

Course-Section: SPCH 100 0101  
 Title PUBLIC COMMUNICATION  
 Instructor: WRISK, CELIA  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1615  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	1	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	655/1674	4.27	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	419/1674	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	792/1423	4.38	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	312/1609	4.52	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	8	7	3.95	851/1585	3.64	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	757/1535	3.85	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	7	9	4.21	912/1651	4.04	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1673	4.91	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	522/1656	4.24	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	1237/1586	3.95	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	1047/1585	4.46	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	733/1582	4.22	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	780/1575	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	1	0	4	7	4.15	576/1380	3.71	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	355/1520	4.22	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	873/1515	4.33	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	729/1511	4.34	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	474/ 994	4.08	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPCH 100 0201  
 Title PUBLIC COMMUNICATION  
 Instructor: WRISK, CELIA  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1616  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	0	0	2	11	3	4.06	1147/1674	4.27	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	776/1674	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	660/1423	4.38	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	687/1609	4.52	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	4	2	5	3	3.33	1329/1585	3.64	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	5	3	3.53	1278/1535	3.85	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	8	4	3.88	1246/1651	4.04	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	868/1673	4.91	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	11	2	4.07	912/1656	4.24	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1412/1586	3.95	4.43	4.43	4.37	3.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	1406/1585	4.46	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.23	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1129/1582	4.22	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1284/1575	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.17	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	4	2	3	2	3.27	1152/1380	3.71	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	942/1520	4.22	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	788/1515	4.33	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	896/1511	4.34	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	408/ 994	4.08	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPCH 210 0101  
 Title INTERPERS COMMUNICATIO  
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1617  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	1	1	1	5	4	3.83	1366/1674	3.83	4.23	4.27	4.32	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	6	1	2	3.00	1608/1674	3.00	4.26	4.23	4.26	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1423	****	4.36	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	2	2	3.00	1557/1609	3.00	4.23	4.22	4.23	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	3	3.67	1121/1585	3.67	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	1006/1535	3.92	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	1	4	3.42	1480/1651	3.42	4.20	4.18	4.20	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	5	0	2	3.11	1522/1656	3.11	4.06	4.07	4.10	3.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	5	1	2	1	2.42	1576/1586	2.42	4.43	4.43	4.48	2.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	510/1585	4.92	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	2	3	1	2	2.73	1551/1582	2.73	4.30	4.26	4.35	2.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	3	1	4	3.17	1464/1575	3.17	4.32	4.27	4.39	3.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	4	0	0	1	2	2.57	1314/1380	2.57	3.94	3.94	4.03	2.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	1221/1520	3.40	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	0	0	8	4.30	857/1515	4.30	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	358/1511	4.80	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	337/ 994	4.30	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.30	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						