

Course-Section: SPCH 100 01
 Title Public Communication
 Instructor: Sly-Thompson,Al
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1394
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	1058/1447	4.00	4.04	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	702/1447	4.38	4.23	4.27	4.30	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	2	2	0	5	3.00	1215/1241	3.00	3.70	4.33	4.25	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	923/1402	4.08	3.89	4.24	4.15	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	6	2	3.54	1156/1358	3.54	4.00	4.11	4.03	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	1	7	1	3.70	1026/1316	3.70	3.89	4.14	3.99	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	925/1427	4.08	3.66	4.19	4.24	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	819/1447	4.77	4.69	4.69	4.68	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	996/1434	3.89	3.44	4.10	4.10	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1153/1387	4.08	3.79	4.46	4.46	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	1042/1387	4.62	4.64	4.73	4.71	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	962/1386	4.15	3.87	4.32	4.32	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	6	3	3.64	1204/1380	3.64	3.78	4.32	4.31	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	224/1193	4.60	4.01	4.02	3.99	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1090/1172	3.00	3.68	4.15	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	638/1182	4.40	4.38	4.35	4.18	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	864/1170	4.00	4.14	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	335/ 800	4.25	4.13	4.06	3.95	4.25

Frequency Distribution

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

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	1	0	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	1017/1447	4.08	4.04	4.31	4.31	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	1	6	4.08	1005/1447	4.08	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	658/1241	4.40	3.70	4.33	4.35	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	2	5	3.69	1191/1402	3.69	3.89	4.24	4.24	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	387/1358	4.46	4.00	4.11	4.12	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	774/1316	4.08	3.89	4.14	4.08	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	4	1	4	3.23	1335/1427	3.23	3.66	4.19	4.14	3.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1008/1447	4.62	4.69	4.69	4.70	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	2	2	2	1	3.00	1349/1434	3.00	3.44	4.10	3.97	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	2	5	2	3.50	1304/1387	3.50	3.79	4.46	4.42	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	982/1387	4.67	4.64	4.73	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	2	4	3	3.58	1241/1386	3.58	3.87	4.32	4.24	3.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	1096/1380	3.92	3.78	4.32	4.30	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	3	2	2	4	3.42	995/1193	3.42	4.01	4.02	4.04	3.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	1	8	4.36	496/1172	4.36	3.68	4.15	4.12	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	668/1182	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.30	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	751/1170	4.27	4.14	4.38	4.32	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: SPCH 210 01
 Title Interpers Communicatio
 Instructor: Mabe,Mitzi
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1395
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						