

Course-Section: SPCH 100 0101  
 Title PUBLIC COMMUNICATION  
 Instructor: SLYTHOMPSON, AL  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1588  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	1037/1649	4.43	4.31	4.28	4.11	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	1254/1648	4.35	4.05	4.23	4.16	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	4	3	4	3.25	1281/1375	3.85	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	818/1595	4.41	4.17	4.20	4.03	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	6	1	6	3.86	966/1533	3.84	3.97	4.04	3.87	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	2	3	0	4	2.85	1469/1512	3.69	3.79	4.10	3.86	2.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	2	2	8	3.81	1234/1623	3.96	3.72	4.16	4.08	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.64	4.48	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	12	1	3.87	1096/1621	4.20	4.11	4.06	3.96	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	2	6	4	3.71	1414/1568	4.27	3.95	4.43	4.39	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	1174/1572	4.79	4.81	4.70	4.64	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	1200/1564	4.41	4.14	4.28	4.20	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	1258/1559	4.36	4.22	4.29	4.20	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1002/1352	4.22	4.12	3.98	3.86	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1384	4.50	4.61	4.08	3.86	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1382	4.50	4.75	4.29	4.03	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1368	4.63	4.74	4.30	4.01	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 948	3.83	4.42	3.95	3.75	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.54	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 16	Non-major 16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 10		
				? 1			

Course-Section: SPCH 100 0201  
 Title PUBLIC COMMUNICATION  
 Instructor: GARDENGHI, SARA  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1589  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	433/1649	4.43	4.31	4.28	4.11	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	195/1648	4.35	4.05	4.23	4.16	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	617/1375	3.85	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	417/1595	4.41	4.17	4.20	4.03	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	5	3	7	3.82	996/1533	3.84	3.97	4.04	3.87	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	366/1512	3.69	3.79	4.10	3.86	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	1	5	9	4.11	968/1623	3.96	3.72	4.16	4.08	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	5	4.28	1384/1646	4.64	4.48	4.69	4.67	4.28	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	348/1621	4.20	4.11	4.06	3.96	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	358/1568	4.27	3.95	4.43	4.39	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1572	4.79	4.81	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	187/1564	4.41	4.14	4.28	4.20	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	123/1559	4.36	4.22	4.29	4.20	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	120/1352	4.22	4.12	3.98	3.86	4.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.61	4.08	3.86	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.75	4.29	4.03	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	560/1368	4.63	4.74	4.30	4.01	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	564/ 948	3.83	4.42	3.95	3.75	3.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 3	Under-grad 20 Non-major 20
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 7	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPCH 210 0101  
 Title INTERPERS COMMUNICATIO  
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 1590  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	1	3	8	4.07	1136/1649	4.07	4.31	4.28	4.29	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	1	5	3.43	1517/1648	3.43	4.05	4.23	4.25	3.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1375	****	3.85	4.27	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	1	5	4	3.69	1317/1595	3.69	4.17	4.20	4.22	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	643/1533	4.23	3.97	4.04	4.04	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	883/1512	4.00	3.79	4.10	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	0	3	5	2	3.23	1489/1623	3.23	3.72	4.16	4.21	3.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	1469/1646	4.15	4.48	4.69	4.63	4.15	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	7	3	3.92	1045/1621	3.92	4.11	4.06	4.01	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	5	4	2	3.31	1492/1568	3.31	3.95	4.43	4.39	3.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	740/1572	4.85	4.81	4.70	4.73	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	2	3	5	3.62	1356/1564	3.62	4.14	4.28	4.27	3.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	2	6	3.92	1181/1559	3.92	4.22	4.29	4.33	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	818/1352	3.90	4.12	3.98	4.07	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	284/1384	4.71	4.61	4.08	3.99	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.75	4.29	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1368	4.86	4.74	4.30	4.21	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.42	3.95	3.89	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	****	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.65	****	

Frequency Distribution

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