

Name: YOUNG, J
Number enrolled: 82Dept: POLS
Number rating: 74Course No.: POLS 370
Date: 04/09

Section: 001

Part I: Instructor Evaluation	Mean	SD	%E	%VG	%G	%W	%I	%NR
1 Prepared for class	4.4	0.8	53	24	9	0	1	12
2 Made clear assignments	4.1	1.0	39	26	16	7	0	12
3 Set clear standards for grading	4.1	1.1	41	23	18	4	3	12
4 Graded fairly	4.2	0.9	39	28	16	3	1	12
5 Knew if students understood him/her	4.1	1.0	39	30	12	5	1	12
6 Spoke understandably	4.4	0.9	51	22	11	3	1	12
7 Answered impromptu questions	4.3	1.0	49	20	15	1	3	12
8 Showed interest in course	4.7	0.6	66	16	5	0	0	12
9 Gave examples for complex ideas	4.4	0.8	49	26	9	1	0	15
10 Accepted criticism and suggestions	4.2	0.9	38	28	15	3	0	16
11 Increased appreciation for subject	4.2	1.1	47	24	5	5	4	14
12 Organized, presented subject well	4.3	1.0	51	19	14	3	1	12
13 Specified course objectives	4.3	0.9	46	22	19	1	0	12
14 Achieved specific course objectives	4.3	0.9	47	19	19	1	0	14
15 Explained the subject clearly	4.4	0.9	53	19	11	5	0	12
16 Showed interest in students	4.3	0.9	51	18	16	1	1	12
17 Was enthusiastic about subject	4.7	0.6	66	14	8	0	0	12
18 Available outside of class	4.4	1.0	50	20	9	1	3	16
19 Encouraged student participation	4.3	0.9	47	23	15	1	1	12
20 In general, taught class effectively	4.3	0.9	53	16	15	4	0	12

Part II: Course Evaluation	Mean	SD	%SA	%A	%N	%D	%SD	%NR
21 Course was a good learning experience	4.1	1.2	39	31	7	5	5	12
22 Course content was good	4.1	1.0	35	36	11	3	3	12
23 The course was well-organized	4.3	0.9	41	34	7	4	1	14
24 Trouble paying attention in class *	3.4	1.3	12	11	16	28	20	12
25 Additional prerequisites *	3.4	1.0	5	8	34	27	12	14
26 Fewer prerequisites *	3.1	0.9	7	5	51	16	5	15
27 Course was very interesting	4.1	1.1	36	34	7	5	4	14
28 Required work was appropriate	3.6	1.1	18	38	19	7	5	14
29 Course was one of the best	3.3	1.3	18	26	22	9	11	15
30 The tests covered the course	3.8	1.1	23	39	12	9	3	14
31 Course was a waste of time *	3.6	1.3	9	7	16	27	27	14
32 Textbook was good	3.2	1.1	9	20	38	9	8	15
33 AV could be used more effectively *	3.0	1.2	11	18	26	23	9	14
34 Should be taught in some other way *	3.3	1.2	8	12	19	34	12	15
35 Covered material in other courses *	3.5	1.2	8	9	19	30	22	12
36 Material was too difficult *	3.4	1.2	9	9	18	41	9	14
37 Course should continue to be offered	4.2	1.0	42	27	11	5	1	14
38 Reading assignments hard to understand *	2.8	1.1	11	30	18	23	4	15
39 I was often confused *	3.4	1.2	9	9	16	34	16	15
40 Generally, the course was good	4.1	1.0	36	31	9	4	3	16

SIUC Instructor and Course Evaluation Report

Name: YOUNG, J Dept: POLS Course No.: POLS 370 Section: 001
 Number enrolled: 82 Number rating: 74 Date: 04/09

Part III: Objectives	Mean	SD	%E	%V	%G	%L	%N	%NR
41 Gaining factual knowledge	4.1	1.0	39	18	16	4	1	22
42 Learning fundamental principles	4.0	1.0	30	27	18	3	1	22
43 Learning to apply course material	4.0	1.0	27	27	20	3	1	22
44 Developing specific competencies	3.9	1.0	26	24	22	1	3	24
45 Professionals gain new knowledge	4.0	1.0	31	20	23	4	0	22
46 Creative capacities	3.7	1.1	24	15	30	3	4	24
47 Personal responsibility	3.8	1.1	26	22	19	8	1	24
48 Broader appreciation	3.9	1.0	27	20	27	1	1	23
49 Skill in expression	3.8	1.0	26	22	26	4	1	22
50 Implications of course for myself	3.9	1.0	24	24	22	3	3	24

Part IV: Self Rating	Mean	SD	%Y	%N	%NR
51 Strong interest in material	0.8	0.4	59	16	24
52 Strong interest in discipline	0.7	0.5	54	22	24
53 To obtain a good grade	0.7	0.5	53	23	24
54 To satisfy a requirement for major	0.6	0.5	49	27	24
55 To fulfill electives	0.6	0.5	47	28	24
56 Form adequately evaluates course	0.7	0.4	55	20	24

 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).