

Name: YOUNG,
Number enrolled: .Dept: POLS
Number rating: 21Course No.: POLS 375
Date: 12/08

Section: 001

Part I: Instructor Evaluation	Mean	SD	%E	%VG	%G	%W	%I	%NR
1 Prepared for class	4.8	0.4	81	19	0	0	0	0
2 Made clear assignments	4.7	0.6	71	24	5	0	0	0
3 Set clear standards for grading	4.7	0.6	76	19	5	0	0	0
4 Graded fairly	4.7	0.5	67	33	0	0	0	0
5 Knew if students understood him/her	4.7	0.6	71	24	5	0	0	0
6 Spoke understandably	4.8	0.4	81	19	0	0	0	0
7 Answered impromptu questions	4.7	0.6	76	19	5	0	0	0
8 Showed interest in course	4.9	0.4	86	14	0	0	0	0
9 Gave examples for complex ideas	4.7	0.7	76	14	10	0	0	0
10 Accepted criticism and suggestions	4.7	0.5	67	33	0	0	0	0
11 Increased appreciation for subject	4.7	0.6	76	19	5	0	0	0
12 Organized, presented subject well	4.6	0.5	62	38	0	0	0	0
13 Specified course objectives	4.6	0.6	62	33	5	0	0	0
14 Achieved specific course objectives	4.6	0.6	62	33	5	0	0	0
15 Explained the subject clearly	4.7	0.6	71	24	5	0	0	0
16 Showed interest in students	4.7	0.7	76	14	10	0	0	0
17 Was enthusiastic about subject	4.7	0.7	76	14	10	0	0	0
18 Available outside of class	4.8	0.5	81	14	5	0	0	0
19 Encouraged student participation	4.7	0.6	71	24	5	0	0	0
20 In general, taught class effectively	4.8	0.4	81	19	0	0	0	0

Part II: Course Evaluation	Mean	SD	%SA	%A	%N	%D	%SD	%NR
21 Course was a good learning experience	4.6	0.6	67	29	5	0	0	0
22 Course content was good	4.7	0.5	67	33	0	0	0	0
23 The course was well-organized	4.6	0.5	62	38	0	0	0	0
24 Trouble paying attention in class *	3.7	1.2	10	5	14	52	19	0
25 Additional prerequisites *	3.6	1.1	10	5	14	57	14	0
26 Fewer prerequisites *	2.9	1.0	14	10	52	24	0	0
27 Course was very interesting	4.6	0.5	57	43	0	0	0	0
28 Required work was appropriate	4.2	0.8	38	52	5	5	0	0
29 Course was one of the best	4.1	0.8	33	52	10	5	0	0
30 The tests covered the course	4.4	0.5	38	62	0	0	0	0
31 Course was a waste of time *	4.1	1.2	10	0	10	33	48	0
32 Textbook was good	3.6	0.9	10	52	29	5	5	0
33 AV could be used more effectively *	3.3	1.2	10	10	33	33	14	0
34 Should be taught in some other way *	3.8	1.2	10	5	14	43	29	0
35 Covered material in other courses *	3.4	1.2	10	14	24	33	19	0
36 Material was too difficult *	3.8	1.0	10	0	5	71	14	0
37 Course should continue to be offered	4.7	0.5	71	29	0	0	0	0
38 Reading assignments hard to understand *	3.1	1.2	10	24	24	29	14	0
39 I was often confused *	3.9	1.1	10	0	5	62	24	0
40 Generally, the course was good	4.7	0.5	71	29	0	0	0	0

SIUC Instructor and Course Evaluation Report

Name: YOUNG, Dept: POLS Course No.: POLS 375 Section: 001
 Number enrolled: . Number rating: 21 Date: 12/08

Part III: Objectives	Mean	SD	%E	%V	%G	%L	%N	%NR
41 Gaining factual knowledge	4.4	0.7	48	38	10	0	0	5
42 Learning fundamental principles	4.5	0.6	48	43	5	0	0	5
43 Learning to apply course material	4.5	0.5	43	52	0	0	0	5
44 Developing specific competencies	4.3	0.7	43	38	14	0	0	5
45 Professionals gain new knowledge	4.2	0.8	38	43	10	5	0	5
46 Creative capacities	4.1	0.8	29	43	24	0	0	5
47 Personal responsibility	3.9	1.0	33	24	29	10	0	5
48 Broader appreciation	4.3	0.7	43	38	14	0	0	5
49 Skill in expression	4.1	1.0	43	19	29	5	0	5
50 Implications of course for myself	4.1	1.1	43	24	24	0	5	5

Part IV: Self Rating	Mean	SD	%Y	%N	%NR
51 Strong interest in material	1.0	0.0	90	0	10
52 Strong interest in discipline	0.9	0.3	86	10	5
53 To obtain a good grade	0.8	0.4	76	14	10
54 To satisfy a requirement for major	0.9	0.4	81	14	5
55 To fulfill electives	0.6	0.5	48	38	14
56 Form adequately evaluates course	0.9	0.4	81	14	5

 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).