Course-Section: PUB 150H 0101 University of Maryland Title PUBLIC AFFAIRS SCHOL S MEYERS, ROY T.

Ρ

Ι

0

0

1

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: Enrollment: 13

Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1387

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Ouestions					NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	
~																		
1. Did yo	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course					0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	335/1576	4.73	4.73	4.30	4.11	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	920/1576	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	****	4.32	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	597/1520	4.45	4.45	4.25	4.09	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	284/1465	4.64	4.64	4.12	4.02	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.50	4.14	3.94	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained						1	1	2	3	2	2	3.20	1422/1547	3.20	3.20	4.19	4.10	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1574	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.50	4.10	4.01	4.50
		Lecture																
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	0	3	6	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.67	4.47	4.41	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	5.00	5.00	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	,	4.67	4.67	4.32	4.26	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	637/1489	4.56	4.56	4.32	4.22	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						1	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	429/1277	4.38	4.38	4.03	3.91	4.38
Discussion																		
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned							0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	5.00	4.17	3.96	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1279	5.00	5.00	4.17	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion						0	0	0	0	0	4		1/12/0	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.09	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful						3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 878	****	****	4.05	3.91	****
i. Were by	9	5	Ü	O	U	O	_	3.00	, 070			1.05	3.71					
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Reasons						Ty	pe		Majors		}
													Good door to					
00-27 28-55	2 5	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	А б В 4	Required for Majors					S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0	
28-55 56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	в 4 С 0	General							0 Under-q		rad 13		Non-major		13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		General						U	onder-g.	Lau I	. 3	MOI1-	·iiia JOI	13
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-3.49	8	D 0 F 0		Electives						0	#### - 1	Moana +	horo o	ro not	onous	, h
Grad. U 3.50-4.00 8 F 0 Elec							SCLTA	ves				U	#### - 1	means t	nere a		. emoug	111

Other

10