

Course-Section: SPCH 100 0101  
 Title PUBLIC COMMUNICATION  
 Instructor: SLYTHOMPSON, AL  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1525  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	2	6	6	2	3.00	1539/1576	3.00	3.33	4.30	4.11	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	4	9	3	3.45	1415/1576	3.45	3.31	4.27	4.18	3.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	5	8	4	1	2.95	1307/1342	2.95	2.95	4.32	4.19	2.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	768/1520	4.33	3.76	4.25	4.09	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	5	3	6	1	2.74	1433/1465	2.74	3.41	4.12	4.02	2.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1346/1434	3.14	3.49	4.14	3.94	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	6	4	8	3.90	1145/1547	3.90	3.50	4.19	4.10	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	866/1574	4.70	4.80	4.64	4.59	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	1	9	7	0	3.11	1431/1554	3.11	3.05	4.10	4.01	3.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	3	2	3	3	6	3.41	1404/1488	3.41	2.93	4.47	4.41	3.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	1255/1493	4.44	4.31	4.73	4.65	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	5	5	5	3.61	1303/1486	3.61	3.12	4.32	4.26	3.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	2	3	3	4	2.94	1430/1489	2.94	2.93	4.32	4.22	2.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	14	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1277	****	2.60	4.03	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/1279	****	4.44	4.17	3.96	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1270	****	4.56	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1269	****	3.67	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	****	4.25	4.05	3.91	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General	3
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	4
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPCH 210 0101  
 Title INTERPERS COMMUNICATIO  
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1526  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	1383/1576	3.67	3.33	4.30	4.35	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	1	2	3	3	3.17	1503/1576	3.17	3.31	4.27	4.32	3.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1342	****	2.95	4.32	4.41	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	0	2	4	2	3.18	1451/1520	3.18	3.76	4.25	4.26	3.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	808/1465	4.08	3.41	4.12	4.09	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	8	2	3.83	1045/1434	3.83	3.49	4.14	4.06	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	3	0	2	3	2	3.10	1449/1547	3.10	3.50	4.19	4.22	3.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	469/1574	4.91	4.80	4.64	4.62	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	3.05	4.10	4.05	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	5	1	2	1	2	2.45	1478/1488	2.45	2.93	4.47	4.44	2.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	1	0	8	4.18	1379/1493	4.18	4.31	4.73	4.75	4.18	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	3	2	1	2	2.64	1463/1486	2.64	3.12	4.32	4.29	2.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	0	3	1	3	2.91	1440/1489	2.91	2.93	4.32	4.31	2.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	4	2	0	2	2.60	1230/1277	2.60	2.60	4.03	4.01	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	510/1279	4.44	4.44	4.17	4.14	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	597/1270	4.56	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1067/1269	3.67	3.67	4.35	4.29	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	367/ 878	4.25	4.25	4.05	3.92	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 13 Non-major 13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 0		