

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SPCH 100 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Public Communication</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gardenghi,Sarah</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	435/1589	4.02	4.09	4.32	4.20	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	400/1589	4.26	4.21	4.29	4.28	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	639/1391	3.81	4.00	4.34	4.29	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	693/1552	4.19	4.18	4.25	4.16	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	5	3	8	3.65	1221/1495	3.47	3.79	4.14	4.07	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	4	5	8	3.80	1087/1457	3.48	3.78	4.15	3.99	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	4	4	7	3.55	1386/1572	3.73	3.91	4.21	4.18	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	768/1589	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.59	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	481/1569	3.93	3.88	4.13	4.08	4.42
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	577/1530	4.10	3.91	4.49	4.45	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	293/1533	4.67	4.72	4.75	4.69	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	524/1528	4.23	4.13	4.35	4.31	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	6	13	4.50	739/1529	3.89	4.06	4.36	4.31	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	3	2	2	5	5	3.41	1189/1393	3.02	3.31	4.06	3.99	3.41
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1337	3.60	4.13	4.17	4.01	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1331	4.00	4.33	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/1333	4.36	4.56	4.40	4.22	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SPCH 100 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Public Communication</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gardenghi,Sarah</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1014	3.78	3.98	4.05	3.91	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 11	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1 C 0	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1 F 0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	4				
			? 4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> SPCH 100 02	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 23
<b>Title:</b> Public Communication		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 21
<b>Instructor:</b> Sly-Thompson,AI		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	4	11	2	3.38	1525/1589	4.02	4.09	4.32	4.20	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	6	7	3.86	1296/1589	4.26	4.21	4.29	4.28	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	7	4	4	3.14	1350/1391	3.81	4.00	4.34	4.29	3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	6	9	4.00	1081/1552	4.19	4.18	4.25	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	6	2	6	5	3.29	1396/1495	3.47	3.79	4.14	4.07	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	5	0	4	5	4	3.17	1386/1457	3.48	3.78	4.15	3.99	3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	6	8	3.90	1190/1572	3.73	3.91	4.21	4.18	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	1	3	16	4.57	1042/1589	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.59	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	7	7	1	3.44	1401/1569	3.93	3.88	4.13	4.08	3.44
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	3	4	2	7	3.50	1468/1530	4.10	3.91	4.49	4.45	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	1361/1533	4.67	4.72	4.75	4.69	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	6	5	5	3.82	1299/1528	4.23	4.13	4.35	4.31	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	4	4	3	5	3.28	1456/1529	3.89	4.06	4.36	4.31	3.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	3	2	4	0	2	2.64	1363/1393	3.02	3.31	4.06	3.99	2.64
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	5	1	3	3.60	1090/1337	3.60	4.13	4.17	4.01	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	5	1	5	4.00	989/1331	4.00	4.33	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	810/1333	4.36	4.56	4.40	4.22	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	700/1014	3.78	3.98	4.05	3.91	3.78

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> SPCH 100 02	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 23
<b>Title:</b> Public Communication		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 21
<b>Instructor:</b> Sly-Thompson, AI		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.17	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	21	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>SPCH 210 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Interpers Communication</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Mabe,Mitzi</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>19</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	995/1589	4.21	4.09	4.32	4.33	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	7	7	4.11	1092/1589	4.11	4.21	4.29	4.30	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	761/1391	4.38	4.00	4.34	4.36	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	9	4.16	954/1552	4.16	4.18	4.25	4.26	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	508/1495	4.42	3.79	4.14	4.18	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	557/1457	4.37	3.78	4.15	4.14	4.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	6	10	4.26	829/1572	4.26	3.91	4.21	4.19	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	624/1589	4.84	4.73	4.66	4.63	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	7	2	3.77	1201/1569	3.77	3.88	4.13	4.12	3.77
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	3	4	4	5	3.53	1465/1530	3.53	3.91	4.49	4.47	3.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	814/1533	4.82	4.72	4.75	4.78	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	1229/1528	3.94	4.13	4.35	4.35	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	852/1529	4.40	4.06	4.36	4.39	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	3	2	6	6	3.88	922/1393	3.88	3.31	4.06	4.13	3.88
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	337/1337	4.67	4.13	4.17	4.16	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	478/1331	4.67	4.33	4.35	4.32	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	438/1333	4.75	4.56	4.40	4.39	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	444/1014	4.18	3.98	4.05	4.03	4.18

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	SPCH 210 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	24
<b>Title:</b>	Interpers Communication		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	19
<b>Instructor:</b>	Mabe,Mitzi			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/180	****	****	4.20	4.50	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/178	****	****	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/181	****	****	4.40	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/165	****	****	4.12	4.42	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/62	****	****	4.46	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/65	****	****	4.43	4.06	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	****	4.29	3.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/61	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/61	****	****	4.19	4.26	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	3.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.60	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/39	****	****	4.00	4.01	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.93	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	4.67	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> SPCH 210 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 24
<b>Title:</b> Interpers Communication		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 19
<b>Instructor:</b> Mabe,Mitzi		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	4.56	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	19	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						