's easy to talk to as well.
18. Introducing the basics of quantitative research.
19. Other than the knowledge on book, can also learn something about SPSS
20. Professor Groshek is a passionate educator and timely with feedback and grading.

4. In your judgment, in what ways could this course be improved?

1. We felt rushed through initiating the SPSS exercises in class, rather than actually learning the material first then practicing.
2. More clear instruction.
3. Maybe write more scholars/experts in real industry to give lectures.
4. Spending more time explaining the SPSS and the statics terms in order to have stronger learning on the subject.

5. Syllabus and instruction of exercise might be more clear.
6. Good enough.
7. More time with SPSS; more structured timeline for data collection.
8. More time on SPSS!
9. Jacks organization and needed way more SPSS instruction- we rushed through this leaving us unprepared for our final project and exam.
10. Final project was very rushed, didn't receive qualtrics data until late. Didn't have much prior knowledge of how to prepare for final project, not much time to complete it. I hate SPSS.
11. The final project was often inconsistently outlined for me. The combination of what felt like shifty expectation and a late start made this much more stressful than it needed to be.
12. Maybe slow down the pace a little bit.
13. Would be great to have classes in a lab, SPSS editions for students should be purchased. Textbook access at the library (in PDF form) would be great.
14. The SPSS workshops seemed to come at the expense at the time studying and understanding the methodologies behind the procedures.
15. Blank.
16. Need more time w/ SPSS training and need to have this course in a lab for access to the program.
17. I think less focus should be given on the in-class exercise because I felt rushed to copy what he was doing on the screen and didn't fully understand why I was doing it. It would have been better to just take notes.
18. The path and clarify.
19. Maybe make the explanation clarify would be much better for students to follow.
20. Class size was too large, more time should have been spent explaining of concepts and how they are related to SPSS data and real-life application.

5. Provide a brief assessment of the quality of the instructor's presentation of the course content (lectures, readings, projects, guests, tests, etc.)

1. Would have appreciated PPT slides in class re: SPSS. Overall, a good Prof. but course content was a bit muddled.

2. There are several guests speakers which is good. Overall it is good.
3. Very good.
4. Professor Groshek is very good at interpreting the presentation. I suggest that power point should still be used.
5. Kind of confusing that we have dropbox to get access to our course content but we use google to hand in homework. But its easy to get access to all materials.
6. It's great. I do love it.
7. Good.
8. Overall, great! I don't think we needed the PPT slides, so I'm ok with you getting rid of them. Perhaps work on SPSS info more for in class presentations.
9. Dr. Groshek knows his stuff and I especially enjoyed when Jill Walsh and Erik Bucy came in to speak to our class.
10. A little fast, but through, helpful, fun, and willing to explain more where needed. SPSS needed more explanation otherwise he's great.
11. Lectures were clear and compelling. At times, I felt that the readings assigned while helpful, were somewhat redundant and either overlapped each other on content presented in class.
12. Good.
13. Professor Groshek is good at explaining concepts and he designed the PPTs, lectures well but towards the end of the semester he seemed really rushed and we felt that we haven't grasped the last bit too well.
14. Research methodology: 10/10 wonderful data analysis: 6/10-did not feel that I attached masters of anything more than repeat procedures in SPSS.
15. Blank
16. Fair methods of evaluating, perhaps the final paper should have been more like a longer exercise than a full paper, as this could have been completed next semester?
17. Well, he got rid of power points ½ way through the semester and honestly I would have liked them. I'm a visual person and sometimes it helps to see things written down. But, I did really enjoy his outside speakers and he was helpful every time I needed it.
18. Blank.
19. The quality of instructors presentation of the course content are good.

COM EM 777/888 Course Evaluations
Fall 2015

Instructor: Jacob Groshek

Section: A1

1. Comment on the PROFESSOR(S)/ INSTRUCTOR(S) with regard to ability to communicate ideas, willingness to entertain debate, organization, attitude toward students, accessibility.

1. He is enthusiastic about the subject matter and engaging as a professor, sometimes he rushes too quickly through concepts though and assignments are not always clear.

2. Professor Groshek is an enthusiastic teacher has a strong knowledge base. However, the overall ability to communicate concepts, entertain debate and inculcate a questioning mindset amongst students needs some work.

3. Too much rush in learning more tools/concepts with less time to familiarize with what learnt in class. Attitude not always very professional and fair in a teacher –student relationship.

4. Attitude toward students was very poor at times-bordering unprofessional in tone. Feedback was very negative and condescending at times which was very disheartening from a learning perspective.

2. Comment on the COURSE with regard to pace, workload, level of difficulty, educational value, and topics covered integration of sections.

1. The course had a decent workload, sometimes group projects very very time-consuming and we needed more/clearer instruction on SPSS because many people have no experience with it.

2. The pace of the course is too fast and although assignments are designed well, they need to be consistent to allow us to focus on a single common research topic. That would channelize our efforts better for a final project.

3. The course has a very educational value give the amount and complexity of tools and concepts to learn, more time should have been devoted to practice those tools. Too much importance of the quantity over quality.

4. The pace was very hectic at times-especially toward the end of the semester and project work felt rushed. Programs like SPSS were difficult to follow along, especially because some of us didn't have the program.

3. In your opinion, what were some of the strengths of this course?

1. We learned a lot through practice and it was very cool being able to carry out our own research. I liked the naturalistic observation portion.
2. It is quite intensive and scientific in nature. Very good for an emerging media program. However, this kind of course should warrant the program to be an Master of Science not an MA program.
3. The importance of learning research methods and SSP tool. Both for an academic and business career.
4. I enjoyed working as a group from the beginning and I would have felt completely lost without them to work with and their support.

4. In your judgment, in what ways could this course be improved?

1. Clearer instruction about statistical concepts and SPSS. Clearer instruction in general on assignments.
2. The pace can be more consistent. One semester can teach concepts and basics, next semester on application and tools with an overall goal towards a final project at the end of the program year. The text book is redundant, not very useful.
3. More time spent on studying practicing and familiarizing with tools class concepts. Importance of the quality over the quantity (I felt the quantity has been more important in this course).
4. I wish we could've structured the schedule for the final project better-and I would've appreciated more general knowledge up front as I never worked in research before.

5. Provide a brief assessment of the quality of the instructor's presentation of the course content (lectures, readings, projects, guests, tests, etc.)

1. He clearly know his stuff, he just needs to slow down a bit.
2. Professor Groshek's presentations are insightful. However, over teaching styles is a bit haphazard; difficult to thread the various bits together. If you are an international student it is all the more difficult to comprehend the methodology of teaching.
3. The comment was well presented (power point & drop box).
4. I could've done without the textbook as I only utilized it in the beginning. I wish the instructor felt more engaged sometimes it felt like we were in the way and that he didn't want to be here.

COM EM 888 Course Evaluations
Fall 2015

Instructor: Jacob Groshek

Section: A1

1. Comment on the PROFESSOR(S)/ INSTRUCTOR(S) with regard to ability to communicate ideas, willingness to entertain debate, organization, attitude toward students, accessibility.

1. Dr. Groshek is a terrific educator who cares about his students understanding of course material. Extremely accessible and knowledgeable.
2. Extremely knowledgeable and accessible professor.

2. Comment on the COURSE with regard to pace, workload, level of difficulty, educational value, and topics covered integration of sections.

1. The workload was tough because I worked alone. The weekly assignments took a lot of time because they were robust, challenging learning experiments.
2. We took this class concurrently with EM 847 which was structurally awkward at times, as EM 847 is an advanced stats course.
3. First half of the semester seemed much heavier workload wise than second half.

3. In your opinion, what were some of the strengths of this course?

1. Dr. Groshek's collaborative approach to learning; applied learning process; active feedback processes.
2. Excellent course.
3. Well structured clearly laid out with concrete learning good milestones-comprehensive class exercises and assignments to meet there learning objectives.

4. In your judgment, in what ways could this course be improved?

1. Perhaps more opportunities for groups to share progress with other groups.
2. N/A
3. Smaller class size, for more individual instructional feedback re: semester projects

5. Provide a brief assessment of the quality of the instructor's presentation of the course content (lectures, readings, projects, guests, tests, etc.)

1. Dr. Groshek presented and scaffolded the learning process extremely effectively. I really appreciate the iterative approach to our assignments.
2. Tests were fair and well organized; professor was flexible RE: deadlines and helpful RE: projects
3. Really great presentation-relevant examples, explains concepts a few times in different ways to ensure they're well understood.

REPORT GENERATED ON 6/3/115

COM-15S EM747 A1 Trndinginsights
PROFESSOR Groshek

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 12
NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 13
PERCENT OF ENROLLED STUDENTS RESPONDING: 92.31

STATISTICS REFLECT PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
1. My class year is:	Freshman	0	0	0	0	0	100 Graduate	5.000	0.000
2. My college/school is:	CAS	0	0	100	0	0	0 0 0 0 0 SHA	2.000	0.000
3. Primary reason for enrolling in course:	NR	1	2	3	4			MEAN	ST DEV
	MAJOR/MINOR REQUIREMENT	8	58	16	0	16	OTHER	1.727	1.191

II. GENERAL EVALUATION OF COURSE:

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
4. The overall course workload	Not heavy	0	0	0	16	83	0 Very heavy	3.833	0.389
5. The level of difficulty of the course	Not difficult	0	0	8	41	41	8 Very difficult	3.500	0.798
6. The overall course rating	Poor	0	0	0	33	16	50 Superior	4.167	0.937
7. The course syllabus was comprehensive and clear	Disagree	0	0	0	25	50	25 Strongly agree	4.000	0.739
8. The course syllabus stated the course objectives clearly	Disagree	0	0	0	25	33	41 Strongly agree	4.167	0.835
9. Would you recommend this course to your friends?	Yes	0	50	8	25	16	0 Definitely not	2.083	1.240
10. Compare course with similar courses taken at BU	NR	1	2	3	4	5	6	MEAN	ST DEV
	Higher quality	0	58	16	8	8	0 8 No comparison	2.000	1.595
11. Grade I expect to receive	A (3.6 or above)	0	66	33	0	0	0 0 Pass	1.333	0.492

III. PROFESSOR/INSTRUCTOR EVALUATIONS:

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
12. The instructor's enthusiasm in teaching	Poor	0	0	8	0	25	66 Superior	4.500	0.905
13. The instructor's effectiveness in explaining concepts	Poor	0	0	0	25	33	41 Superior	4.167	0.835
14. The instructor's ability to stimulate interest in subject matter	Poor	0	0	0	33	25	41 Superior	4.083	0.900
15. The instructor's availability to students outside of class	Poor	0	0	0	25	25	50 Superior	4.250	0.866
16. The instructor's fairness in grading	Poor	0	0	0	16	33	50 Superior	4.333	0.778
17. Overall rating of this instructor	Poor	0	0	0	25	16	58 Superior	4.333	0.888

REPORT GENERATED ON 6/3/115

COM-15S EM747 A1 Trndinginsights
PROFESSOR Groshek

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 12
NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 13
PERCENT OF ENROLLED STUDENTS RESPONDING: 92.31

STATISTICS REFLECT FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
1. My class year is:	Freshman	0	0	0	0	0	12 Graduate	5.000	0.000
2. My college/school is:	CAS	0	0	12	0	0	0 0 0 0 0 SEA	2.000	0.000
3. Primary reason for enrolling in course:	NR	1	2	3	4			MEAN	ST DEV
	MAJOR/MINOR REQUIREMENT	1	7	2	0	2	OTHER	1.727	1.191

II. GENERAL EVALUATION OF COURSE:

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
4. The overall course workload	Not heavy	0	0	0	2	10	0 Very heavy	3.833	0.389
5. The level of difficulty of the course	Not difficult	0	0	1	5	5	1 Very difficult	3.500	0.798
6. The overall course rating	Poor	0	0	0	4	2	6 Superior	4.167	0.937
7. The course syllabus was comprehensive and clear	Disagree	0	0	0	3	6	3 Strongly agree	4.000	0.739
8. The course syllabus stated the course objectives clearly	Disagree	0	0	0	3	4	5 Strongly agree	4.167	0.835
9. Would you recommend this course to your friends?	Yes	0	6	1	3	2	0 Definitely not	2.083	1.240
10. Compare course with similar courses taken at BU	NR	1	2	3	4	5	6	MEAN	ST DEV
	Higher quality	0	7	2	1	1	0 1 No comparison	2.000	1.595
11. Grade I expect to receive	A (3.6 or above)	0	8	4	0	0	0 0 Pass	1.333	0.492

III. PROFESSOR/INSTRUCTOR EVALUATIONS:

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
12. The instructor's enthusiasm in teaching	Poor	0	0	1	0	3	8 Superior	4.500	0.905
13. The instructor's effectiveness in explaining concepts	Poor	0	0	0	3	4	5 Superior	4.167	0.835
14. The instructor's ability to stimulate interest in subject matter	Poor	0	0	0	4	3	5 Superior	4.083	0.900
15. The instructor's availability to students outside of class	Poor	0	0	0	3	3	6 Superior	4.250	0.866
16. The instructor's fairness in grading	Poor	0	0	0	2	4	6 Superior	4.333	0.778
17. Overall rating of this instructor	Poor	0	0	0	3	2	7 Superior	4.333	0.888

COM EM 747 Course Evaluations
Spring 2015

Instructor: Jacob Groshek

Section: A1

1. Comment on the PROFESSOR(S)/ INSTRUCTOR(S) with regard to ability to communicate ideas, willingness to entertain debate, organization, attitude toward students, accessibility.

1. He respected every students opinions/comments and was enthusiastic about the topic.
2. He is enthusiastic.
3. No comment.
4. Below my expectation.
5. No comment.
6. Good job encouraging conversations & debate on topics that were sometimes ambiguous to pull out learnings.
7. Dr. Groshek is a great professor- he has a lot of enthusiasm for data/visualization. This was the first time I event took a course like this and I think it was highly beneficial. I wish the program had a part 1 and 2 to build some more skills.
8. Really engaging teaching style clearly covers a lot about the topics or ideas and open to differing opinions especially if they might lead to further discussion.
9. Interesting topics but certainly challenging. Organization could be improved (only in terms of having perhaps a few slides to illustrate intricacies of network analysis...the markers almost never have ink for the white boards).
10. Could be more clear in explaining how concepts relate to work outside of academic research very accessible and excited. Great personality!
11. no comment.
12. Good

2. Comment on the COURSE with regard to pace, workload, level of difficulty, educational value, and topics covered integration of sections.

1. Average workload, enough not to overwhelm you but also make you learn a lot from them.
2. The workload is heavy most of the time, we have to learn by ourselves. The instructions are not clear.
3. Workload is heavy if you're taking other courses in the same semester.
4. The course should clearer when reference analysis definitions, not how to do.
5. No comment
6. Super helpful in the long run. Workload for assignments was high but not unreasonable and fit in clearly with final project.
7. Educational value 100%. Weekly assignments were challenging but also rewarding. Maybe allow 2 weeks for the bigger assignments and to allow more time for trouble shooting.
8. Pretty heavy workload but reasonable for good-level class. Readings were fairly dense but that's to be expected for such a new topic.
9. Fair pace.
10. It was a very rigorous course load with dense reading. But it mostly felt valuable.
11. no comment
12. Not very fast. A lot to learn

3. In your opinion, what were some of the strengths of this course?

1. Giving insights on visualizing and analyzing data.
2. No comment
3. No comment.
4. Software usage.
5. No comment.
6. Teaches ability to use unique software and data analysis
7. learning to work with data/new tech and software! Studying networks/influences more in depth.
8. Introduction to completely new research methods and data analysis.

9. Hands on felt like I learned a lot this semester and have a lot of visualizations so show for it.

10. Hand on work. Learning new tech/software.

11. No comment

12. very practical.

4. In your judgment, in what ways could this course be improved?

1. More focused work on client project and more workshop on the other tools.

2. There is not enough time for the final project. The things we learned in class us not as useful unless the professor explains what does this mean.

3. Professor can give clearer instructions on assignments.

4. Change the format of final presentation to do doing more practical objectives.

5. No comment.

6. Start with a little more theory and definitions of spatializations was not possible due to altered schedule.

7. Add some more workshops for semester project throughout the semester if possible. Some more work check-ins would be beneficial as would some class/peer feedback.

8. Better integration of theoretical components and practical application assignments-tough for learning to use software necessarily takes up time so not as much time to address theoretical connections during workshops.

9. More time and heads-up about final project requirements.

10. More clarify w. tutorials (in person & assignments sheets). More structure & guidance for group project.

11. No comment.

12. Tools used in this class might not be the ones that are being widely used by professionals in the area. Might be better if other tools could be introduced.

5. Provide a brief assessment of the quality of the instructor's presentation of the course content (lectures, readings, projects, guests, tests, etc.)

1. He was enthusiastic about the topic which got us more engaged. He was clear on his presentation.
2. Most of the time is wasted. Should put more emphasis on explaining the works.
3. No comment.
4. We may need more powerful software to achieve the course goal.
5. No comment.
6. ok sometimes concepts were hard to understand but bringing in examples was very helpful.
7. Some readings overlapped or were repetitive but also this helped to reinforce new info. Brief class discussions about findings from assignments would be fun!
8. Nice discussion-leading style. Would have been nice if more students participated in discussions but that can't really be blamed on professor.
9. Great Professor!
10. No comment. All was good. I really appreciated your highlighted readings being uploaded to Box.
11. No comment.
12. Good.

REPORT GENERATED ON 1/16/115

COM-14F CM722 A1 COM Research
 PROFESSOR Groshek

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 22
 NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 24
 PERCENT OF ENROLLED STUDENTS RESPONDING: 91.67

STATISTICS REFLECT FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

										NR	1	2	3	4	5			MEAN	ST DEV		
1. My class year is:	Freshman	0	0	0	0	1	21	Graduate											4.955	0.213	
										NR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
2. My college/school is:	CAS	0	2	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	SEA		1.909	0.294	
										NR	1	2	3	4						MEAN	ST DEV
3. Primary reason for enrolling in course:	MAJOR/MINOR REQUIREMENT	0	22	0	0	0	OTHER												1.000	0.000	

II. GENERAL EVALUATION OF COURSE:

										NR	1	2	3	4	5			MEAN	ST DEV	
4. The overall course workload	Not heavy	0	0	0	5	8	9	Very heavy											4.182	0.795
5. The level of difficulty of the course	Not difficult	0	0	0	2	16	4	Very difficult											4.091	0.526
6. The overall course rating	Poor	0	1	2	9	8	2	Superior											3.364	0.953
7. The course syllabus was comprehensive and clear	Disagree	0	0	1	1	12	8	Strongly agree											4.227	0.752
8. The course syllabus stated the course objectives clearly	Disagree	0	0	1	1	12	8	Strongly agree											4.227	0.752
9. Would you recommend this course to your friends?	Yes	0	2	9	5	4	2	Definitely not											2.773	1.152
										NR	1	2	3	4	5	6			MEAN	ST DEV
10. Compare course with similar courses taken at BU	Higher quality	0	3	15	1	2	0	1	No comparison										2.273	1.120
11. Grade I expect to receive	A (3.6 or above)	0	8	13	1	0	0	0	Pass										1.682	0.568

III. PROFESSOR/INSTRUCTOR EVALUATIONS:

										NR	1	2	3	4	5			MEAN	ST DEV	
12. The instructor's enthusiasm in teaching	Poor	0	0	0	3	6	13	Superior											4.455	0.739
13. The instructor's effectiveness in explaining concepts	Poor	0	0	2	6	10	4	Superior											3.727	0.883
14. The instructor's ability to stimulate interest in subject matter	Poor	0	0	1	13	6	2	Superior											3.409	0.734
15. The instructor's availability to students outside of class	Poor	1	1	1	3	8	8	Superior											4.000	1.095
16. The instructor's fairness in grading	Poor	0	0	1	2	10	9	Superior											4.227	0.813
17. Overall rating of this instructor	Poor	0	0	1	2	16	3	Superior											3.955	0.653

COM CM722 A1 – COM Research
Professor Groshek – Fall 2014

- 1) Comment on the PROFESSOR (S)/INSTRUCTOR (S) regard to ability to communicate ideas, willingness to entertain debate, organization, attitude toward students, accessibility.
 1. He genuinely wants his students to do well and is more than willing to provide extra help. More visual examples (graphs, charts etc) would have been helpful.
 2. Great professor, open to help and all that
 3. Lectures are relatively clear. Willing to answer questions anytime
 4. No comment
 5. Good attitude, seems enthusiastic about research and com studies
 6. A little unorganized with syllabus.
 7. Fine. Presentations too lengthy.
 8. Very intelligent, sometimes speaks in terms that we don't understand
 9. No comment
 10. Jacob can explain academic concepts by using good examples
 11. Dr. Groshek made lectures available to us if we needed to review them further. He communicated his ideas to us clearly with willingness to explain
 12. No comment
 13. Prof. Groshek was very clear and organizes. He was enthusiastic about lectures and very accessible
 14. Didn't always explain concepts clearly, but great professor, very helpful
 15. Prof Groshek was available & willing to meet, which was very helpful
 16. Groshek was a little confusing during lectures. But he would always take all the time necessary to clarify concepts or repeat ideas
 17. Lectures were complicated and confusing. Dr. Groshek seemed to expect more from us than he communicated to us.
 18. Willing to communicate & always give feedbacks
 19. Very passionate on teaching and very knowledgeable.
 20. Prof. Groshek was obviously very passionate and enthusiastic about the subject matter & I appreciate his ability to simplify complex topics. He's also very funny & personable
 21. This course is difficult with heavy workload. Our professor is responsible and helpful but still some of the concept mentioned in the course is unclear to me.
 22. The instructor tends to make a simple concept really complex, and he seem to focus more on his study than being engaged in class and accessible to his students.

- 2) Comment on the COURSE with regard to pace, workload, level of difficulty, educational value, topics covered, and integration of sections.

1. There was a lot of homework for this class. It would have helped me more if we had a full week to complete the weekly assignments instead of turning it in on Mondays.
2. Man, course was boring, prolly(sic) cuz(sic) it was 3 hours long.
3. Workload is relatively heavy. Covered most topics in the field.
4. No comment
5. Good difficulty & workload.
6. Heavy workload with moderate difficulty
7. Heavy work load (too many assignments—difficult to meet with group partners outside of class sometimes)
8. Challenging but managable(sic)
9. No comment
10. Workload is kind of heavy, but it's worthy. We can learn a lot from every task.
11. The course itself was rather difficult to understand but with manageable assignments
12. Light workload; understandable pace, strong educational value
13. The workload was high but I appreciate that it was very helpful for the midterm and the final project. Variety of topics was great.
14. A decent amount of work. Assignments due every week.
15. Sometimes felt like too much was being squeezed into one session. Could get overwhelming at times.
16. Very heavy. The weekly assignments were a lot to keep up with but overall were helpful when doing the final project.
17. The pace was pretty fast, but lectures complicated and hard to follow. It was hard to complete assignments that were the same—complicated. It didn't feel like lectures related to assignments. I took a research course in undergrad and referred more often to those notes.
18. No comment
19. Workload is heavy, some assignments are hard to understand.
20. It was a VERY heavy workload, and at times the work was hard to understand, but I think Prof. G did his best to make it understandable.
21. Very difficult. But interesting. The pace is not reasonable, level of difficulty is not too high but the difficulty of assignment isn't compatible.
22. No comment

3) In your opinion, what were some of the strengths of this course?

1. The instructor's enthusiasm
2. The teacher
3. Contents are practical
4. Good foundation for research techniques
5. I like that we learned how to use SPSS
6. No comment
7. Step by step instructions to SPSS helps

8. Knowledgeable professor, good weekly assignments/ final project
9. No comment
10. No comment
11. The strengths include the weekly assignments to help prepare for final project
12. Taught the ability to understand experimental designs and interpret statistical results.
13. Broad number of topics covered helped to give an overall understanding of comm. research.
14. Learned a lot from the course
15. Prof. Goshek's enthusiasm/willingness to work with students
16. Hands on assignments
17. It was cool to do original research
18. Covers a wide range of topic that are useful in future study.
19. Definitely practices SPSS which can be used in the future
20. I like that each of the assignments builds up to the final project.
21. I think our professor is really knowledgeable
22. No comment

4) In your judgment, in what ways could this course be improved?

1. The instructor assigning groups.
2. Offer not in 3 hour bloc [sic].
3. No comment
4. Cleaner guidelines in the syllabus. Updated dates for finals
5. More guidance/teaching of SPSS. I felt there was a ton we could do with it, but it was easy to get lost with all the data.
6. No comment
7. Different classroom
8. We moved a little too quickly at times
9. No comment
10. No comment
11. Wish we discussed projects more.
12. Organization, organization, organization
13. Some of the last exercises didn't prepare us to evaluate and analyze our own data.
14. No comment
15. The final project work in class was very focused on interpreting other researcher's data; I felt a bit unprepared to analyze data I had collected myself.
16. Less group work. It was very stressful & felt unrealistic.
17. DON'T hold it in 704 comm. Terrible layout.
18. No comment
19. Maybe give more detailed explanations of each concept.
20. I liked the workshop classes better than the lecture classes
21. The way Prof. Groshek presents new concepts should be improved as we're easily lost facing with some terms and vocabulary related in this subject.
22. The syllabus in terms of schedule. I would suggest we do the research project throughout the semester.

5) Provide a brief assessment of the quality of the instructor's presentation of the course content (lectures, readings, projects, guests, tests, etc.)

1. Good presentations. I am a visual learner so even more examples of SPSS analysis would be great
2. Teacher is great, material not so much.
3. No comment
4. No comment
5. No comment
6. No comment
7. Sometimes late in returning assignments. Could add more office hour.
8. Really good. A little boring at times but that's the topic not prof.
9. No comment
10. No comment
11. Dr. Groshek presented this course in a more professional manner than other courses IVE taken.
12. Course content comparative to lower level courses the course seemed to easy and less informative
13. Lectures were very clear, organized and informatives[sic]. Projects allowed for practical learning which helped a lot.
14. No comment
15. Lectures were clear, tests were straight forward; assignments were clear. Would have liked a little more preparation for final project data gathering/analysis.
16. A little mundane, but it's not his fault, researching isn't all that interesting to begin with.
17. Homework didn't seem to reflect the course content well, then we were graded harshly. We were often lost with the final project.
18. No comment
19. Readings is not very useful
20. I think the readings were a little dull and we could have had more engaging articles to read. Also, the lectures were dry sometimes. The tests were reasonable.
21. All good
22. No comment

REPORT GENERATED ON 1/16/115

COM-14F CM321 E1 Mass Comm Rsrch
PROFESSOR Groshek

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 24
NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 25
PERCENT OF ENROLLED STUDENTS RESPONDING: 96.00

STATISTICS REFLECT FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
1. My class year is:	Freshman	0	0	0	6	18	0 Graduate	3.750	0.442
2. My college/school is:	CAS	0	0	23	0	0	0 0 0 0 1 SEA	2.292	1.429
3. Primary reason for enrolling in course:	NR	1	2	3	4			MEAN	ST DEV
	MAJOR/MINOR REQUIREMENT	0	24	0	0	0	OTHER	1.000	0.000

II. GENERAL EVALUATION OF COURSE:

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
4. The overall course workload	Not heavy	0	0	0	9	12	3 Very heavy	3.750	0.676
5. The level of difficulty of the course	Not difficult	0	0	0	9	12	3 Very difficult	3.750	0.676
6. The overall course rating	Poor	1	1	5	7	9	1 Superior	3.174	0.984
7. The course syllabus was comprehensive and clear	Disagree	0	1	0	4	9	10 Strongly agree	4.125	0.992
8. The course syllabus stated the course objectives clearly	Disagree	0	0	2	1	10	11 Strongly agree	4.250	0.897
9. Would you recommend this course to your friends?	Yes	0	0	6	7	9	2 Definitely not	3.292	0.955
10. Compare course with similar courses taken at BU	NR	1	2	3	4	5	6	MEAN	ST DEV
	Higher quality	1	2	13	4	2	1 1 No comparison	2.565	1.199
11. Grade I expect to receive	A (3.6 or above)	0	8	15	1	0	0 0 Pass	1.708	0.550

III. PROFESSOR/INSTRUCTOR EVALUATIONS:

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
12. The instructor's enthusiasm in teaching	Poor	0	0	0	2	6	16 Superior	4.583	0.654
13. The instructor's effectiveness in explaining concepts	Poor	0	1	1	4	12	6 Superior	3.875	0.992
14. The instructor's ability to stimulate interest in subject matter	Poor	0	1	3	10	6	4 Superior	3.375	1.056
15. The instructor's availability to students outside of class	Poor	1	1	0	1	9	12 Superior	4.348	0.935
16. The instructor's fairness in grading	Poor	0	0	1	3	11	9 Superior	4.167	0.816
17. Overall rating of this instructor	Poor	0	1	1	5	11	6 Superior	3.833	1.007

COM CM321 – Mass Comm Research
Professor Groshek – Fall 2014

- 1) Comment on the PROFESSOR (S)/INSTRUCTOR (S) regard to ability to communicate ideas, willingness to entertain debate, organization, attitude toward students, accessibility.
 - 1) Great professor. Very helpful. Both individually, in a group, or in class
 - 2) Confusing sometimes
 - 3) Very enthusiastic, but unclear about some concepts
 - 4) Didn't explain concepts very well
 - 5) No comment
 - 6) Was always helpful with questions
 - 7) Very positive and friendly. Encourage questions. Explained concepts clearly
 - 8) Explains concepts clearly and effectively
 - 9) No comment
 - 10) He was very helpful whenever I had any questions. Always willing to help step by step when asked
 - 11) Good -> always helpful
 - 12) The materials is dense and boring. He works with what he has.
 - 13) Knows a lot about the material but fails to teach it in an interesting way. Most students in the class weren't passionate about topic to begin with and I wish the prof. shared better why the course matters
 - 14) Very accessible via email. Sometimes hard to follow, changes his wording around so not the best at communicating ideas.
 - 15) He spoke to us like we were dense but moved quickly through explaining concepts like we wouldn't understand
 - 16) Always tried to stimulate class discussion
 - 17) Clear slideshows and interesting research study examples to go along with the material
 - 18) Prof Groshek was able to illustrate concepts in a way that minimized my questions
 - 19) Extremely knowledgeable and experienced in the field. Provided great examples and was timely/organized with the curriculum. Also very enthusiastic.
 - 20) Professor is very enthusiastic about subject
 - 21) Groshek was very good about connecting concepts and covering everything. Sometimes should have been concentrating on more and given more background knowledge.
 - 22) Attitude towards students was always good. Communicated ideas very well. Liked discussion/debate.
 - 23) The course was good but the end seemed rush
 - 24) We covered a lot of material but when it came to SPSS, it was more lecture style which didn't allow us to understanding the meaning or explanation of exercises.

- 2) Comment on the COURSE with regard to pace, workload, level of difficulty, educational value, topics covered, and integration of sections.

- 1) Too many assignments. Some were just pointless
 - 2) A lot of group work.
 - 3) Good, not too fast but some topics aren't applicable in life
 - 4) Very fast-paced at times hard to keep up with
 - 5) Educational value – 5. Workload pace good. Pace – 5. Topics covered – 5.
 - 6) Was harder than other courses. Final project took a lot of time and work
 - 7) Weekly group assignments were difficult to collaborate with
 - 8) The material in this course is boring but Groshek did a good job teaching it
 - 9) No comment
 - 10) SPSS was very hard. Maybe he could've spent more time explaining step by step
 - 11) Hard concepts, but pace was good
 - 12) I don't see why this is a requirement. It should be an elective for those who want to pursue research
 - 13) Assignments due every week at the same time, organized
 - 14) A lot of group work
 - 15) The workload was crazy given the ambiguity with which concepts were explained and assignments were given. I have no idea what I learned this semester.
 - 16) Relatively consistent workload. Topics were not interesting.
 - 17) Pretty steady pace. 1 Assignment/ week isn't much but it was hard to get work done on final project because SPSS is only in lab and library
 - 18) The pace of the course was a bit fast. I think that biweekly assignments rather than weeklies would be helpful
 - 19) The workload and pace was good/reasonable. Not too difficult, but I got the basics/foundation of com research
 - 20) No comment
 - 21) The pace and workload were all appropriate to the amount of material that we were supposed to cover
 - 22) Pace was manageable and workload was fair. Was not overly difficult
 - 23) The course pace was good but the end seemed rushed
 - 24) The pace was good but not too quick. A lot of group work, something due in a group every week was hard because my group all had conflicting schedules
- 3) In your opinion, what were some of the strengths of this course?
- 1) The professor's knowledge about material and group work
 - 2) Prof very enthusiastic
 - 3) Learning SPSS software. Groups
 - 4) Useful information (some)
 - 5) Good, informative, helpful for COM majors
 - 6) Slide shows
 - 7) Organization
 - 8) Gives experience working in groups. Now understand how to read data.
 - 9) Large amount of assignments
 - 10) Less group projects/assignments
 - 11) Flexible final project

- 12) Weekly assignments
 - 13) Nothing
 - 14) No comment
 - 15) Learning how to properly research
 - 16) There were none. Other than, making me feel stupid every class
 - 17) Really learned a lot and got a good overview of com research
 - 18) Lets students conduct research on what they're interested in. learned a lot.
 - 19) The consistency of concepts from one assignment to the next and cumulative approach to mastering the material
 - 20) The material we covered in class was directly related to assignments and exams (no surprises)
 - 21) No comment
 - 22) No comment
 - 23) Providing "workshop" classes. This let us ask any question to the professor that we had.
 - 24) Professor was personable and enthusiastic. Had to be organized and efficient at working/learning in groups.
- 4) In your judgment, in what ways could this course be improved?
- 1) More help choosing final project topics and choosing them earlier and having option to re-pick groups
 - 2) Less group work
 - 3) No comment
 - 4) Explain things better
 - 5) No comment
 - 6) Spend more time on coding
 - 7) No weekly group assignments. instead more final project time
 - 8) More interesting studies to learn from
 - 9) No comment
 - 10) Less group projects/assignments
 - 11) More explanation of topics
 - 12) Eliminating it
 - 13) Ways this course matters in the real world should have been better communicated
 - 14) Less group assignments; more quizzes/exams
 - 15) Different instructor, more concentrated curriculum
 - 16) Better understanding of how concepts relate to outside world
 - 17) More help with SPSS – we did exercises together in class so I felt a bit lost when using it alone for final project
 - 18) I think the pace and work is bad on some weeks
 - 19) We did a lot of group work – maybe too much? I had a bad partner so I ended up doing most of it
 - 20) No comment
 - 21) Some type of refresher in statistics would have been nice to more thoroughly understand concepts
 - 22) Less reading
 - 23) Less group work

- 24) Should be more upfront about the large amount of group work, and maybe giving a guide for the exams farther in advance.
- 5) Provide a brief assessment of the quality of the instructor's presentation of the course content (lectures, readings, projects, guests, tests, etc.)
1. Good lectures and liked that lectures were all online
 2. Very good
 3. Enthusiastic but goes off topic a lot. Had to end up teaching myself lots of concepts
 4. He is knowledgeable but did not explain things in a way that was easy for students to understand
 5. No comment
 6. Was good, just didn't like the content not interested in research
 7. Very enthusiastic!
 8. Did his best to make it interesting, he was always excited and engaged. It's the course that's hard to like, definitely not him. The course just didn't pertain to my major
 9. Informative but could be more engaging
 10. No comment
 11. Good -> always had powerpoints for class
 12. Clear but super boring
 13. Good mix of lectures, exercises, and group projects
 14. Readings should have been better – book needs to be updated
 15. He did a terrible job. This class/semester with him was miserable
 16. Lectures were well organized
 17. Relevant readings, projects, assignments, etc
 18. Professor presented the content very well
 19. Clear, enthusiastic, helpful, and understanding
 20. No comment
 21. Some powerpoints were hard to follow but besides that, presentation and class discussion was good
 22. Great!
 23. Lectures were in-depth and relevant
 24. Lecture slides being available online was really helpful and professor showed interest in the topic.

Course Evaluations

Session: Summer 2, 2014
Instructor: Christopher Groshek
Course: COM CM321-B1 Mass Communication Research

STATISTICS REFLECT FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES

Number of students enrolled: 20
 Number of students responding: 20
 Percent of enrolled students responding: 100

SECTION A: COURSE EVALUATION:	NR	Poor			Superior			Mean	StDev
		1	2	3	4	5			
1 The extent to which you found the class intellectually challenging	0	1	1	5	10	3	3.650	0.988	
2 The extent that assignments furthered your understanding of course content	0	0	3	10	4	3	3.350	0.933	
3 The extent that the class normally met the required number of hours	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.450	0.605	
4 I found the textbook/cases/course materials	0	1	6	5	5	3	3.150	1.182	
5 The extent to which I would recommend this course to others	0	2	3	12	3	0	2.800	0.834	
6 I would rate the course overall as	0	2	2	9	7	0	3.050	0.945	

SECTION B: INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION:	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	StDev
7 The instructor's ability to present material is	0	1	1	9	8	1	3.350	0.875
8 I would rate the instructor's enthusiasm as	0	1	0	4	7	8	4.050	1.050
9 The instructor's ability to encourage questions/discussion is	0	1	2	6	9	2	3.450	0.999
10 The instructor's mastery of the course materials is	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.350	0.671
11 The extent to which the instructor's grading criteria are clear and fair	0	1	3	5	7	4	3.500	1.147
12 The extent to which the instructor returned assignments in a timely manner	0	1	0	1	9	9	4.250	0.967
13 The instructor's overall rating is	0	1	1	7	9	2	3.500	0.946

SECTION C: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	StDev
14 How would you rate your Boston University Summer Term experience, overall?	0	0	1	9	9	1	3.500	0.688

	NR	Yes	No	Mean	StDev
15 Are you a Boston University student?	0	18	2	1.100	0.308
16 Are you an international student?	0	3	17	1.850	0.366

	NR	C or less	A- or A	Mean	StDev
17 What grade do you expect to receive in the course?	1	1	4	3.000	0.882

Course Evaluations

Session: Summer 2, 2014
Instructor: Christopher Groshek
Course: COM CM321-B1 Mass Communication Research

STATISTICS REFLECT PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES

Number of students enrolled: 20
 Number of students responding: 20
 Percent of enrolled students responding: 100

SECTION A: COURSE EVALUATION:	NR	Poor			Superior			Mean	StDev
		1	2	3	4	5			
1 The extent to which you found the class intellectually challenging	0	5	5	25	50	15	3.650	0.988	
2 The extent that assignments furthered your understanding of course content	0	0	15	50	20	15	3.350	0.933	
3 The extent that the class normally met the required number of hours	0	0	0	5	45	50	4.450	0.605	
4 I found the textbook/cases/course materials	0	5	30	25	25	15	3.150	1.182	
5 The extent to which I would recommend this course to others	0	10	15	60	15	0	2.800	0.834	
6 I would rate the course overall as	0	10	10	45	35	0	3.050	0.945	

SECTION B: INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION:	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	StDev
7 The instructor's ability to present material is	0	5	5	45	40	5	3.350	0.875
8 I would rate the instructor's enthusiasm as	0	5	0	20	35	40	4.050	1.050
9 The instructor's ability to encourage questions/discussion is	0	5	10	30	45	10	3.450	0.999
10 The instructor's mastery of the course materials is	0	0	0	10	45	45	4.350	0.671
11 The extent to which the instructor's grading criteria are clear and fair	0	5	15	25	35	20	3.500	1.147
12 The extent to which the instructor returned assignments in a timely manner	0	5	0	5	45	45	4.250	0.967
13 The instructor's overall rating is	0	5	5	35	45	10	3.500	0.946

SECTION C: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	StDev
14 How would you rate your Boston University Summer Term experience, overall?	0	0	5	45	45	5	3.500	0.688

	NR	Yes	No	Mean	StDev
15 Are you a Boston University student?	0	90	10	1.100	0.308
16 Are you an international student?	0	15	85	1.850	0.366

	NR	C or less	A- or A	Mean	StDev		
17 What grade do you expect to receive in the course?	5	5	20	40	30	3.000	0.882

Course Evaluations

Session: Summer 2, 2014
Instructor: Christopher Groshek
Course: COM CM321-B1 Mass Communication Research

Student Comments:

About the Instructor:

Good presentations and good enthusiasm. Only professor I've had that understands the importance of breaks. Improve: He should be more clear when explaining assignments, and understand that the summer is short.

Very enthusiastic. Very knowledgeable. Improve: Explain better what specifically we are supposed to do. Better timeline.

Very enthusiastic about material. Good Powerpoints. Easy to talk to. Improve: Went too fast sometimes. Didn't follow the syllabus. Wasn't clear on grading.

This professor is very nice, he is very patient to respond to any questions at anytime.

Knew material well. Great with answering questions.

Very enthusiastic, demos were helpful.

Improve: I need all the spaces for negatives. 1) He assigned books without reading them. (Going Viral.) 2) The syllabus is all messed up. (10 assignments? We got six.) 3) We asked when our projects were due and he couldn't give us a straight answer. 4) We wasted so much time doing statistics on a computer without learning the math or what the tests were. I'd rather just have a magic math wand, because if I'm not going to learn, I'd at least like to be cool.

Knows the material inside out. Improve: Demonstrates assignments and exercises in class, but too fast sometimes.

Great guy. Very fair. Improve: Very effective on every topic. Well prepared.

He's really enthusiastic about the class, but the environment is bad. We're in a basement with blocked view of the board, sound doesn't travel well, and it's early in the morning. Improve: Project louder and slow down. Also revise the syllabus for the Summer Term.

Improve: Did not schedule class work well.

He knows what he's talking about and has a lot of experience. Improve: The Powerpoints were overloaded with text so it made paying attention for three and a half hours hard. We did not follow the syllabus assignments, and the entire class seemed unorganized. He was nice, but could be more clear when answering questions.

Blackboard site is helpful. Improve: Organization, scheduling, following the syllabus, exam preparation.

He definitely knows the material. Improve: The material, however, is pretty dry, and he's sometimes unclear about what is and is not important.

He had a great understanding of the material he was teaching. Improve: Elaborated too much on simple concepts and didn't touch on other more complex ones. It was hard to tell what the overarching concepts were—this made studying for the final exam difficult.

He knows the material very well, has done communications research himself, and is enthusiastic about explaining it. Improve: Don't expect so much in terms of quick comprehension because the material is quite confusing at times.

Course Evaluations

Session: Summer 2, 2014
Instructor: Christopher Groshek
Course: COM CM321-B1 Mass Communication Research

I can tell that he's studied this material in school and knows it very well so that we can learn from his knowledge. He also tries to make the course relatable, such as how we are currently studying the use of online videos. Improve: It's difficult to generate a lively discussion in a computer lab where half of the class isn't even looking straight on. I'm not sure of how to improve this.

About the Course:

Strong: Improves research skills.

Lectures are thorough. Improve: Clearer instructions on assignments.

Strong: Learned things that I will use in the future. Improve: Took too much time on assignments. Did not follow syllabus. Dry material.

Strong: Some real tools for comm work. Improve: Too much content in less time, the work is too heavy.

Relevant course to society.

Strong: Assignments helped frame. Improve: Tried to do too much in a Summer Term, sometimes felt rushed and that course organization could've been better.

The strong point? The class confirmed my suspicions that communications is not a real, serious field of study. So there's that. 5) He never seemed interested in our projects or answering questions. 6) You can't even see in the "classroom" because of all the pillars.

Strong: Teaches the basics about statistics and communications research.

Strong: Everything on Blackboard. Improve: A little slower pace.

Improve: Don't teach it during the summer. Too much info for six weeks.

We learned how to use SPSS. Improve: I think the course should be more focused on the final project. The assignments in between were too extensive and took up too much time so by the end we're too behind to finish the project on time. He made an extended deadline, but that's not fair for those of us who are leaving August 9.

Improve: Material is dull—make it more interesting/involved.

Improve: Clearer idea/rubric of what needs to be done on assignments.

Strong: Learned a lot and found in-class exercises helpful. Improve: Timeline of the course was unclear and constantly changing. His grading criteria was unclear and it felt impossible to get a higher grade. Wish there had been more attention paid to the final project or the guidelines were clear before a week before the due date.

Strong: Great availability of resources on Blackboard. Improve: Too much content attempting to be fit in small amount of time—especially Summer Term.

Strong: It really sticks with the course description and truly teaches you the ways of mass communication research...Improve:...it's just too bad that the material isn't all that interesting.

REPORT GENERATED ON 6/11/14

COM-14S CM561 A1 Special Topics
PROFESSOR Groshek

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 2
NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 2
PERCENT OF ENROLLED STUDENTS RESPONDING: 100.00

STATISTICS REFLECT FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

-----											MEAN	ST DEV		
1. My class year is:	Freshman	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Graduate			4.500	0.707		
2. My college/school is:	CAS	NR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	SEA	2.000	0.000
3. Primary reason for enrolling in course:	MAJOR/MINOR REQUIREMENT	NR	1	2	3	4	OTHER					1.500	0.707	

II. GENERAL EVALUATION OF COURSE:

-----											MEAN	ST DEV	
4. The overall course workload	Not heavy	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Very heavy			2.500	0.707	
5. The level of difficulty of the course	Not difficult	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Very difficult			3.500	0.707	
6. The overall course rating	Poor	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Superior			2.500	0.707	
7. The course syllabus was comprehensive and clear	Disagree	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly agree			3.000	0.000	
8. The course syllabus stated the course objectives clearly	Disagree	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly agree			4.000	0.000	
9. Would you recommend this course to your friends?	Yes	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Definitely not			3.000	0.000	
10. Compare course with similar courses taken at BU	Higher quality	NR	1	2	3	4	5	6	No comparison			2.000	-1.000
11. Grade I expect to receive	A (3.6 or above)	NR	1	2	3	4	5	6	Pass			1.000	0.000

III. PROFESSOR/INSTRUCTOR EVALUATIONS:

-----											MEAN	ST DEV
12. The instructor's enthusiasm in teaching	Poor	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Superior			4.500	0.707
13. The instructor's effectiveness in explaining concepts	Poor	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Superior			3.000	1.414
14. The instructor's ability to stimulate interest in subject matter	Poor	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Superior			3.500	0.707
15. The instructor's availability to students outside of class	Poor	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Superior			4.500	0.707
16. The instructor's fairness in grading	Poor	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Superior			4.500	0.707
17. Overall rating of this instructor	Poor	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Superior			3.500	0.707

COM CM 561 A1 – Special Topics
Professor Groshek – Spring 2014

- 1) Comment on the PROFESSOR (S)/INSTRUCTOR (S) regard to ability to communicate ideas, willingness to entertain debate, organization, attitude toward students, accessibility.
 1. Prof. Groshek is clearly well-versed in the subject and very familiar with relevant software and research. Lots of software issues but readings were really helpful.
 2. Professor was helpful & enthusiastic.

- 2) Comment on the COURSE with regard to pace, workload, level of difficulty, educational value, topics covered, and integration of sections.
 1. It was a brand new course so needs to be tweaked a lot but Groshek was very open to constructive ideas to incorporate into next semester.

- 3) In your opinion, what were some of the strengths of this course?
 1. The information about what tools are being developed to mine social media data are really useful. The concepts behind the need and use of the data apply to business, politics, etc.
 2. Learning new ways to see data.

- 4) In your judgment, in what ways could this course be improved?
 1. Resolving software issues and more emphasis on understanding concepts v. technical skills.
 2. More instruction, structure and clear goals.

- 5) Provide a brief assessment of the quality of the instructor's presentation of the course content (lectures, readings, projects, guests, tests, etc.)
 1. He is very knowledgeable but I wish we had spent more time discussing the readings/other research and less time troubleshooting software
 2. Well prepared for all. Great guy just not the easiest class.

REPORT GENERATED ON 6/11/14

COM-14S CM321 B1 Mass Comm Rsrch
PROFESSOR Groshek

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 20
NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 24
PERCENT OF ENROLLED STUDENTS RESPONDING: 83.33

STATISTICS REFLECT FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

-----											MEAN	ST DEV		
1. My class year is:	Freshman	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Graduate			3.300	0.470		
			0	0	0	14	6	0						
2. My college/school is:	CAS	NR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	SEA	MEAN	ST DEV
			0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0		2.000	0.000
3. Primary reason for enrolling in course:	MAJOR/MINOR REQUIREMENT	NR	1	2	3	4	OTHER					MEAN	ST DEV	
			1	19	0	0	0						1.000	0.000

II. GENERAL EVALUATION OF COURSE:

-----											MEAN	ST DEV		
4. The overall course workload	Not heavy	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Very heavy			3.550	0.605		
			0	0	0	10	9	1						
5. The level of difficulty of the course	Not difficult	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Very difficult			3.900	0.553		
			0	0	0	4	14	2						
6. The overall course rating	Poor	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Superior			2.800	1.056		
			0	2	6	7	4	1						
7. The course syllabus was comprehensive and clear	Disagree	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly agree			3.579	1.017		
			1	1	1	6	8	3						
8. The course syllabus stated the course objectives clearly	Disagree	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly agree			3.500	1.100		
			0	1	2	7	6	4						
9. Would you recommend this course to your friends?	Yes	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Definitely not			3.400	1.046		
			0	0	4	8	4	4						
10. Compare course with similar courses taken at BU	Higher quality	NR	1	2	3	4	5	6	No comparison			MEAN	ST DEV	
			0	1	9	4	4	2	0				2.850	1.137
11. Grade I expect to receive	A (3.6 or above)	NR	1	2	3	4	5	6	Pass			MEAN	ST DEV	
			1	3	16	0	0	0	0				1.842	0.375

III. PROFESSOR/INSTRUCTOR EVALUATIONS:

-----											MEAN	ST DEV	
12. The instructor's enthusiasm in teaching	Poor	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Superior			3.950	1.050	
			0	1	0	5	7	7					
13. The instructor's effectiveness in explaining concepts	Poor	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Superior			3.250	1.209	
			0	2	3	6	6	3					
14. The instructor's ability to stimulate interest in subject matter	Poor	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Superior			2.850	1.226	
			0	3	5	6	4	2					
15. The instructor's availability to students outside of class	Poor	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Superior			3.800	1.056	
			0	1	0	7	6	6					
16. The instructor's fairness in grading	Poor	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Superior			3.500	0.827	
			0	0	3	5	11	1					
17. Overall rating of this instructor	Poor	NR	1	2	3	4	5	Superior			3.350	1.137	
			0	2	1	8	6	3					

COM CM321 B1 – Mass Communication Research
Professor Groshek – Spring 2014

- 1) Comment on the PROFESSOR (S)/INSTRUCTOR (S) regard to ability to communicate ideas, willingness to entertain debate, organization, attitude toward students, accessibility.
 1. He's great – It's an 8 am class so it's hard to expect students to participate in zombie mode. He gave an A+ effort
 2. BORING, RAMBLING, CANT MAKE A POINT, DOESN'T EXPLAIN TOPICS CLEARLY, gives unhelpful feedback.
 3. Overall good attitude, and tries to make material as interesting for students as possible.
 4. The professor presented the material in a clear and concise manner.
 5. The instructor is really smart & passionate about the subject & available to students unfortunately for him, I think this is a class that many students aren't interested in.
 6. He was messy in the presentation of his lectures
 7. The professor is passionate but the syllabus was rarely followed.
 8. Instructor effort was there, but explaining concepts through lectures was difficult to grasp because there is so much content in so little time.
 9. Considering how complex the subject matter was, Groshek explained ideas thoroughly and was always open to questions.
 10. Very long powerpoints
 11. No comment
 12. He was very excited about the coursework and the class even though its 8 AM
 13. Available outside of class and is able to communicate ideas effectively. However I felt lost on assignments because we were not taught how to do them ntil after they were due.
 14. Ideas were confusing, would go off on tangents.
 15. There was no organization to this course. I never knew when assignments or readings were due. The syllabus did not make sense.
 16. The professor was very nice and willing to help when asked. His enthusiasm was appreciated. But the way the lectures were organized and the way the class was run I felt that he did a poor job of explaining several concepts.
 17. Professor has incredible knowledge of the subject and enthusiasm, but it is a tough subject to get students interested in.
 18. Very nice prof. Encouraging
 19. TANGENTS!
 20. Sometimes long powerpoints. Always there to help students.
- 2) Comment on the COURSE with regard to pace, workload, level of difficulty, educational value, topics covered, and integration of sections.
 1. It's fine, I was never stressed. Learned some cool shit.

2. Zero educational value. Not hard, but made difficult by a bad professor. Useless class.
3. Workload was fair, sometimes the material is difficult to understand
4. The courseload was steady and average.
5. Did not think this course would benefit me in career pursuits – I understand it is important to know research but did not think it had helped me personally.
6. It was okay workwise
7. The first half felt very slow and boring. Once we started with SPSS it got more interesting
8. I don't necessarily need this course, and because I have never seen the program we used, it was very difficult for me
9. Pace felt a little rushed at the end but overall the workload and assignments were manageable throughout the semester.
10. Not bad
11. No comment
12. COM average
13. The course was educational but I found it difficult.
14. Pace is too quick
15. The topics covered were difficult to understand and the Professor did not explain well.
16. The exercises and the activities were frustrating and confusing. The wording on assignments was also confusing. The group work was terrible and the finals should have been an independent project.
17. The workload was heavy but there was a decent amount of in-class work time.
18. I think the class would be better if it solely focused on SPSS because that is a skill we can put on our resumes
19. Pace was good & instructor always helped when things were unclear
20. Average workload. Lots of in class time to work w/ group was helpful

3) In your opinion, what were some of the strengths of this course?

1. SPSS program.
2. NONE. This was a waste of time.
3. Strength in creating research and stimulating interest.
4. The course's materials were clear. The midterm particularly followed the course's material.
5. Learned how to create successful hypotheses & surveys.
6. We learned how to use SPSS
7. Learning SPSS was very useful.
8. Good teacher, team exercises in class helped re-inforce(sic) how to do things through practice
9. Groshek explained the significance of each test well and answered all questions we had.
10. SPSS was cool
11. No comment
12. The teacher

13. No comment
14. No comment
15. No comment
16. Enthusiastic professor
17. The Professor's set schedule of classtime and fair grading
18. SPSS + analyzing data
19. Guest speaker was VERY helpful; in understanding concepts.\
20. Actually get to conduct research.

4) In your judgment, in what ways could this course be improved?

1. Not 8am dude, its research. NOT exactly a "light" class to be learning at 8am
2. Stop making this required.
3. Just more time evenly distributed among group time/feedback from professor.
4. This course could be improved by engaging students in a more interesting way.
5. NO use of SPSS! Many of the functions can be done in Excel.
6. If it was more organized into clear and understandable sections. Maybe finding some way to be more engaged
7. More actual learning of SPSS rather than just following what is being done by the professor
8. Less material in terms of learning, more concentration on broader topics. Too much information in just a 1.5 hour class. Everything felt rushed
9. I think the assignments/exercises could've been more organized (i.e. exercises being consistently letters or numbers throughout) and that due dates could've been more concrete.
10. Shorter powerpoints
11. No comment
12. A better grading scale, more specific
13. It could be more interesting if we actually went out and conducted field work in the real world as a class. Also I think lectures should be taught before assignments so that we know how to do them and actually do well!
14. Make it more entertaining
15. Group project. My group did not do their part and it was difficult to work
16. The class content often requires individual instruction and there is often not enough time for that.
17. Less subject matter and another exam
18. More SPSS!
19. No comment
20. No comment

5) Provide a brief assessment of the quality of the instructor's presentation of the course content (lectures, readings, projects, guests, tests, etc.)

1. Solid. PPT were clear and concise. Always online after. Made studying easier.
2. Boring, unclear lectures. Lots of small assignment with unclear instructions.
3. Great!
4. The professor gave an average presentation.

5. He tried to engage students & was very fair.
6. Good. He loved this stuff, nobody else did though.
7. No comment
8. Material professor taught correlated but he needs to not rush on certain slides. Hard to grasp info b/c it is all new.
9. Groshek clearly has a strong passion and knowledge of research which clearly showed throughout the whole semester. Thanks! ☺
10. Not bad
11. No comment
12. Grading is off, but overall good
13. No comment
14. Was confusing
15. Lectures made no sense. The Professor would go off on a tangent and would not make sense.
16. While he made a great effort, the content was never made interesting
17. Content was interesting because it was his own tested work – impressive!
18. Good job Groshek, made a difficult and seemingly monotonous subject interesting.
19. Presentations were straight forward but you went on MANY unnecessary tangents
20. Sometimes long, but exercises helpful

REPORT GENERATED ON 2/2/114

COM-13F CM321 C1 Mass Comm Rsrch
PROFESSOR Groshek

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 23
NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 25
PERCENT OF ENROLLED STUDENTS RESPONDING: 92.00

STATISTICS REFLECT FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV				
1. My class year is:	Freshman	0	0	0	5	18	0	Graduate	3.783	0.422			
2. My college/school is:	CAS	3	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	SHA	2.000	0.000
3. Primary reason for enrolling in course:	MAJOR/MINOR REQUIREMENT	0	22	0	1	0		OTHER	1.087	0.417			

II. GENERAL EVALUATION OF COURSE:

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV		
4. The overall course workload	Not heavy	0	0	1	8	12	2	Very heavy	3.652	0.714	
5. The level of difficulty of the course	Not difficult	0	0	0	5	15	3	Very difficult	3.913	0.596	
6. The overall course rating	Poor	0	6	9	3	5	0	Superior	2.304	1.105	
7. The course syllabus was comprehensive and clear	Disagree	0	4	4	3	6	6	Strongly agree	3.261	1.484	
8. The course syllabus stated the course objectives clearly	Disagree	1	2	2	7	6	5	Strongly agree	3.455	1.224	
9. Would you recommend this course to your friends?	Yes	0	0	6	1	3	13	Definitely not	4.000	1.314	
10. Compare course with similar courses taken at BU	Higher quality	1	2	4	6	4	6	0	No comparison	3.364	1.329
11. Grade I expect to receive	A (3.6 or above)	0	5	17	1	0	0	0	Pass	1.826	0.491

III. PROFESSOR/INSTRUCTOR EVALUATIONS:

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV	
12. The instructor's enthusiasm in teaching	Poor	0	3	4	5	8	3	Superior	3.174	1.267
13. The instructor's effectiveness in explaining concepts	Poor	0	8	3	7	5	0	Superior	2.391	1.196
14. The instructor's ability to stimulate interest in subject matter	Poor	0	10	7	3	3	0	Superior	1.957	1.065
15. The instructor's availability to students outside of class	Poor	0	1	6	7	7	2	Superior	3.130	1.058
16. The instructor's fairness in grading	Poor	1	2	6	3	7	4	Superior	3.227	1.307
17. Overall rating of this instructor	Poor	0	4	6	7	5	1	Superior	2.696	1.146

COM C321 C1 – Mass Communication Research
Professor Groshek – Fall 2013

- 1) Comment on the PROFESSOR (S)/INSTRUCTOR (S) regard to ability to communicate ideas, willingness to entertain debate, organization, attitude toward students, accessibility.
 1. NO COMMENT
 2. Prof. Groshek's lessons were hard to follow and understand. He was generally helpful in class but I spent a lot of time unsure about material/trying to teach myself.
 3. At times it a little difficult to understand the ideas and messages he's trying to communicate, but is willing to help.
 4. Far too ambitious of a class taken as a requirement for non-math oriented students. Comes off as a bit arrogant and response rarely to student feedback with understanding.
 5. Very organized able to communicate ideas, very accessible, high knowledge of topics
 6. Willing to give feedback on all work.
 7. Had to learn a lot from book/group to understand what was taught in class
 8. Powerpoints are too long & wordy, not stimulating, very little opportunity for student participation not engaging
 9. Honestly one of the least effective professor's I've had at BU. Extremely vague, ambiguous, refuses to tell us what he wants then docks points when he doesn't see exactly what he is looking for.
 10. Professor Groshek did a really great job making fairly boring material hold my interest. Plus it was 8am, plus the room was always stifling hot, and he still held my attention
 11. NO COMMENT
 12. Explanations would be more effective if professor didn't use pronouns so much like "this here.." "this one is different from this other one."
 13. Prof. was not very organized – we ended up cramming assignments in. He was pretty accessible outside of class. He wasn't very good at explaining concepts in a language "non-stats" people could understand.
 14. Prof Groshek is a very knowledgeable(sic) professor. However, he doesn't know how to engage with students sometimes.
 15. Great w/ emails; not a bad lecturer but doesn't really explain things as much as he seems excited to show that he knows them.
 16. Cannot communicate ideas, over complicates topics, talks a lot
 17. Prof. Groshek is a nice man but lacks ability to explain even the easiest if concepts. It was so frustrating to have to teach myself basically everything after class hours because of his obscure and confusing lectures.
 18. Professor Groshek has been one of the worst professors I have had during my time at BU.
 19. Was a nice/knowledgeable(sic) person, just not very good at explaining things.
 20. Groshek has an attitude and doesn't grade fairly. He assumes we know things that he hasn't taught.
 21. Lectures were difficult to follow, but most likely due to 8am time slot. Decks were very informative though and projects helped us learn material.
 22. Very lecture-y class. Participation was not built into the framework of class time, but prof. simple posed questions idiosyncratically. Prof. was accessible and organized as well as fairly friendly toward students.

23. Very nice professor. Way of teaching is a bit confusing. PPT slides are good for review, but during class it's too much information. I would rather the professor concise the concepts in a few lines on the slides, expand by talking & explaining graphs & tables (also include them in slides)
- 2) Comment on the COURSE with regard to pace, workload, level of difficulty, educational value, topics covered, and integration of sections.
1. This course was pretty good, I feel like I learned quite a bit
 2. The topics of this class should not be difficult but some concepts were explained ineffectively. The pace and workload were fair.
 3. The course overall was standard requirement course, but was made better by the way Groshek ran it.
 4. Original pace and workload were insane. Educational value for a Com major was nil. Has nothing to do with anything I study. Terrible foundation requirement.
 5. Pace – too quick, workload – heavy, level of difficulty – moderate, low education value, few topics covered
 6. Early in the semester I often felt that we got points deducted for things we didn't learn. Too much focus on weekly assignments, not enough on the final.
 7. Prof had to reevaluate expectations midway through semester
 8. Syllabus was far too ambitious, moved through concepts too quickly, little value of topics to most students
 9. A waste of a course for non-graduate students. This course will in no way prepare me for my future career. And PS325 teaches the same thing, but only more effectively.
 10. Very fair course load, well spaced out and I learned a lot.
 11. I thought the workload was perfect with plenty of time to complete the weekly assignments and they each directly related to what we were doing with our final project.
 12. Assignment every week keeps us on our toes/useful for final project. Don't see the necessity in taking this course as a COM requirement.
 13. I worked very hard for my grade. The concepts were confusing & I will never use the info. I learned later in life.
 14. The workload is alright but SPSS is quite difficult topic covered in the class I don't think it's that useful in real life.
 15. The info covered in the course was far more in depth & difficult than necessary for a required intro course
 16. SPSS was expected to be known but teaching for this seemed scattered and ineffective
 17. NO COMMENT
 18. This course is muddled & is too focused on teaching math rather than teaching how to conduct research.
 19. Workload was heavy, but manageable once he adjusted the syllabus. However I don't think 90% of the students should have had to take it.
 20. There were a lot of group assignments which is usually fine but they were very confusing.
 21. Weekly assignments kept me engaged throughout the semester and it was the first class where math and data were used practically.

22. It seemed that the prof. expected more prior experience with statistics and research terminology than students felt they should know. The language was a little too robust and overcomplicated simple lessons.
23. Course has a lot of information & concepts to remember. I'm not good with statistics but it's helpful to know. However, I haven't felt it was very applicable to real-life yet. Maybe because examples aren't very relevant to how data would be used in campaigns.

3) In your opinion, what were some of the strengths of this course?

1. Learned a lot. The skills and info are relevant and applicable to real world.
2. Professor Groshek was a fair grader and posted many resources on blackboard.
3. I loved working in groups I thought it was beneficial and productive to learning key skills for the future.
4. That it ended.
5. Organization
6. NO COMMENT
7. NO COMMENT
8. Time in class to work on assignments, no final because tests do not reinforce this information properly
9. None.
10. Prof. Groshek was great. I really appreciated how he tried to make the material as interesting as possible, even with a sometimes unresponsive clan.
11. NO COMMENT
12. NO COMMENT
13. NO COMMENT
14. We do a lot of things in groups and I have great teammates.
15. NO COMMENT
16. Teams
17. NO COMMENT
18. None.
19. I'll be able to better understand research articles in the future.
20. Expose COM students to math and data. That's a joke through, I'll never use any of this.
21. Quality of information, topics covered
22. "Trial by five" introduction to research. Very intense, and I feel like I learned a lot, but mostly through effort to pick apart what prof. was saying and figuring it out on my own.
23. Knowing how to conduct research is necessary

4) In your judgment, in what ways could this course be improved?

1. It's pretty dry, it could be made a little more interesting
2. Work on explaining the material more effectively and include more context for material.
3. Sometimes it's hard to know what he's trying to get us to do.
4. Don't make it a requirement for people with no interest in it. It makes the class atmosphere negative and unfulfilling.
5. Do not hold this class at 8am. I did not see the point of this class; it should not be a major requirement. I feel like I didn't learn anything
6. Not making weekly assignments count for 60% of the final grade.
7. Access to computer lab outside of class hours to use SPSS

8. Make it more applicable to life, less technical & be aware of what can actually be accomplished in a semester
9. Get rid of it as a requirement. There are so many other PR course I would have rather --?- - take in its place.
10. I lucked out and have taken stats classes before, but if I hadn't I think I might have been a little lost. Also, 704 Comm Ave is a TERRIBLE classroom.
11. Some of the lectures that were solely about statistics were hard to follow and felt irrelevant to the class so I tuned it out. Maybe an assignment in-class on these concepts would have helped.
12. Make it more interesting. How can I actually apply this to real life?
13. I feel this course would have been easier to understand if we had taken stats before.
14. More interesting subjects instead of learning something super hard and I won't use in the future.
15. Less focus on SPSS, more focus on explaining what you're trying to get from data/why we care.
16. Professors that engage students
17. There should be less of a focus on SPSS. From the midterm until the end of the semester, 95% of the class was centered around SPSS. If that is going to be such a large portion of CM321, it should be a requirement for every section b/c I know there are sections that spent significantly less time on it. It felt like the only thing Groshek could teach was SPSS but he still managed to confuse everyone.
18. Less stats work, better professor, should NOT be offered at 8 AM.
19. Focus more on research methods, not how to use SPSS. Teach us what each of the tests are & why we would do one before you teach us how to work a complicated computer program.
20. Don't make COM seniors take a mandatory class at 8am. Make it more interesting instead of feeling like pulling teeth.
21. I think just a later time would be better. Hard to focus on data so early in the morning.
22. Don't dumb it down, but use simpler language and make lessons more digestible and interactive. More show, less tell. TLi(sic) DR use smaller words. Big ones are distracting.
23. Assignments can be more relevant to how researching & planning relate to campaigns.

5) Provide a brief assessment of the quality of the instructor's presentation of the course content (lectures, readings, projects, guests, tests, etc.)

1. See #4; the work we did in the course directly applied to what we learned and helped give me a better understanding. He's a good professor – helpful!
2. Readings were generally helpful but presentation of course content could be improved.
3. Overall I thought he did a great job for his first time teaching the course.
4. Readings provided were moderately helpful. \$200 book we had to buy was completely worthless(sic).
5. Lectures – boring, not very informative. Readings – pointless, textbook isn't required. Guests – pointless, projects – too much focus, tests – satisfactory
6. NO COMMENT
7. Guest speaker was interesting to see how this is applied in life
8. Ppts were too lengthy so the important details are overwhelmed by what doesn't matter, little helpful feedback given on assignments

9. Again, vague. He could never quite explain any concept in a clear cut way. Like he's only capable of speaking ambiguously.
10. Managed to make stats interesting and exciting! Despite it being an 8am I never fell asleep once.
11. NO COMMENT
12. Not very interesting.
13. He was very difficult to pay attention to in class – spoke using very statistical language that didn't mean anything to most of us. Also, the room was terrible.
14. PPT are comprehensive book was very boring and super expensive.
15. NO COMMENT
16. Presentations were dry. Professor came off pretentious at times
17. The midterm was fair, but a large percentage of our grades came from weekly group projects and that allows for some members to slack off more than others, but still get credit. 10 group projects is a little excessive.
18. He read directly from powerpoints & never explained concepts unless he was hounded.
19. Focused so much on teaching SPSS that people didn't understand the basics, like the difference between validity & reliability. I can do a regression but I have no idea what it means or what its for. SPSS distracted from the real learning.
20. I have been personally victimized by Jacob Groshek.
21. Material was all there, but sometimes overwhelming at 8am.
22. Lectures were helpful. Try to avoid getting an 8am time slot. 8am is too early for logic.
23. Like guest lectures, good tests. Working in groups can be frustrating but good opportunity

REPORT GENERATED ON 2/2/114

COM-13F CM321 E1 Mass Comm Rsrch
PROFESSOR Groshek

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 23
NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 25
PERCENT OF ENROLLED STUDENTS RESPONDING: 92.00

STATISTICS REFLECT FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
1. My class year is:	Freshman	0	0	0	1	22	0 Graduate	3.957	0.209
2. My college/school is:	CAS	0	0	22	0	0	0 0 1 0 0 SEA	2.217	1.043
3. Primary reason for enrolling in course:	MAJOR/MINOR REQUIREMENT	1	21	0	1	0	OTHER	1.091	0.426

II. GENERAL EVALUATION OF COURSE:

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
4. The overall course workload	Not heavy	0	0	1	12	10	0 Very heavy	3.391	0.583
5. The level of difficulty of the course	Not difficult	0	0	0	5	14	4 Very difficult	3.957	0.638
6. The overall course rating	Poor	0	2	4	10	6	1 Superior	3.000	1.000
7. The course syllabus was comprehensive and clear	Disagree	0	0	3	4	11	5 Strongly agree	3.783	0.951
8. The course syllabus stated the course objectives clearly	Disagree	0	0	1	7	8	7 Strongly agree	3.913	0.900
9. Would you recommend this course to your friends?	Yes	1	2	5	6	6	3 Definitely not	3.136	1.207
10. Compare course with similar courses taken at BU	Higher quality	0	2	8	8	1	1 3 No comparison	3.000	1.477
11. Grade I expect to receive	A (3.6 or above)	0	6	17	0	0	0 0 Pass	1.739	0.449

III. PROFESSOR/INSTRUCTOR EVALUATIONS:

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
12. The instructor's enthusiasm in teaching	Poor	0	0	1	2	8	12 Superior	4.348	0.832
13. The instructor's effectiveness in explaining concepts	Poor	0	1	4	6	6	6 Superior	3.522	1.201
14. The instructor's ability to stimulate interest in subject matter	Poor	0	1	3	11	6	2 Superior	3.217	0.951
15. The instructor's availability to students outside of class	Poor	2	0	4	6	7	4 Superior	3.524	1.030
16. The instructor's fairness in grading	Poor	0	0	0	3	14	6 Superior	4.130	0.626
17. Overall rating of this instructor	Poor	0	0	1	6	12	4 Superior	3.826	0.778

COM CM321 E1 – Mass Communication Research
Professor Groshek – Fall 2013

- 1) Comment on the PROFESSOR (S)/INSTRUCTOR (S) regard to ability to communicate ideas, willingness to entertain debate, organization, attitude toward students, accessibility.
 1. Professor is understanding, patient, and very knowledgeable(sic) about the subject.
 2. He seemed very interested & knowledgeable(sic) about the subject
 3. Could go too fast w/ the difficulty of material
 4. Groshek knows SO much about this topic & is so enthusiastic/passionate. I think he expected us to know more about it.
 5. Like the professor, but hate the class
 6. Prof. Groshek can be very wordy at times and speak eloquently which complicates the subjects he tries to explain. However, I do very much enjoy his teaching method because it's very organized and systematic. I especially like how he has actually delivered his promises made in the first class—we would be familiar with the concepts throughout the semester.
 7. Groshek is very enthusiastic and clearly loves research.
 8. A little long-winded but very approachable/willing to help. Lectures do veer towards the boring side.
 9. Professor was knowledgeable(sic) about subject. Sometimes explained things as if we already knew background info
 10. NO COMMENT
 11. Great attitude—always willing to help in class. Enthusiastic about the subject matter
 12. His answers were not very clear. Long and hard to understand. Though he was approachable and accessible to help
 13. Sometimes failed to make dry, boring material interesting
 14. Prof. Groshek really enjoys the subject matter
 15. Didn't explain very well
 16. Prof is really nice and clearly knows a lot about the subject. I, on the other hand, don't know anything about the subject.
 17. NO COMMENT
 18. Really likes the class topic, not good at explaining concepts
 19. Terrible communicator. Never effectively explained concepts—took him a while to realize PR students can't do math
 20. NO COMMENT
 21. Very organized and patient
 22. He understood the material of the class could be very dry and boring, so he always made it relatable to the class and our career objectives.
 23. NO COMMENT

- 2) Comment on the COURSE with regard to pace, workload, level of difficulty, educational value, topics covered, and integration of sections.
 1. Topics are seldom engaging, but that just depends on the student I guess. Workload was very fair though. I think it's great that we are working in groups the entire semester.

2. It's hard because of all the numbers, but once the topics is explained a few times it becomes clearer
3. Workload was fair but material confusing
4. This is the worst course I've ever taken. I despise numbers and will never use the information learned ever.
5. This class literally sucks & I needs an in-depth explanation as to why anyone in COM needs to take this & why I need to start dealing w/ numbers senior year.
6. Very high educational value. I do very much agree that learning how to conduct comm. research is very important and I'm glad to have Groshek as my professor. SPSS was hard to learn in the beginning, but through in-class demonstrations I got much better at it and eventually liked it.
7. Good pace, on par with other BU COM classes.
8. Workload is fine and topics apply well to Mass Comm but PR/Advertising connection is unclear.
9. Pace and workload was average, content was confusing
10. NO COMMENT
11. Pace was fast. Workload was manageable. Difficult because I feel like Jacob expected us to know more about research...and we don't
12. Good pace with assignments. Variety of topics, though more analytical/SPSS work would have been helpful.
13. Syllabus changed a lot, hard to keep up with
14. The course is very boring & dry! Not a subject I am interested it, but it was a requirement for my minor!
15. Alot(sic) of in class assignments that were busy work, went too fast
16. Great that we don't have a final exam because if we did I would definitely be in tears
17. NO COMMENT
18. Didn't learn anything really helpful; will NEVER use any of ever.
19. This course had a lot of class work. Buying the book was a waste of money. Topics were boring & not relevant to PR
20. NO COMMENT
21. NO COMMENT
22. The pace was great. We had a week to complete assignments, giving us ample time to ask questions.
23. NO COMMENT

3) In your opinion, what were some of the strengths of this course?

1. NO COMMENT
2. I learned how to use SPSS and more about statistics & their importance in communications
3. He enjoys the material
4. We didn't have a final which was great.
5. No final & group work otherwise I would have died.
6. Course material, professor's enthusiasm in teaching. And Groshek is very willing to help and understanding to his student's situations.
7. Learning how to manipulate numbers.
8. Instructor mostly effective, grading scale very fair.

9. Teacher enjoyed reaching. Learned how to use new programs
10. NO COMMENT
11. I can add SPSS to my resume!
12. It shows a different side of the communication field and stresses importance in clear data collection and close analysis.
13. Learning a wide variety of analyzing data
14. NO COMMENT
15. NO COMMENT
16. Apparently it will be a helpful if I ever become employed
17. NO COMMENT
18. No final!
19. NONE
20. NO COMMENT
21. NO COMMENT
22. The organization of materials and pacing of assignments.
23. NO COMMENT

4) In your judgment, in what ways could this course be improved?

1. I'm not sure how relevant the material is to most of us who have to take it. For a mandatory pre-req, the material is very complicated
2. –more time explaining certain things –more class time for group projects
3. More step by step instructions! Also turn heat down in room, we are melting!
4. The temperature in this room was 83 degrees everyday.
5. We shouldn't have to take it. If I am a pr executive, I am not dealing w/ numbers. PS- turn the AC on!
6. Professor simplifying his words during lectures!
7. Cooler temperatures! IT'S SO HOT! HALP(sic)!
8. Lectures could be more engaging.
9. If we are going to talk this much about math concepts we need a stats background. Concepts went over our heads.
10. Create a worksheet of step-by-step instructions for how to do each thing on SPSS and what it's used for. Quickly going through the motions on the projector does not help us learn what to do.
11. NO COMMENT
12. Better explained concepts and more time devoted to SPSS.
13. The first half of the class is full of basic knowledge. Make it more intriguing to learn
14. NO COMMENT
15. More interesting less data work
16. Probably shouldn't be a major requirement since I'm not actually sure what I learned.
17. NO COMMENT
18. More comprehensive assignments
19. Less boring lectures, buy all students SPSS computer programs, don't limit it to classroom but expect outside work
20. NO COMMENT
21. NO COMMENT

22. The material still needs to be put in simpler terms. It gets very confusing to try to understand course concepts and the usage of a new system (SPSS)
23. NO COMMENT

5) Provide a brief assessment of the quality of the instructor's presentation of the course content (lectures, readings, projects, guests, tests, etc.)

1. NO COMMENT
2. He's great
3. Lecture slides were clear but project assignments could be confusing
4. Groshek is so awesome. Never met a professor so passionate about a topic. Really wants his students to do well.
5. Really nice & helpful- THANK JESUS!
6. Well done! Have a home brew ☺ Thank you, Professor!
7. Groshek is an awesome professor!
8. Decent enough (see above answers).
9. Everything was presented well. The content just didn't make sense to those with no previous knowledge.
10. NO COMMENT
11. Lectures were great—especially when it came time to study for the midterm.
12. The projects were relevant, but we could have been better prepared for them if the lectures were more clear.
13. Sometimes dry
14. Need to give more class time to do assignments! 15 mins. is not enough
15. NO COMMENT
16. Prof loves powerpoints and they love him back. He's really enthusiastic which is more than I can say. This class was not that fun, if you can't tell.
17. NO COMMENT
18. BORING—really hard to understand material
19. Professor said I hurt his feelings b/c his class is so boring—creepy.
20. NO COMMENT
21. NO COMMENT
22. Groshek did a great job taking his time and gauging the class' level of understanding.
23. NO COMMENT