

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

Lisa Staiano-Coico
 Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

Phone: (215) 204-4775
 Fax: (215) 204-5816
 E-mail: provost@temple.edu

To: Instructors Who Taught Courses in Spring 2008

From: Lisa Staiano-Coico

Subject: Course and Teaching Evaluations

Date: June 6, 2008

Included in this report are the results from the student evaluations for your course in spring 2008. The results are based on those student evaluations that were returned to your college or departmental office by the student volunteer from your course. This message contains a summary of the rating data and a listing of all the comments made by the students in your course to the open-ended questions on the evaluation form. A brief explanation of how to interpret the data is presented below.

Data from a hypothetical course section for Question 1 within the “General Information About the Instructor” area:

		Strongly Agree = 5	Agree = 4	Neutral = 3	Disagree = 2	Strongly Disagree = 1	Not Applicable or Did Not Answer	Mean	SD	Pct'l Rank
ENROLLMENT:	14									
RETURNED FORMS:	12									
1. The instructor clearly explained the educational objectives of this course.	n = 12	(7)	(4)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	58%	33%	8%	0%	0%		4.50	0.65	
	Department	41%	43%	11%	4%	2%		4.17	0.89	74
	College	44%	42%	9%	3%	1%		4.25	0.85	68
	Level	46%	40%	9%	3%	2%		4.24	0.89	59
	University	45%	41%	9%	4%	2%		4.23	0.89	66

The data presented above indicate that there were 14 students enrolled in the course, but that only 12 returned the evaluation form. The first line in the table reports the number of students who used each of the possible ratings. Thus, of the 12 students who completed the

rating form, 7 indicated that they “Strongly Agree” with the statement that “The instructor clearly explained the educational objectives of this course”, four indicated that they “Agree” with this statement, one student reported “Neutral”, and no student indicated disagreement with the statement. In addition, no student checked “Not Applicable” or did not answer the question.

The second line of the table (labeled “Section”) presents these same data converted into percentages. Since 7 out of the 12 students used the rating of “Strongly Agree”, this is 58% of the ratings. The 4 students who indicated that they “Agree” with the statement represent 33% of the ratings, and so on. Using a value of 5 for “Strongly Agree,” 4 for “Agree,” 3 for “Neutral” and so on, the mean (or average) for this section is 4.50. The column labeled “SD” (for Standard Deviation) is an indication of the dispersion of the ratings. Since most of the students rated the course fairly highly, the dispersion of these ratings is relatively small.

The final four lines of the table report the data for different comparison groups. These groups are:

Third line (Department):	All of the courses in the same department as the hypothetical course
Fourth line (College):	All of the courses in the same college as the hypothetical course
Fifth line (Level):	All of the courses, across the University, at the same level (lower division undergraduate, upper division undergraduate, or graduate/professional) as the hypothetical course
Sixth line (University):	All of the courses across the entire University

The final number in the table at the end of lines three through six is a percentile rank that is provided as one way to compare an instructor’s ratings to these different groups. For example, on the bottom line, the table indicates that for Question 1, the average score for all University courses rated in the sample semester was 4.23. When the average Question 1 scores for all University courses are listed from top to bottom, the hypothetical course’s average of 4.50 is at the 66th percentile. That is, 66% of all the courses had average scores lower than the hypothetical’s on Question 1. These data are reported for all 15 questions on the evaluation form.

The additional data that are reported (page 1 of your report) were derived from the questions at the top of the student evaluation form. These questions ask the students to indicate what their interest was in the course prior to taking it, what grade they expect to get, whether the course was required or elected, and the number of hours per week spent preparing for the course. As before, comparison data are provided.

Please be advised that data are not reported for any course in which the enrollment is less than eight. This decision was made to ensure that anonymity is maintained for students whose identity might be determined in courses with limited enrollment.

If you have suggestions about the way the form is structured or about the way the data are reported, please send your suggestions to provost@temple.edu. Thank you for your participation.

Temple University Course and Teaching Evaluation - Spring 2008

CRN: **066007**
 INSTR. NAME: **JOHNSON, MICHAEL**
 DEPARTMENT: **MATH (01305)**
 COURSE #: **4096**
 SECT. #: **001**
 CAMPUS: **BROAD AND MONTGOMERY**
 COLLEGE: **SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**

TIMES TAUGHT: **FIRST TIME**
 INSTR. TUID: **911971176**
 COURSE NAME: **SR PROBLEM SOLVING SEM**
 INSTRUCTOR: **1 of 1**

ENROLLMENT: **10**
 COMPLETED EVALUATIONS: **9**

		Low = 1	Moderate = 2	High = 3	Not Answered	Mean	SD	Pct'l Rank
1. Before enrolling, my level of interest in the subject matter of this course was	n= 9	(1)	(6)	(2)	(0)			
Section		11%	67%	22%		2.11	0.57	
Department		35%	47%	18%		1.84	0.71	74
College		24%	51%	25%		2.01	0.70	59
Level		12%	44%	44%		2.32	0.68	23
University		17%	47%	36%		2.20	0.70	38

		A = 4	B = 3	C = 2	D = 1	F = 0			
2. Expected grade in this course	n= 8	(2)	(3)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(1)		
Section		25%	38%	38%	0%	0%		2.88	0.78
Department		32%	43%	21%	2%	1%		3.05	0.83
College		35%	46%	17%	1%	0%		3.14	0.77
Level		47%	43%	9%	0%	0%		3.38	0.67
University		45%	44%	10%	1%	0%		3.34	0.68

		Required = 1	Elective = 2					
3. Course was: Required or Elective	n= 9	(9)	(0)			(0)		
Section		100%	0%				1.00	0.00
Department		94%	6%				1.06	0.24
College		89%	11%				1.11	0.31
Level		69%	31%				1.31	0.46
University		73%	27%				1.27	0.44

		Less than 1 = 1	1-3 = 2	4-6 = 3	7-9 = 4	More than 9 = 5			
4. Hours per week spent preparing for course	n= 9	(1)	(1)	(3)	(4)	(0)	(0)		
Section		11%	11%	33%	44%	0%		3.11	0.99
Department		14%	46%	30%	7%	3%		2.41	0.93
College		10%	44%	31%	9%	6%		2.57	0.99
Level		9%	47%	31%	8%	5%		2.51	0.94
University		11%	48%	29%	7%	4%		2.45	0.93

Temple University Course and Teaching Evaluation - Spring 2008

CRN: **066007**
 INSTR. NAME: **JOHNSON, MICHAEL**
 DEPARTMENT: **MATH (01305)**
 COURSE #: **4096**
 SECT. #: **001**
 CAMPUS: **BROAD AND MONTGOMERY**
 COLLEGE: **SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**

TIMES TAUGHT: **FIRST TIME**
 INSTR. TUIID: **911971176**
 COURSE NAME: **SR PROBLEM SOLVING SEM**
 INSTRUCTOR: **1 of 1**

ENROLLMENT: **10**
 COMPLETED EVALUATIONS: **9**

		Strongly Agree = 5	Agree = 4	Neutral = 3	Disagree = 2	Strongly Disagree = 1	Not Answered	Mean	SD	Per'l Rank
1. The instructor clearly explained the educational objectives of this course.	n= 9	(6)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%		4.67	0.47	
	Department	42%	40%	12%	4%	2%		4.15	0.93	88
	College	42%	41%	11%	4%	2%		4.16	0.93	87
	Level	50%	39%	7%	3%	1%		4.32	0.84	79
	University	47%	40%	9%	3%	2%		4.28	0.86	81
2. The instructor was well organized and prepared for class.	n= 9	(6)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%		4.67	0.47	
	Department	47%	38%	10%	3%	1%		4.28	0.86	81
	College	46%	39%	9%	3%	2%		4.25	0.88	81
	Level	53%	36%	7%	3%	1%		4.36	0.84	74
	University	51%	37%	8%	3%	1%		4.33	0.84	76
3. So far, the instructor has graded fairly.	n= 9	(6)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%		4.67	0.47	
	Department	47%	37%	10%	4%	2%		4.25	0.90	84
	College	44%	37%	12%	4%	3%		4.15	0.97	84
	Level	49%	36%	10%	4%	2%		4.26	0.92	81
	University	48%	36%	11%	3%	2%		4.24	0.91	81
4. The instructor scheduled time and was available to students outside of class.	n= 9	(7)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	78%	22%	0%	0%	0%		4.78	0.42	
	Department	43%	37%	16%	3%	1%		4.18	0.88	93
	College	41%	38%	16%	3%	1%		4.15	0.89	94
	Level	47%	37%	13%	2%	1%		4.25	0.85	92
	University	45%	37%	15%	2%	1%		4.22	0.86	93
5. The instructor provided prompt feedback about exams, projects, rehearsals, and performances.	n= 9	(6)	(2)	(0)	(1)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	67%	22%	0%	11%	0%		4.44	0.96	
	Department	45%	39%	11%	4%	2%		4.23	0.89	61
	College	42%	39%	12%	4%	2%		4.16	0.94	65
	Level	47%	37%	10%	4%	2%		4.25	0.90	58
	University	45%	38%	11%	4%	2%		4.21	0.92	61
6. The instructor consistently started and ended class on time.	n= 9	(6)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%		4.67	0.47	
	Department	49%	40%	7%	3%	1%		4.33	0.82	83
	College	47%	42%	7%	2%	1%		4.31	0.81	84
	Level	52%	39%	6%	3%	1%		4.38	0.80	78
	University	50%	40%	6%	3%	1%		4.35	0.81	80
7. The instructor promoted a classroom atmosphere in which I felt free to ask questions and express my opinions.	n= 9	(7)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	78%	22%	0%	0%	0%		4.78	0.42	
	Department	46%	36%	11%	4%	3%		4.19	0.96	91
	College	46%	36%	11%	4%	3%		4.19	0.97	88
	Level	55%	32%	8%	3%	2%		4.37	0.88	82
	University	53%	34%	9%	3%	2%		4.33	0.89	83
8. The instructor taught this course well.	n= 9	(7)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	78%	22%	0%	0%	0%		4.78	0.42	
	Department	44%	33%	14%	6%	4%		4.08	1.06	91
	College	43%	34%	13%	5%	4%		4.08	1.06	90
	Level	51%	32%	10%	4%	3%		4.25	0.98	84
	University	49%	33%	11%	4%	3%		4.21	0.99	86

Temple University Course and Teaching Evaluation - Spring 2008

CRN: **066007**
 INSTR. NAME: **JOHNSON, MICHAEL**
 DEPARTMENT: **MATH (01305)**
 COURSE #: **4096**
 SECT. #: **001**
 CAMPUS: **BROAD AND MONTGOMERY**
 COLLEGE: **SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**

TIMES TAUGHT: **FIRST TIME**
 INSTR. TUID: **911971176**
 COURSE NAME: **SR PROBLEM SOLVING SEM**
 INSTRUCTOR: **1 of 1**

ENROLLMENT: **10**
 COMPLETED EVALUATIONS: **9**

		Strongly Agree = 5	Agree = 4	Neutral = 3	Disagree = 2	Strongly Disagree = 1	Not Answered	Mean	SD	Per'l Rank
1. The course materials (textbook, handouts, etc.) and course activities were useful and of high quality.	n= 9	(4)	(5)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	44%	56%	0%	0%	0%		4.44	0.50	
	Department	29%	42%	18%	7%	4%		3.84	1.05	93
	College	29%	42%	18%	7%	4%		3.85	1.04	92
	Level	36%	40%	15%	6%	3%		4.01	1.00	81
	University	34%	41%	16%	6%	3%		3.99	0.99	83
2. I learned a great deal in this course.	n= 9	(6)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%		4.67	0.47	
	Department	28%	41%	21%	7%	3%		3.83	1.02	97
	College	30%	43%	18%	6%	3%		3.92	0.97	96
	Level	42%	39%	12%	4%	2%		4.16	0.93	87
	University	39%	41%	14%	4%	2%		4.10	0.94	90
3. I increased my ability to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view.	n= 8	(3)	(5)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(1)			
	Section	38%	63%	0%	0%	0%		4.38	0.48	
	Department	25%	37%	28%	7%	3%		3.72	1.02	92
	College	26%	39%	26%	7%	3%		3.78	1.00	89
	Level	38%	39%	18%	5%	2%		4.05	0.94	73
	University	34%	39%	20%	5%	2%		3.99	0.96	77
4. Information technology (Internet, e-mail, courseware, etc.) was used effectively in the course.	n= 6	(3)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(3)			
	Section	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%		4.50	0.50	
	Department	25%	33%	27%	9%	5%		3.65	1.10	95
	College	32%	39%	20%	6%	3%		3.92	1.01	89
	Level	39%	39%	16%	4%	2%		4.10	0.93	82
	University	37%	40%	17%	4%	2%		4.05	0.94	85
5. I gained an interest in learning more about the material covered in this course.	n= 9	(3)	(3)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	33%	33%	33%	0%	0%		4.00	0.82	
	Department	19%	26%	29%	16%	9%		3.31	1.21	91
	College	24%	34%	25%	11%	6%		3.59	1.15	77
	Level	40%	36%	15%	6%	3%		4.03	1.03	41
	University	35%	36%	18%	7%	4%		3.92	1.07	49
6. This course had value to me.	n= 9	(3)	(5)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	33%	56%	11%	0%	0%		4.22	0.63	
	Department	24%	38%	23%	9%	6%		3.67	1.11	88
	College	28%	40%	20%	7%	4%		3.81	1.06	77
	Level	43%	38%	12%	4%	2%		4.16	0.95	46
	University	39%	39%	14%	5%	3%		4.06	0.99	54
7. The workload for this course was	n= 9	(0)	(3)	(6)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	0%	33%	67%	0%	0%		3.33	0.47	
	Department	3%	24%	61%	11%	1%		3.18	0.70	63
	College	9%	32%	51%	8%	1%		3.41	0.77	50
	Level	6%	29%	57%	8%	1%		3.32	0.72	56
	University	5%	27%	58%	9%	1%		3.27	0.72	60

Temple University Course and Teaching Evaluation - Spring 2008

CRN: 066007
INSTR. NAME: JOHNSON, MICHAEL

INSTRUCTOR: 1 of 1

Additional Items Report

Below is an analysis of responses in the "Additional Items" section of the student sheets.

This section was not scored because either additional (optional) items were not used or no additional items were answered.

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. What aspects of the course or the instructor's approach contributed most to your learning?

Dr. Johnson was extremely approachable and a great teacher.

2. What aspects of the course or the instructor's approach would you change to improve the learning that takes place in the course?

nothing

3. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (for example, political viewpoint, race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, sexual identity and disability) of the students in the class.

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. What aspects of the course or the instructor's approach contributed most to your learning?

He knew the topic very well.

2. What aspects of the course or the instructor's approach would you change to improve the learning that takes place in the course?

Nothing

3. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (for example, political viewpoint, race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, sexual identity and disability) of the students in the class.

N/A

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. What aspects of the course or the instructor's approach contributed most to your learning?

Since Mike was near the same age as us, it was much easier to identify w/ him. Also, it wasn't too long ago that he was a student so he really taught at a level where undergrads could truly understand the material, unlike other math instructors.

2. What aspects of the course or the instructor's approach would you change to improve the learning that takes place in the course?

3. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (for example, political viewpoint, race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, sexual identity and disability) of the students in the class.

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. What aspects of the course or the instructor's approach contributed most to your learning?

Mike is a brilliant guy. His biggest strength is his love for math. He has a well-rounded approach & is easy to talk to.

I hope you guys hold on to Mike for a while b/c he is one of the best teachers in the math department.

2. What aspects of the course or the instructor's approach would you change to improve the learning that takes place in the course?

3. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (for example, political viewpoint, race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, sexual identity and disability) of the students in the class.

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. What aspects of the course or the instructor's approach contributed most to your learning?

Examples , explanations .

2. What aspects of the course or the instructor's approach would you change to improve the learning that takes place in the course?

None .

3. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (for example, political viewpoint, race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, sexual identity and disability) of the students in the class.

Taught well .

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. What aspects of the course or the instructor's approach contributed most to your learning?

I liked Dr. Johnson's lecturing style

2. What aspects of the course or the instructor's approach would you change to improve the learning that takes place in the course?

I wish we started the projects earlier

3. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (for example, political viewpoint, race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, sexual identity and disability) of the students in the class.

Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. What aspects of the course or the instructor's approach contributed most to your learning?

Instructor was very interested in the students. This made the course a wonderful learning experience.

2. What aspects of the course or the instructor's approach would you change to improve the learning that takes place in the course?

Return homework sooner so we can learn more before the next hw.

3. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (for example, political viewpoint, race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, sexual identity and disability) of the students in the class.

