

Course-Section: SPCH 100 0201
 Title PUBLIC COMMUNICATION
 Instructor: WRISK, CELIA
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1449
 JUN 14, 2005
 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		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	105/1504	4.92	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	209/1503	4.77	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	311/1290	4.69	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	186/1453	4.77	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	605/1421	4.18	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	558/1365	4.27	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	412/1485	4.55	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	306/1483	4.55	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	1002/1425	4.31	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	926/1426	4.69	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	848/1418	4.25	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	829/1416	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	0	9	4.50	271/1199	4.50	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	164/1312	4.80	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	507/1303	4.60	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	354/1299	4.75	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.50

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	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPCH 210 0101
 Title INTERPERS COMMUNICATIO
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1450
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	0	0	1	7	3	2	3.46	1368/1504	3.46	4.24	4.27	4.26	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	4	4	2	3.38	1353/1503	3.38	4.22	4.20	4.18	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.32	4.28	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	1214/1453	3.70	4.22	4.21	4.20	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	7	4	3.79	981/1365	3.79	4.11	4.08	4.00	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	0	4	5	1	2.93	1406/1485	2.93	4.20	4.16	4.15	2.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	2	2	3	4	0	2.82	1413/1483	2.82	4.07	4.06	4.02	2.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	5	3	2	3.42	1326/1425	3.42	4.41	4.41	4.40	3.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	808/1426	4.77	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	8	1	3.62	1221/1418	3.62	4.29	4.25	4.22	3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1222/1416	3.58	4.34	4.26	4.24	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	2	1	3	2	0	2.63	1130/1199	2.63	3.95	3.97	3.95	2.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	454/1312	4.42	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	356/1303	4.75	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	613/1299	4.46	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	2	1	4	2	3.40	614/ 758	3.40	4.05	4.01	3.89	3.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	15	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						