

Name: YOUNG, J
Number enrolled: 32Dept: POLS
Number rating: 30Course No.: POLS 372I
Date: 04/09

Section: 001

Part I: Instructor Evaluation		Mean	SD	%E	%VG	%G	%W	%I	%NR
1	Prepared for class	4.4	0.7	53	33	10	0	0	3
2	Made clear assignments	4.3	0.8	47	33	13	3	0	3
3	Set clear standards for grading	4.3	0.9	50	27	17	3	0	3
4	Graded fairly	4.3	0.8	47	37	10	3	0	3
5	Knew if students understood him/her	4.2	1.0	43	43	0	7	3	3
6	Spoke understandably	4.5	0.9	63	23	7	0	3	3
7	Answered impromptu questions	4.3	1.0	57	23	13	0	3	3
8	Showed interest in course	4.4	0.7	53	37	3	3	0	3
9	Gave examples for complex ideas	4.1	1.2	50	27	7	7	7	3
10	Accepted criticism and suggestions	4.6	0.6	53	33	3	0	0	10
11	Increased appreciation for subject	4.4	1.0	63	17	10	3	3	3
12	Organized, presented subject well	4.3	0.9	50	27	13	3	0	7
13	Specified course objectives	4.3	0.9	47	30	13	3	0	7
14	Achieved specific course objectives	4.2	0.9	43	37	10	7	0	3
15	Explained the subject clearly	4.2	1.2	50	30	7	3	7	3
16	Showed interest in students	4.4	0.8	60	23	10	3	0	3
17	Was enthusiastic about subject	4.4	0.8	57	23	17	0	0	3
18	Available outside of class	4.3	1.0	47	27	13	0	3	10
19	Encouraged student participation	4.6	0.6	63	27	7	0	0	3
20	In general, taught class effectively	4.4	1.0	63	17	13	0	3	3
Part II: Course Evaluation		Mean	SD	%SA	%A	%N	%D	%SD	%NR
21	Course was a good learning experience	4.3	0.9	47	37	10	0	3	3
22	Course content was good	4.1	0.9	30	57	3	3	3	3
23	The course was well-organized	4.2	0.6	30	60	7	0	0	3
24	Trouble paying attention in class *	3.6	1.2	7	10	23	33	23	3
25	Additional prerequisites *	2.8	1.2	17	20	30	23	7	3
26	Fewer prerequisites *	3.7	0.9	0	3	43	23	23	7
27	Course was very interesting	4.1	0.9	37	40	13	7	0	3
28	Required work was appropriate	4.1	0.6	23	63	10	0	0	3
29	Course was one of the best	3.2	1.3	23	13	27	20	10	7
30	The tests covered the course	3.9	1.0	23	57	7	7	3	3
31	Course was a waste of time *	4.0	0.9	0	7	17	40	33	3
32	Textbook was good	3.4	0.9	10	40	27	20	0	3
33	AV could be used more effectively *	3.3	0.9	0	20	33	33	10	3
34	Should be taught in some other way *	3.8	0.9	0	7	30	37	23	3
35	Covered material in other courses *	3.8	1.0	3	7	17	50	20	3
36	Material was too difficult *	3.6	1.1	7	3	30	37	20	3
37	Course should continue to be offered	4.4	0.8	50	37	7	3	0	3
38	Reading assignments hard to understand *	3.1	1.1	7	23	30	27	10	3
39	I was often confused *	3.2	1.2	7	30	10	40	10	3
40	Generally, the course was good	4.2	0.9	43	37	13	0	3	3

SIUC Instructor and Course Evaluation Report

Name: YOUNG, J Dept: POLS Course No.: POLS 372I Section: 001
 Number enrolled: 32 Number rating: 30 Date: 04/09

Part III: Objectives	Mean	SD	%E	%V	%G	%L	%N	%NR
41 Gaining factual knowledge	3.8	1.0	27	27	33	0	3	10
42 Learning fundamental principles	3.7	1.0	27	20	40	0	3	10
43 Learning to apply course material	3.7	1.1	27	30	20	10	3	10
44 Developing specific competencies	3.7	1.2	30	20	23	10	3	13
45 Professionals gain new knowledge	3.6	1.1	20	30	20	13	3	13
46 Creative capacities	3.6	1.1	23	23	27	10	3	13
47 Personal responsibility	3.6	1.0	17	30	30	7	3	13
48 Broader appreciation	3.7	1.1	23	23	30	3	3	17
49 Skill in expression	3.7	1.1	27	23	27	7	3	13
50 Implications of course for myself	3.4	1.2	17	23	30	3	10	17

Part IV: Self Rating	Mean	SD	%Y	%N	%NR
51 Strong interest in material	0.6	0.5	43	33	23
52 Strong interest in discipline	0.7	0.4	57	20	23
53 To obtain a good grade	0.8	0.4	60	20	20
54 To satisfy a requirement for major	0.8	0.4	60	17	23
55 To fulfill electives	0.6	0.5	47	27	27
56 Form adequately evaluates course	0.8	0.4	63	20	17

 Note: Items marked * are reversed in scoring. Disagreement leads to a high mean. Response percentages have not been changed.
 Note: SD is the standard deviation. The standard deviation can be viewed as a measure of student agreement for a given mean score, i.e., a lower SD means most students rated the instructor the same while a higher SD means that student opinion varied widely on the item. The SD can range from a low of zero (total student agreement) to a high of two (maximum disagreement).