

**St. Lawrence University Course Evaluation Summary - Control #161
20102011 spr - ECON 200A - Quantitative Methods - Runst, Petrik**

TOTAL EVALUATIONS

This Course	19
Total Undergraduate	7456

STUDENT BACKGROUNDS

Your primary reason(s) for enrolling in this course

			Univ.
Major	17	89%	45%
Minor	-	-	11%
Distribution/Diversity	2	11%	15%
Interest in subject	-	-	28%
Instructor	-	-	5%
Other	-	-	9%
Unduplicated Count	19	100%	100%

Gender

			Univ.
Male	10	56%	43%
Female	8	44%	53%
Other	-	-	1%
Prefer not to disclose	-	-	3%
Total	18	100%	100%

Class Year

			Univ.
First Year	10	53%	31%
Sophomore	5	26%	26%
Junior	4	21%	21%
Senior	-	-	21%
Graduate Student	-	-	-
Other	-	-	1%
Total	19	100%	100%

STUDENT RESPONSES

Q1: Taking this course has been a valuable educational experience

			Univ.
Agree strongly	1	5%	36%
Agree	12	63%	43%
Agree somewhat	3	16%	13%
Neutral	1	5%	5%
Disagree somewhat	2	11%	2%
Disagree	-	-	2%
Disagree strongly	-	-	1%
Total	19	100%	100%

Q2: The course was effectively organized

			Univ.
Agree strongly	6	33%	33%
Agree	9	50%	43%
Agree somewhat	1	6%	13%
Neutral	2	11%	5%
Disagree somewhat	-	-	3%
Disagree	-	-	2%
Disagree strongly	-	-	1%
Total	18	100%	100%

Q3: The instructor created an environment conducive to learning

			Univ.
Agree Strongly	2	11%	42%
Agree	12	63%	40%
Agree Somewhat	4	21%	11%
Neutral	-	-	4%
Disagree Somewhat	1	5%	2%
Disagree	-	-	1%
Disagree Strongly	-	-	-
Total	19	100%	100%

Q4a: In this course, the workload was

			Univ.
Too High	-	-	4%
(Somewhat High)	-	-	14%
Appropriate	17	89%	79%
(Somewhat Low)	2	11%	2%
Too Low	-	-	-
Total	19	100%	100%

Q4b: In this course, the grading standards were

			Univ.
Too High	1	6%	7%
(Somewhat High)	2	11%	18%
Appropriate	15	83%	73%
(Somewhat Low)	-	-	2%
Too Low	-	-	-
Total	18	100%	100%

Q4c: In this course, the level of intellectual and/or creative sophistication required was

			Univ.
Too High	-	-	2%
(Somewhat High)	5	28%	16%
Appropriate	13	72%	78%
(Somewhat Low)	-	-	4%
Too Low	-	-	1%
Total	18	100%	100%

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

Q5a: The instructor's assessments of student work were fair			
			Univ.
Agree strongly	1	5%	27%
Agree	12	63%	49%
Agree somewhat	2	11%	11%
Neutral	4	21%	8%
Disagree somewhat	-	-	4%
Disagree	-	-	2%
Disagree strongly	-	-	1%
Total	19	100%	100%

Q5b: The instructor's assessments of student work were timely			
			Univ.
Agree strongly	1	5%	29%
Agree	13	68%	43%
Agree somewhat	3	16%	11%
Neutral	2	11%	8%
Disagree somewhat	-	-	4%
Disagree	-	-	3%
Disagree strongly	-	-	1%
Total	19	100%	100%

Q5c: The instructor's assessments of student work were constructive			
			Univ.
Agree strongly	1	5%	31%
Agree	10	53%	44%
Agree somewhat	3	16%	12%
Neutral	3	16%	8%
Disagree somewhat	2	11%	3%
Disagree	-	-	1%
Disagree strongly	-	-	1%
Total	19	100%	100%

Q6a: I would recommend this instructor to another student			
			Univ.
Agree strongly	3	16%	46%
Agree	11	58%	32%
Agree somewhat	3	16%	9%
Neutral	1	5%	6%
Disagree somewhat	-	-	3%
Disagree	-	-	2%
Disagree strongly	1	5%	2%
Total	19	100%	100%

Q6b: I would recommend this course to another student			
			Univ.
Agree strongly	5	26%	39%
Agree	9	47%	34%
Agree somewhat	4	21%	12%
Neutral	1	5%	9%
Disagree somewhat	-	-	3%
Disagree	-	-	3%
Disagree strongly	-	-	2%
Total	19	100%	100%

Q6c: The instructor was an effective teacher			
			Univ.
Agree strongly	4	21%	45%
Agree	11	58%	34%
Agree somewhat	1	5%	10%
Neutral	1	5%	6%
Disagree somewhat	1	5%	2%
Disagree	1	5%	1%
Disagree strongly	-	-	1%
Total	19	100%	100%

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

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

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

**St. Lawrence University Course Evaluation Summary - Control #162
20102011 spr - ECON 200B - Quantitative Methods - Runst, Petrik**

TOTAL EVALUATIONS

This Course	14
Total Undergraduate	7456

STUDENT BACKGROUNDS

Your primary reason(s) for enrolling in this course

			Univ.
Major	9	64%	45%
Minor	4	29%	11%
Distribution/Diversity	1	7%	15%
Interest in subject	1	7%	28%
Instructor	-	-	5%
Other	1	7%	9%
Unduplicated Count	14	100%	100%

Gender

			Univ.
Male	11	85%	43%
Female	2	15%	53%
Other	-	-	1%
Prefer not to disclose	-	-	3%
Total	13	100%	100%

Class Year

			Univ.
First Year	4	29%	31%
Sophomore	9	64%	26%
Junior	1	7%	21%
Senior	-	-	21%
Graduate Student	-	-	-
Other	-	-	1%
Total	14	100%	100%

STUDENT RESPONSES

Q1: Taking this course has been a valuable educational experience

			Univ.
Agree strongly	2	14%	36%
Agree	3	21%	43%
Agree somewhat	3	21%	13%
Neutral	2	14%	5%
Disagree somewhat	2	14%	2%
Disagree	2	14%	2%
Disagree strongly	-	-	1%
Total	14	100%	100%

Q2: The course was effectively organized

			Univ.
Agree strongly	2	15%	33%
Agree	4	31%	43%
Agree somewhat	2	15%	13%
Neutral	1	8%	5%
Disagree somewhat	-	-	3%
Disagree	4	31%	2%
Disagree strongly	-	-	1%
Total	13	100%	100%

Q3: The instructor created an environment conducive to learning

			Univ.
Agree Strongly	5	36%	42%
Agree	6	43%	40%
Agree Somewhat	1	7%	11%
Neutral	2	14%	4%
Disagree Somewhat	-	-	2%
Disagree	-	-	1%
Disagree Strongly	-	-	-
Total	14	100%	100%

Q4a: In this course, the workload was

			Univ.
Too High	-	-	4%
(Somewhat High)	-	-	14%
Appropriate	14	100%	79%
(Somewhat Low)	-	-	2%
Too Low	-	-	-
Total	14	100%	100%

Q4b: In this course, the grading standards were

			Univ.
Too High	1	7%	7%
(Somewhat High)	2	14%	18%
Appropriate	10	71%	73%
(Somewhat Low)	1	7%	2%
Too Low	-	-	-
Total	14	100%	100%

Q4c: In this course, the level of intellectual and/or creative sophistication required was

			Univ.
Too High	-	-	2%
(Somewhat High)	3	21%	16%
Appropriate	8	57%	78%
(Somewhat Low)	2	14%	4%
Too Low	1	7%	1%
Total	14	100%	100%

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

Q5a: The instructor's assessments of student work were fair			
			Univ.
Agree strongly	3	21%	27%
Agree	7	50%	49%
Agree somewhat	-	-	11%
Neutral	-	-	8%
Disagree somewhat	3	21%	4%
Disagree	1	7%	2%
Disagree strongly	-	-	1%
Total	14	100%	100%

Q5b: The instructor's assessments of student work were timely			
			Univ.
Agree strongly	5	36%	29%
Agree	7	50%	43%
Agree somewhat	1	7%	11%
Neutral	1	7%	8%
Disagree somewhat	-	-	4%
Disagree	-	-	3%
Disagree strongly	-	-	1%
Total	14	100%	100%

Q5c: The instructor's assessments of student work were constructive			
			Univ.
Agree strongly	4	29%	31%
Agree	6	43%	44%
Agree somewhat	-	-	12%
Neutral	1	7%	8%
Disagree somewhat	2	14%	3%
Disagree	1	7%	1%
Disagree strongly	-	-	1%
Total	14	100%	100%

Q6a: I would recommend this instructor to another student			
			Univ.
Agree strongly	4	29%	46%
Agree	4	29%	32%
Agree somewhat	1	7%	9%
Neutral	3	21%	6%
Disagree somewhat	-	-	3%
Disagree	1	7%	2%
Disagree strongly	1	7%	2%
Total	14	100%	100%

Q6b: I would recommend this course to another student			
			Univ.
Agree strongly	2	14%	39%
Agree	5	36%	34%
Agree somewhat	3	21%	12%
Neutral	4	29%	9%
Disagree somewhat	-	-	3%
Disagree	-	-	3%
Disagree strongly	-	-	2%
Total	14	100%	100%

Q6c: The instructor was an effective teacher			
			Univ.
Agree strongly	4	29%	45%
Agree	4	29%	34%
Agree somewhat	1	7%	10%
Neutral	1	7%	6%
Disagree somewhat	2	14%	2%
Disagree	2	14%	1%
Disagree strongly	-	-	1%
Total	14	100%	100%

Summary of Means	Mean	Univ.
Q1: Taking this course has been a valuable educational experience	- 4.6	6.0
Q2: The course was effectively organized	- 4.6	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	- 5.3	5.8
Q5b: The instructor's assessments of student work were timely	- 6.1	5.7
Q5c: The instructor's assessments of student work were constructive	- 5.4	5.9
Q6a: I would recommend this instructor to another student	- 5.1	6.0
Q6b: I would recommend this course to another student	- 5.4	5.8
Q6c: The instructor was an effective teacher	- 5.1	6.1

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

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