

control #164

St. Lawrence University Course Evaluation Summary
20102011 fall - ECON 200A - Quantitative Methods - Runst, Petrik

TOTAL EVALUATIONS	N
This Course	11
Total Undergraduate	7916

STUDENT BACKGROUND

Your primary reason(s) for enrolling in this course	Univ.
Major	10 91% 41%
Minor	1 9% 10%
Distribution/Diversity	- - 18%
Interest in subject	- - 29%
Instructor	- - 3%
Other	- - 9%
No response	- - -
<hr/>	
Unduplicated Count	11 100% 100%

Class Year	Univ.
First Year	- - 30%
Sophomore	8 73% 25%
Junior	3 27% 22%
Senior	- - 22%
Graduate Student	- - -
Other	- - 1%
<hr/>	
Total	11 100% 100%

Gender	Univ.
Male	9 82% 44%
Female	2 18% 53%
Other	- - 1%
Prefer not to disclose	- - 2%
<hr/>	
Total	11 100% 100%

STUDENT RESPONSES

Q1: Taking this course has been a valuable educational experience	Univ.
Agree strongly	- - 37%
Agree	8 73% 41%
Agree somewhat	2 18% 13%
Neutral	1 9% 5%
Disagree somewhat	- - 2%
Disagree	- - 2%
Disagree strongly	- - 1%
<hr/>	
Total	11 100% 100%

Q2: The course was effectively organized	Univ.
Agree strongly	2 18% 34%
Agree	7 64% 42%
Agree somewhat	2 18% 13%
Neutral	- - 5%
Disagree somewhat	- - 3%
Disagree	- - 1%
Disagree strongly	- - 1%
<hr/>	
Total	11 100% 100%

Q3: The instructor created an environment conducive to learning	Univ.
Agree Strongly	4 36% 41%
Agree	4 36% 40%
Agree Somewhat	2 18% 10%
Neutral	1 9% 5%
Disagree Somewhat	- - 2%
Disagree	- - 1%
Disagree Strongly	- - 1%
<hr/>	
Total	11 100% 100%

Q4a: In this course, the workload was	Univ.
Too High	- - 4%
(Somewhat High)	- - 17%
Appropriate	9 82% 76%
(Somewhat Low)	2 18% 3%
Too Low	- - -
<hr/>	
Total	11 100% 100%

Q4b: In this course, the grading standards were	Univ.
Too High	- - 7%
(Somewhat High)	2 18% 19%
Appropriate	9 82% 72%
(Somewhat Low)	- - 2%
Too Low	- - -
<hr/>	
Total	11 100% 100%

Q4c: In this course, the level of intellectual and/or creative sophistication required was	Univ.
Too High	- - 2%
(Somewhat High)	1 9% 17%
Appropriate	9 82% 75%
(Somewhat Low)	- - 5%
Too Low	1 9% 1%
<hr/>	
Total	11 100% 100%

* Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding. "Univ" refers to corresponding undergrad/graduate-level semester

Q5a: The instructor's assessments of student work were fair Univ.

Agree strongly	1	9%	27%
Agree	9	82%	48%
Agree somewhat	-	-	10%
Neutral	-	-	8%
Disagree somewhat	1	9%	5%
Disagree	-	-	1%
Disagree strongly	-	-	1%
Total	11	100%	100%

Q5b: The instructor's assessments of student work were timely Univ.

Agree strongly	1	9%	29%
Agree	9	82%	43%
Agree somewhat	-	-	11%
Neutral	-	-	9%
Disagree somewhat	1	9%	4%
Disagree	-	-	2%
Disagree strongly	-	-	1%
Total	11	100%	100%

Q5c: The instructor's assessments of student work were constructive Univ.

Agree strongly	1	9%	32%
Agree	6	55%	44%
Agree somewhat	1	9%	12%
Neutral	2	18%	8%
Disagree somewhat	-	-	3%
Disagree	1	9%	1%
Disagree strongly	-	-	1%
Total	11	100%	100%

Q6a: I would recommend this instructor to another student Univ.

Agree strongly	3	27%	46%
Agree	5	45%	32%
Agree somewhat	-	-	9%
Neutral	-	-	7%
Disagree somewhat	2	18%	3%
Disagree	1	9%	2%
Disagree strongly	-	-	2%
Total	11	100%	100%

Q6b: I would recommend this course to another student Univ.

Agree strongly	2	18%	39%
Agree	3	27%	34%
Agree somewhat	2	18%	12%
Neutral	2	18%	8%
Disagree somewhat	1	9%	3%
Disagree	1	9%	2%
Disagree strongly	-	-	2%
Total	11	100%	100%

Q6c: The instructor was an effective teacher Univ.

Agree strongly	1	9%	46%
Agree	7	64%	35%
Agree somewhat	1	9%	10%
Neutral	1	9%	6%
Disagree somewhat	1	9%	2%
Disagree	-	-	1%
Disagree strongly	-	-	1%
Total	11	100%	100%

Summary of Means

	Mean	Univ.
Q1: Taking this course has been a valuable educational experience	5.6	6.0
Q2: The course was effectively organized	6.0	5.9
Q3: The instructor created an environment conducive to learning	6.0	6.1
Q5a: The instructor's assessments of student work were fair	5.8	5.8
Q5b: The instructor's assessments of student work were timely	5.8	5.7
Q5c: The instructor's assessments of student work were constructive	5.3	5.9
Q6a: I would recommend this instructor to another student	5.4	6.0
Q6b: I would recommend this course to another student	5.0	5.9
Q6c: The instructor was an effective teacher	5.5	6.1

Scale:

7 = Agree Strongly, 6 = Agree, 5 = Agree Somewhat, 4 = Neutral, 3 = Disagree Somewhat, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Disagree Strongly

control #165

St. Lawrence University Course Evaluation Summary
20102011 fall - ECON 200B - Quantitative Methods - Runst, Petrik

TOTAL EVALUATIONS	N
This Course	10
Total Undergraduate	7916

STUDENT BACKGROUND

Your primary reason(s) for enrolling in this course	Univ.
Major	7 70% 41%
Minor	1 10% 10%
Distribution/Diversity	- - 18%
Interest in subject	1 10% 29%
Instructor	- - 3%
Other	1 10% 9%
No response	1 10% -
<hr/>	
Unduplicated Count	10 100% 100%

Class Year	Univ.
First Year	- - 30%
Sophomore	7 70% 25%
Junior	1 10% 22%
Senior	2 20% 22%
Graduate Student	- - -
Other	- - 1%
<hr/>	
Total	10 100% 100%

Gender	Univ.
Male	7 70% 44%
Female	3 30% 53%
Other	- - 1%
Prefer not to disclose	- - 2%
<hr/>	
Total	10 100% 100%

STUDENT RESPONSES

Q1: Taking this course has been a valuable educational experience	Univ.
Agree strongly	- - 37%
Agree	4 40% 41%
Agree somewhat	3 30% 13%
Neutral	3 30% 5%
Disagree somewhat	- - 2%
Disagree	- - 2%
Disagree strongly	- - 1%
<hr/>	
Total	10 100% 100%

Q2: The course was effectively organized	Univ.
Agree strongly	- - 34%
Agree	5 50% 42%
Agree somewhat	3 30% 13%
Neutral	2 20% 5%
Disagree somewhat	- - 3%
Disagree	- - 1%
Disagree strongly	- - 1%
<hr/>	
Total	10 100% 100%

Q3: The instructor created an environment conducive to learning	Univ.
Agree Strongly	1 10% 41%
Agree	7 70% 40%
Agree Somewhat	- - 10%
Neutral	1 10% 5%
Disagree Somewhat	1 10% 2%
Disagree	- - 1%
Disagree Strongly	- - 1%
<hr/>	
Total	10 100% 100%

Q4a: In this course, the workload was	Univ.
Too High	- - 4%
(Somewhat High)	- - 17%
Appropriate	10 100% 76%
(Somewhat Low)	- - 3%
Too Low	- - -
<hr/>	
Total	10 100% 100%

Q4b: In this course, the grading standards were	Univ.
Too High	- - 7%
(Somewhat High)	1 10% 19%
Appropriate	9 90% 72%
(Somewhat Low)	- - 2%
Too Low	- - -
<hr/>	
Total	10 100% 100%

Q4c: In this course, the level of intellectual and/or creative sophistication required was	Univ.
Too High	- - 2%
(Somewhat High)	1 10% 17%
Appropriate	8 80% 75%
(Somewhat Low)	1 10% 5%
Too Low	- - 1%
<hr/>	
Total	10 100% 100%

* Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding. "Univ" refers to corresponding undergrad/graduate-level semester

Q5a: The instructor's assessments of student work were fair Univ.

Agree strongly	-	-	27%
Agree	9	90%	48%
Agree somewhat	-	-	10%
Neutral	1	10%	8%
Disagree somewhat	-	-	5%
Disagree	-	-	1%
Disagree strongly	-	-	1%
Total	10	100%	100%

Q5b: The instructor's assessments of student work were timely Univ.

Agree strongly	1	11%	29%
Agree	7	78%	43%
Agree somewhat	1	11%	11%
Neutral	-	-	9%
Disagree somewhat	-	-	4%
Disagree	-	-	2%
Disagree strongly	-	-	1%
Total	9	100%	100%

Q5c: The instructor's assessments of student work were constructive Univ.

Agree strongly	1	10%	32%
Agree	7	70%	44%
Agree somewhat	1	10%	12%
Neutral	1	10%	8%
Disagree somewhat	-	-	3%
Disagree	-	-	1%
Disagree strongly	-	-	1%
Total	10	100%	100%

Q6a: I would recommend this instructor to another student Univ.

Agree strongly	-	-	46%
Agree	5	50%	32%
Agree somewhat	4	40%	9%
Neutral	1	10%	7%
Disagree somewhat	-	-	3%
Disagree	-	-	2%
Disagree strongly	-	-	2%
Total	10	100%	100%

Q6b: I would recommend this course to another student Univ.

Agree strongly	-	-	39%
Agree	4	40%	34%
Agree somewhat	3	30%	12%
Neutral	3	30%	8%
Disagree somewhat	-	-	3%
Disagree	-	-	2%
Disagree strongly	-	-	2%
Total	10	100%	100%

Q6c: The instructor was an effective teacher Univ.

Agree strongly	-	-	46%
Agree	6	60%	35%
Agree somewhat	4	40%	10%
Neutral	-	-	6%
Disagree somewhat	-	-	2%
Disagree	-	-	1%
Disagree strongly	-	-	1%
Total	10	100%	100%

Summary of Means

	Mean	Univ.
Q1: Taking this course has been a valuable educational experience	5.1	6.0
Q2: The course was effectively organized	5.3	5.9
Q3: The instructor created an environment conducive to learning	5.6	6.1
Q5a: The instructor's assessments of student work were fair	5.8	5.8
Q5b: The instructor's assessments of student work were timely	6.0	5.7
Q5c: The instructor's assessments of student work were constructive	5.8	5.9
Q6a: I would recommend this instructor to another student	5.4	6.0
Q6b: I would recommend this course to another student	5.1	5.9
Q6c: The instructor was an effective teacher	5.6	6.1

Scale:

7 = Agree Strongly, 6 = Agree, 5 = Agree Somewhat, 4 = Neutral, 3 = Disagree Somewhat, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Disagree Strongly