Course-Section: SPCH 100 1 Title

University of Maryland Public Communication Baltimore County Fall 2009

Instructor: Sly-Thompson,Al

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 18

Page 1459 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	4	6	5	3.88	1236/1509	4.02	4.13	4.31	4.18	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	731/1509	4.58	4.31	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	6	2	6	3.75	1091/1287	4.10	4.06	4.30	4.24	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	432/1459	4.65	4.39	4.22	4.11	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	518/1406	3.66	3.90	4.09	4.02	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	1	5	8	4.06	773/1384	4.17	4.10	4.11	3.98	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	233/1489	4.53	3.87	4.17	4.20	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	350/1506	4.82	4.84	4.67	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	8	3	3.87	1013/1463	4.20	4.00	4.09	4.02	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	1116/1438	4.48	4.15	4.46	4.44	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	4	1	10	4.40	1217/1421	4.70	4.74	4.73	4.66	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	1	5	7	4.13	978/1411	4.51	4.26	4.31	4.27	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	1	4	7	3.87	1150/1405	4.23	4.15	4.32	4.27	3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	841/1236	3.68	3.76	4.00	3.87	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	958/1260	3.71	4.27	4.14	3.95	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	647/1255	4.43	4.59	4.33	4.15	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	620/1258	4.50	4.71	4.38	4.18	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	705/ 873	3.50	4.00	4.03	3.89	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPCH 100 2 University of Maryland Title Public Communication

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1460

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Gardenghi,Sarah Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean		Mean	Mean								
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	11	6	4.17	976/1509	4.02	4.13	4.31	4.18	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	234/1509	4.58	4.31	4.26	4.25	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	590/1287	4.10	4.06	4.30	4.24	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	173/1459	4.65	4.39	4.22	4.11	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	4	1	4	1	4	3.00	1333/1406	3.66	3.90	4.09	4.02	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	3	1	9	4.29	589/1384	4.17	4.10	4.11	3.98	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	5	10	4.35	652/1489	4.53	3.87	4.17	4.20	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	909/1506	4.82	4.84	4.67	4.66	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	301/1463	4.20	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	430/1438	4.48	4.15	4.46	4.44	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1421	4.70	4.74	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	159/1411	4.51	4.26	4.31	4.27	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	558/1405	4.23	4.15	4.32	4.27	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	3	1	6	2	3.58	945/1236	3.68	3.76	4.00	3.87	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1260	3.71	4.27	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1255	4.43	4.59	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1258			4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	3.50	4.00	4.03	3.89	****
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades		Reasons						Туре			Majors			;
00.27 0 0.00.000 0 7 12 Required for Majora 10												Mo i		

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18	
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	#### - Means there are not			
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	2	-				
				?	0							

Course-Section: SPCH 210 1 University of Maryland Page 1461 Title Interpers Communicatio Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Mabe,Mitzi

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 18

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

~							~										
						Fr	eaue:	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept			Sect
		Questions				1	_		4	5				_			
		General															
1. Did you	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	800/1509	4.33	4.13	4.31	4.34	4.33			
2. Did the	1	0	0	2	5	5	5	3.76	1252/1509	3.76	4.31	4.26	4.32	3.76			
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflect the	expected goals	1	10	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.06	4.30	4.35	4.00
4. Did otl	0	2	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	1111/1459	3.88	4.39	4.22	4.30	3.88			
5. Did as	0	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	462/1406	4.39	3.90	4.09	4.09	4.39			
6. Did wr	itten as:	0	0	0	2	5	3	8	3.94	886/1384	3.94	4.10	4.11	4.09	3.94		
7. Was the	e gradin	0	0	5	5	4	1	3	2.56	1461/1489	2.56	3.87	4.17	4.19	2.56		
8. How man	ny times	0	1	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	622/1506	4.88	4.84	4.67	4.61	4.88		
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean								3.60					
		Lecture															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lectures well	l prepared	2	0	0	2	8	2	4	3.50	1371/1438	3.50	4.15	4.46	4.48	3.50
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem interested	in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	768/1421	4.81	4.74	4.73	4.76	4.81
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presented and	explained clearly	2	0	0	2	5	4	5	3.75	1204/1411	3.75	4.26	4.31	4.37	3.75
4. Did the	e lectur	es contribute to what	you learned	2	0	0	0	7	2	7	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.15	4.32	4.39	4.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enhance	your understanding	2	1	0	1	5	3	6	3.93	741/1236	3.93	3.76	4.00	4.11	3.93
		Discussion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	187/1260	4.83	4.27	4.14	4.19	4.83
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively encoura	ged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	344/1255	4.75	4.59	4.33	4.37	4.75
		ctor encourage fair a		6	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	212/1258	4.92	4.71	4.38	4.44	4.92
		echniques successful	•	6	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.50
			Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Re	ason	S			Ту	pe		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 s	3	 Graduat	te 0		Major		0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 4														

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Expected Grades Reasons				Туре				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18	
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	
				P	0			responses to	gnificant			
				I	0	Other	0	_				
				2	1							