

Course-Section: SPCH 100 0201
 Title PUBLIC COMMUNICATION
 Instructor: WRISK, CELIA
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1414
 JUN 13, 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	3	9	13	4.40	678/1481	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	446/1481	4.56	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	16	4.64	357/1249	4.64	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	178/1424	4.80	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	8	5	9	3.72	942/1396	3.72	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	7	9	3.80	956/1342	3.80	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	490/1459	4.48	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	13	4	3.95	904/1450	3.95	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	968/1409	4.33	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	919/1407	4.71	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	9	14	4.54	523/1399	4.54	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	5	7	11	4.26	859/1400	4.26	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	2	3	4	10	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	507/1262	4.33	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	457/1256	4.67	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	159/ 788	4.57	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.57	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 6	Under-grad 25 Non-major 1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 9	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 11	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPCH 210 0101
 Title INTERPERS COMMUNICATIO
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1415
 JUN 13, 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	1	4	8	6	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	8	3	3	3.11	1412/1481	3.11	4.26	4.23	4.29	3.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	8	5	3.84	1130/1424	3.84	4.27	4.21	4.28	3.84	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	536/1396	4.21	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	10	4	3.95	832/1342	3.95	4.12	4.07	4.05	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	7	4	3	4	1	2.37	1434/1459	2.37	4.19	4.16	4.17	2.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	855/1480	4.79	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	7	7	2	3.59	1195/1450	3.59	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	3	8	2	3	3.18	1346/1409	3.18	4.46	4.42	4.47	3.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	300/1407	4.94	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	5	6	2	3	3.06	1320/1399	3.06	4.30	4.26	4.29	3.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	5	5	3.76	1140/1400	3.76	4.35	4.27	4.34	3.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	4	7	4	3.88	712/1179	3.88	3.94	3.96	4.05	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	205/1262	4.75	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	272/1256	4.83	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	133/ 788	4.67	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 1	B 7				
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General	6	Under-grad 19	Non-major 4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0				
			I 1	Other	4		
			? 0				