

Fall 2016 - Office of Institutional Research

Course: ENGL_115-010-FA16-01: Illness Narratives(Includes HMS 115-010)

1 - Overall, the instruc	ctor's teach	ing was e	ffective										
James McAdams													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	17	85%					4.85	4.64		4.44
Agree Somewhat			(4)	3	15%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%								
			•			0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	it	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
20/27 (74.07%)	4.85	0.37	5.00	1,22	23	4.64	0.66	5.00		12,623	4.44	0.90	5.00

2 - Overall, the quality	of the cou	rse was g	ood										
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent l	Responses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	17	85%					4.85	4.59		4.43
Agree Somewhat			(4)	3	15%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%								
			•			0	25 5	0 75	100	Instructor	Departmen	it	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
20/27 (74.07%)	4.85	0.37	5.00	1,22	20	4.59	0.73	5.00		12,473	4.43	0.90	5.00





Fall 2016 - Office of Institutional Research

Course: ENGL_115-010-FA16-01: Illness Narratives(Includes HMS 115-010)

5 - The instructor gav	e good exa	mples of t	he concep	ots									
James McAdams													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	17	85%					4.85	4.69		4.53
Agree Somewhat			(4)	3	15%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%	7							
			•			0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	it	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
20/27 (74.07%)	4.85	0.37	5.00	1,22	24	4.69	0.64	5.00		12,599	4.53	0.84	5.00

6 - The instructor ans	wered ques	tions clea	rly and co	ncisely									
James McAdams													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	16	80%					4.75	4.68		4.45
Agree Somewhat			(4)	3	15%								
Neutral			(3)	1	5%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%	7							
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%	7							
				•		0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	t	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
20/27 (74.07%)	4.75	0.55	5.00	1,22	25	4.68	0.64	5.00		12,608	4.45	0.91	5.00

7 - The instructor kne	w the subje	ct well											
James McAdams													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	20	100%					5.00	4.87		4.82
Agree Somewhat			(4)	0	0%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%								
			•			0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	t	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
20/27 (74.07%)	5.00	0.00	5.00	1,22	25	4.87	0.43	5.00		12,612	4.82	0.52	5.00

8 - The instructor was	generally v	vell prepa	red for the	class									
James McAdams													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	12	60%					4.50	4.76		4.74
Agree Somewhat			(4)	6	30%								
Neutral			(3)	2	10%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%								
			•			0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	it	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
20/27 (74.07%)	4.50	0.69	5.00	1,22	26	4.76	0.60	5.00		12,612	4.74	0.62	5.00

Fall 2016 - Office of Institutional Research

Course: ENGL_115-010-FA16-01: Illness Narratives(Includes HMS 115-010)

9 - The instructor was	enthusiast	ic about t	eaching										
James McAdams													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	17	85%					4.85	4.84		4.69
Agree Somewhat			(4)	3	15%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%	7							
						0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	t	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
20/27 (74.07%)	4.85	0.37	5.00	1,22	25	4.84	0.46	5.00		12,604	4.69	0.69	5.00

10 - The instructor wa	s helpful w	hen stude	nts were	confused									
James McAdams													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	18	94.74%					4.95	4.70		4.50
Agree Somewhat			(4)	1	5.26%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%								
						0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	t	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
19/27 (70.37%)	4.95	0.23	5.00	1,22	25	4.70	0.65	5.00		12,599	4.50	0.89	5.00


11 - The instructor tre	ated studer	nts with re	spect										
James McAdams													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	19	95%					4.95	4.85		4.77
Agree Somewhat			(4)	1	5%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%								
						0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	t	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
20/27 (74.07%)	4.95	0.22	5.00	1,22	25	4.85	0.45	5.00		12,609	4.77	0.62	5.00


12 - Interaction between	en students	and insti	ructor was	positive									
James McAdams													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	20	100%					5.00	4.82		4.69
Agree Somewhat			(4)	0	0%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%	1							
			ı			0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	it	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
20/27 (74.07%)	5.00	0.00	5.00	1,22	25	4.82	0.51	5.00		12,605	4.69	0.70	5.00


Fall 2016 - Office of Institutional Research

Course: ENGL_115-010-FA16-01: Illness Narratives(Includes HMS 115-010)

James McAdams													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	18	90%					4.90	4.85	-	4.59
Agree Somewhat			(4)	2	10%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%								
						0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	t	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
20/27 (74.07%)	4.90	0.31	5.00	1,22	24	4.85	0.46	5.00		12,564	4.59	0.77	5.00








Fall 2016 - Office of Institutional Research

Course: ENGL_115-010-FA16-01: Illness Narratives(Includes HMS 115-010)

17 - The text/readings	were valua	ble in lea	rning cour	se content									
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	lesponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	15	75%					4.70	4.44		4.24
Agree Somewhat			(4)	4	20%								
Neutral			(3)	1	5%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%								
						0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	it	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
20/27 (74.07%)	4.70	0.57	5.00	1,22	22	4.44	0.85	5.00		12,300	4.24	1.04	5.00

18 - The assignments	helped me	learn the	subject m	atter									
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	lesponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	16	80%					4.75	4.47		4.40
Agree Somewhat			(4)	3	15%								
Neutral			(3)	1	5%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%								
			•			0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	it	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
20/27 (74.07%)	4.75	0.55	5.00	1,22	23	4.47	0.81	5.00		12,353	4.40	0.92	5.00

19 - Test and papers	were graded	d and retu	rned prom	ptly										
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Pe	rcent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	16	80%						4.75	4.30		4.51
Agree Somewhat			(4)	3	15%									
Neutral			(3)	1	5%									
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%									
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%	7								
			•			0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	it	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean		STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
20/27 (74.07%)	4.75	0.55	5.00	1,2	19	4.30		1.01	5.00		12,309	4.51	0.86	5.00



Fall 2016 - Office of Institutional Research

Course: ENGL_115-010-FA16-01: Illness Narratives(Includes HMS 115-010)

21 - I would recomme	nd this cou	rse to oth	er student	ts										
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Perce	ent Re	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	18	90%						4.90	4.42		4.27
Agree Somewhat			(4)	2	10%									
Neutral			(3)	0	0%	7								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%	7								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%									
						0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	nt	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	S1	TD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
20/27 (74.07%)	4.90	0.31	5.00	1,22	23	4.42	0.9	.95	5.00		12,347	4.27	1.10	5.00

22 - Discussions clari	fied lecture	material											
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent l	Responses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	0	0%						4.82	1	4.45
Agree Somewhat			(4)	0	0%	7							
Neutral			(3)	0	0%	7							
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%	7							
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%	7							
Not Applicable			(0)	0	0%	7							
						0	25 5	0 75	100	Instructor	Departmer	nt	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
0/27 (0%)	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,1:	29	4.82	0.45	5.00		12,118	4.45	0.91	5.00

23 - The recitation ins	tructor was	an effect	ive discus	sion leader									
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	0	0%						4.77		4.38
Agree Somewhat			(4)	0	0%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%								
Not Applicable			(0)	0	0%								
			•			0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmer	nt	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
0/27 (0%)	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,1	29	4.77	0.50	5.00		12,114	4.38	0.97	5.00

24 - The recitation ins	tructor was	well prep	ared										
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	0	0%						4.76		4.62
Agree Somewhat			(4)	0	0%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%								
Not Applicable			(0)	0	0%								
						0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	t	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
0/27 (0%)	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,12	29	4.76	0.51	5.00		12,113	4.62	0.76	5.00


Fall 2016 - Office of Institutional Research

Course: ENGL_115-010-FA16-01: Illness Narratives(Includes HMS 115-010)

25 - The recitation ins	tructor was	able to e	xplain the	material									
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	0	0%						4.78		4.52
Agree Somewhat			(4)	0	0%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%								
Not Applicable			(0)	0	0%								
						0 2	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	it	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
0/27 (0%)	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,12	29	4.78	0.51	5.00		12,113	4.52	0.89	5.00

26 - The recitation add	ded to the o	verall val	ue of the c	ourse		_							
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent F	Responses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	0	0%						4.77		4.42
Agree Somewhat			(4)	0	0%	7							
Neutral			(3)	0	0%	7							
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%	7							
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%	7							
Not Applicable			(0)	0	0%	7							
			'			0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmer	nt	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
0/27 (0%)	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,12	29	4.77	0.51	5.00		12,113	4.42	0.98	5.00

27 - The lab clarified t	ne lecture r	naterial											
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	0	0%						4.71		4.04
Agree Somewhat			(4)	0	0%								4.04
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%								
Not Applicable			(0)	0	0%								
						0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmer	it	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
0/27 (0%)	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,12	29	4.71	0.56	5.00		12,195	4.04	1.14	4.00




Fall 2016 - Office of Institutional Research

Course: ENGL_115-010-FA16-01: Illness Narratives(Includes HMS 115-010)

29 - The lab instructor	was helpfu	ıl answeri	ng questi	ons									
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent F	Responses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	0	0%						4.74		4.44
Agree Somewhat			(4)	0	0%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%								
Not Applicable			(0)	0	0%								
			•			0	25 5	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	nt	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
0/27 (0%)	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,12	29	4.74	0.56	5.00		12,194	4.44	0.95	5.00

30 - The amount of we	ork was app	ropriate f	or a lab										
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	0	0%						4.68		0.00
Agree Somewhat			(4)	0	0%							ı	3.98
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%								
Not Applicable			(0)	0	0%								
			•			0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	nt	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
0/27 (0%)	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,12	29	4.68	0.58	5.00		12,191	3.98	1.30	4.00





Fall 2016 - Office of Institutional Research

Course: ENGL_001-028-FA16-01: Crit Reading and Composition

1 - Overall, the instru	ctor's teach	ing was e	ffective										
James McAdams													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	12	75%					4.75	4.64		4.44
Agree Somewhat			(4)	4	25%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%	7							
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%	7							
			•			0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmer	it	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
16/18 (88.89%)	4.75	0.45	5.00	1,22	23	4.64	0.66	5.00		12,623	4.44	0.90	5.00

2 - Overall, the quality	of the cou	rse was g	ood										
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent F	Responses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	11	68.75%					4.69	4.59		4.43
Agree Somewhat			(4)	5	31.25%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%	7							
			•			0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	it	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
16/18 (88.89%)	4.69	0.48	5.00	1,22	20	4.59	0.73	5.00		12,473	4.43	0.90	5.00








Fall 2016 - Office of Institutional Research

Course: ENGL_001-028-FA16-01: Crit Reading and Composition

James McAdams													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	10	62.5%					4.63	4.69		4.53
Agree Somewhat			(4)	6	37.5%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%	7							
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%	7							
						0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	t	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
16/18 (88.89%)	4.63	0.50	5.00	1,22	24	4.69	0.64	5.00		12,599	4.53	0.84	5.00







Fall 2016 - Office of Institutional Research

Course: ENGL_001-028-FA16-01: Crit Reading and Composition

9 - The instructor was	enthusiast	ic about t	eaching										
James McAdams													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	12	75%					4.63	4.84		4.69
Agree Somewhat			(4)	2	12.5%								
Neutral			(3)	2	12.5%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%	7							
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%	7							
			•			0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	nt	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
16/18 (88.89%)	4.63	0.72	5.00	1,22	25	4.84	0.46	5.00		12,604	4.69	0.69	5.00

10 - The instructor wa	s helpful w	hen stude	nts were o	confused									
James McAdams													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent	1	Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	12	75%					4.75	4.70		4.50
Agree Somewhat			(4)	4	25%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%								
			1			0 2	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	ıt	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
16/18 (88.89%)	4.75	0.45	5.00	1,22	25	4.70	0.65	5.00		12,599	4.50	0.89	5.00


11 - The instructor tre	atou otuuo.		ороос										
James McAdams													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	14	87.5%					4.88	4.85		4.77
Agree Somewhat			(4)	2	12.5%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%	7							
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%	7							
						0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	t	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
16/18 (88.89%)	4.88	0.34	5.00	1,22	25	4.85	0.45	5.00		12,609	4.77	0.62	5.00


12 - Interaction between	en students	and inst	ructor was	positive									
James McAdams													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	14	87.5%					4.88	4.82		4.69
Agree Somewhat			(4)	2	12.5%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%								
						0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	it	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
16/18 (88.89%)	4.88	0.34	5.00	1,22	25	4.82	0.51	5.00		12,605	4.69	0.70	5.00


Fall 2016 - Office of Institutional Research

Course: ENGL_001-028-FA16-01: Crit Reading and Composition

James McAdams													
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	15	93.75%					4.94	4.85		4.59
Agree Somewhat			(4)	1	6.25%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%								
			•			0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	t	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
16/18 (88.89%)	4.94	0.25	5.00	1,22	:4	4.85	0.46	5.00		12,564	4.59	0.77	5.00










Fall 2016 - Office of Institutional Research

Course: ENGL_001-028-FA16-01: Crit Reading and Composition

17 - The text/readings	were valua	ble in lea	rning cour	se content									
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	7	43.75%					4.19	4.44		4.24
Agree Somewhat			(4)	6	37.5%								
Neutral			(3)	2	12.5%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	1	6.25%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%	7							
			•			0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	ıt	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
16/18 (88.89%)	4.19	0.91	4.00	1,22	22	4.44	0.85	5.00		12,300	4.24	1.04	5.00








Fall 2016 - Office of Institutional Research

Course: ENGL_001-028-FA16-01: Crit Reading and Composition

21 - I would recomme	nd this cou	rse to oth	er student	s									
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	lesponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	12	75%					4.69	4.42		4.27
Agree Somewhat			(4)	3	18.75%								
Neutral			(3)	1	6.25%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%								
						0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	it	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
16/18 (88.89%)	4.69	0.60	5.00	1,22	23	4.42	0.95	5.00		12,347	4.27	1.10	5.00

22 - Discussions clari	fied lecture	material											
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	lesponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	0	0%						4.82		4.45
Agree Somewhat			(4)	0	0%	7							
Neutral			(3)	0	0%	7							
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%	7							
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%	7							
Not Applicable			(0)	16	100%								
			•			0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmer	nt	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
16/18 (88.89%)	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,12	29	4.82	0.45	5.00		12,118	4.45	0.91	5.00

23 - The recitation ins	tructor was	an effect	ive discus	sion leader										
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Perc	ent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	0	0%							4.77		4.38
Agree Somewhat			(4)	0	0%									
Neutral			(3)	0	0%	7								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%	7								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%	7								
Not Applicable			(0)	16	100%									
						0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	it	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	S	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
16/18 (88.89%)	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,1:	29	4.77	0).50	5.00		12,114	4.38	0.97	5.00





Fall 2016 - Office of Institutional Research

Course: ENGL_001-028-FA16-01: Crit Reading and Composition

25 - The recitation ins	tructor was	able to e	xplain the	material										
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent	Resp	onses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	0	0%							4.78		4.52
Agree Somewhat			(4)	0	0%	7								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%	7								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%	7								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%	7								
Not Applicable			(0)	16	100%									
			•			0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	it	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	N	/ledian		College	Mean	STD	Median
16/18 (88.89%)	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,12	29	4.78	0.51		5.00		12,113	4.52	0.89	5.00

Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	0	0%						4.77		4.42
Agree Somewhat			(4)	0	0%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%								
Not Applicable			(0)	16	100%								
			•			0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	nt	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
16/18 (88.89%)	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.12	29	4.77	0.51	5.00		12,113	4.42	0.98	5.00






Fall 2016 - Office of Institutional Research

Course: ENGL_001-028-FA16-01: Crit Reading and Composition

29 - The lab instructo	r was helpfu	ıl answeri	ng questi	ons									
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	lesponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	0	0%						4.74		4.44
Agree Somewhat			(4)	0	0%								
Neutral			(3)	0	0%								
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%								
Not Applicable			(0)	16	100%								
			•			0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmer	nt	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
16/18 (88.89%)	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,12	29	4.74	0.56	5.00		12,194	4.44	0.95	5.00

30 - The amount of w	ork was app	ropriate f	or a lab										
Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent		Percent R	esponses			Means		
Agree Strongly			(5)	0	0%						4.68	ı	
Agree Somewhat			(4)	0	0%	7							3.98
Neutral			(3)	0	0%	7							
Disagree Somewhat			(2)	0	0%								
Disagree Strongly			(1)	0	0%								
Not Applicable			(0)	16	100%								
			•			0	25 50	75	100	Instructor	Departmen	nt	College
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	Depart	ment	Mean	STD	Median		College	Mean	STD	Median
16/18 (88.89%)	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,12	29	4.68	0.58	5.00		12,191	3.98	1.30	4.00





CRN: 40199

Fall 2012 Course Evaluation Summary Report

Course: ENGL 001-022

Title: COMPOSITION & LITERATURE

Instructor: McAdams, James Department: English

AS

										*			k		
	Agree Strongly	လိ	Agree Somewhat	Neutral (3)	trai	Disa Som	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly (1)	THIS COURSE: Mean, StDev, Count		YOUR HOME DEPT: Mean, StDøv, Counf	YOUR Mean	YOUR HOME COLL: Mean, StDev, Count	YOUR HOME COLL: Mean, StDev, Count	
QUESTIONS: 1 Overall, the instructor's teaching was effective	(e) 12 71%	. %	5 29%	0	%0	0	· %0	%0 0	4.71 0.47 17	4.58 (0.78 452	4.34	96.0	8516	
2 Overall the quality of the course was good	13 76%	%	3 18%	0	%0	-	%9	%0 0	4.65 0.79 17	4.55 (0.82 452	4.35	0.94	8171	
ı	10 59%	%	6 35%	-	%9	0	%0	%0 0	4.53 0.62 17	4.55 (0.86 454	4.45	0.87	8546	
	15 88%	%	1 6%	-	%9	0	%0	%0 0	4.82 0.53 17	4.62	0.72 454	4.31	1.01	8547	
5 The instructor gave good examples of the concepts	13 76%	%	4 24%	0	%0	0	%0	%0 0	4.76 0.44 17	4.69	0.67 453	4.45	0.90	8540	
6 The instructor answered questions clearly and concisely	13 76%	%	2 12%	7	12%	0	%0	%0 0	4.65 0.70 17	4.57	0.78 453	4.37	0.95	8539	
7 The instructor knew the subject well	15 88%	%	2 12%	0	%0	0	%0	%O O	4.88 0.33 17	4.92	0.35 452	4.82	0.52	8546	1
8 The instructor was generally well prepared for the class	5 29%	%	10 59%		%9	0	°, %0	1 6%	4.06 0.97 17	4.75	0.62 454	4.72	0.65	8545	
9 The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching	12 71%	%	3 18%	7	12%	0	%0	%0 0	4.59 0.71 17	4.86	0.50 452	4.67	0.69	8546	,
10 The instructor was helpful when students were confused	13 76%	%	3 18%	-	%9	0	%0	%0 0	4.71 0.59 17	4.61	0.76 453	4.39	0.95	8541	i
11 The instructor treated students with respect	16 94	94%	1 6%	0	%0	0	%0	%0 0	4.94 0.24 17	4.73	0.72 454	4.70	0.72	8545	1
12 Interaction between students and instructor was positive	16 94	94%	1 6%	0	%0	0	%0	%0 0	4.94 0.24 17	4.72	0.70 453	4.61	0.79	8540	. 1
13 The instructor was available for conferences with students	16 94	94%	1 6%	0	%0	0	%0	%0 0	4.94 0.24 17	4.78	0.62 450	4.49	0.84	8496	
14 Hearned a great deal in this course	7 41	41%	8 47%	-	%9	0	%0	1 6%	4.18 1.01 17	4.44	0.89 454	4.29	0.97	8173	
15 The course objectives were clear	7 41	41%	9 35%	ဗ	18%	0	%0	1 6%	4.06 1.09 17	4.51	0.84 453	4.41	0.90	8166	. I
16 The grading procedures for the class were fair	11 65	65%	5 29%	-	%9	0	%0	%0 0	4.59 0.62 17	4.41	0.97 451	4.32	0.99	8157	_ 1
17 The text/readings were valuable in learning course content	10 59	29%	4 24%	2	12%	0	%0	1 6%	4.29 1.10 17	4.64	0.71 454	4.17	1.07	8147	
18 The assignments helped me learn the subject matter	12 71	71%	3 18%	-	%9	0	%0	1 6%	4.47 1.07 17	4.54	0.81 452	4.32	0.97	8146	, I
19 Tests and papers were graded and returned promptly	10 59	%69	6 35%	-	%9	0	.%0	%0 0	4.53 0.62 17	4,43	0.92 449	4.45	0.90	8138	_ 1
20 The amount of work was appropriate for the credit received	14 82	82%	2 12%	1	%9	٥	%0	%0 0	4.76 0.56 17	4.53	0.89 452	4.41	0.95	8169	a 1
21 I would recommend this course to other students	13 76	%92	2 12%	-	%9	-	%9	%0 0	4.59 0.87 17	4.40	1.05 453	4.20	1.13	8153	ا <i>م</i>
Distributed by Office of Institutional Research - January 2013			_	n = # of	=# of valld responses	sponse	ø	*Dep	*Dept and College stats based on Full-Time Faculty only	ased on Full	-Time Facu	ilty only			

Fa

CRN: 40199

Fall 2012 Course Evaluation Summary Report

Course: ENGL 001-022

Instructor: McAdams, James

Department: English

College: AS

Title: COMPOSITION & LITERATURE

	Agree		Agree		-	Ë	9010	G	German		*		*	
SUESTIONS:	Strongly (5)	3	Somewhat (4)	;	Neutral (3)	S	Somewhat (2)	Strongly (1)	ylg(THIS COURSE: Mean, StDev, Count	YOUR HOME DEPT: Mean, StDev, Count	YOU	R HOMI 1, SťDev	YOUR HOME COLL: Mean, StDev, Count
22 Discussions clarified lecture material	0 0	. %0	%0 0		%0 0	0	%0	0	%0	O	4.68 0.57 22	4.22	1.09	1289
23 The recitation instructor was an effective discussion leader	0 0	%0	%0 0		%0 0	0	%0	0	%0	0	4.63 0.60 19	4.11	1.19	1263
24 The recitation instructor was well prepared	0 0,	%0	%0 0		%0 0	0	%0	0	%0	0	4.80 0.41 20	4.38	0.96	1259
25 The recitation instructor was able to explain the material	0 0	%0	%0 0		%0 0	0	%0	0	%0	0	4.74 0.56 19	4.31	1.06	1256
26 The recitation added to the overall value of the course	0 0,	%0	%0 0		%0 0	0	%0	0	%0	0	4.67 0.77 18	4.16	1.21	1247
27 The lab clatified the lecture material	0 0	%0	%0 0		%0 0	0	%0	0	%0	0	5.00 0.00 2	4.00	1.01	860
28 The lab instructor explained the labs	0 0	%0	%0 0		%0 0	0	%0	0	%0	0	5.00 0.00 2	4.46	0.81	858
29 The lab instructor was helpful answering questions	ŏ O	%0	%0 0		%0 O	0	%0	0	%0	0	5.00 0.00 2	4.36	0.92	854
30 The amount of work was appropriate for a lab	o o	%0	0 0%		%0 0	0 9	%0	0	%0	0	5.00 0.00 2	4.16	1.10	856
31 The lab added to the overall value of the course	%0 O		%0 0		%0 0	0 9	%0	0	%0	0	5.00 0.00 2	4.20	1.02	85,1



CRN: 10404

Spring 2013 Course Evaluation Summary Report

Course: ENGL 002-020

Instructor: McAdams, James Department: English

College: AS

DUESTIONS:	Agree Strongly (5)	Agree Somewhat (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree Somewhat (2)	Disagree Strongly (1)	THIS COURSE: Mean, StDev, Count	* YOUR HOME DEPT: Mean, StDev, Count	* YOUR HOME COLL: Mean, StDev, Count
1 Overall, the instructor's teaching was effective	15 88%	2 12%	%0 0	%0 0	%0 O	4.88 0.33 17	4.82 0.48 282	4.38 0.93 6519
2 Overall the quality of the course was good	14 88%	1 6%	1 6%	%0 0	%0 0	4.81 0.54 16	4.81 0.48 282	4.35 0.95 6280
3 The instructor stated clearly what was expected of the students	14 82%	3 18%	%0 O	%0 0	%0 0	4.82 0.39 17	4.69 0.63 281	4.46 0.87 6531
4 The instructor presented the material clearly	14 82%	2 12%	1 6%	%0 0	%0 0	4.76 0.56 17	4.80 0.50 282	4.35 0.97 6536
5 The instructor gave good examples of the concepts	16 94%	%0 0	1 6%	%0 0	%0 0	4.88 0.49 17	4.87 0.37 282	4.49 0.88 6541
6 The instructor answered questions clearly and concisely	15 88%	1 6%	1 6%	%0 0	%0 0	4.82 0.53 17	4.83 0.47 282	4.40 0.94 6534
7 The instructor knew the subject well	17 100%	%0 0	%0 0	%0 0	%0 0	5.00 0.00 17	4.94 0.30 282	4.83 0.54 6540
8 The instructor was generally well prepared for the class	10 59%	6 35%	1 6%	%0 0	%0 0	4.53 0.62 17	4.87 0.42 282	4.73 0.65 6540
9 The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching	15 88%	2 12%	%0 O	%0 0	%0 0	4.88 0.33 17	4.94 0.30 282	4.69 0.71 6538
10 The instructor was helpful when students were confused	15 88%	2 12%	%0 0	%0 0	%0 0	4.88 0.33 17	4.82 0.48 282	4.43 0.94 6531
11 The instructor treated students with respect	17 100%	%0 0	%0 o	%0 0	%0 o	5.00 0.00 17	4.91 0.35 282	4.68 0.76 6533
12 Interaction between students and instructor was positive	15 88%	2 12%	%0 O	%0 0	%0 0	4.88 0.33 17	4.89 0.40 281	4.61 0.81 6530
13 The instructor was available for conferences with students	17 100%	%0 0	%0 0	%0 0	%0 O	5.00 0.00 17	4.91 0.39 281	4.56 0.82 6498
14 I learned a great deal in this course	9 53%	6 35%	1 6%	%0 0	1 6%	4.29 1.05 17	4.68 0.62 282	4.34 0.95 6277
15 The course objectives were clear	12 71%	5 29%	%0 0	%0 0	%0 O	4.71 0.47 17	4.67 0.69 282	4.42 0.90 6277
16 The grading procedures for the class were fair	11 65%	4 24%	2 12%	%0 0	%0 0	4.53 0.72 17	4.75 0.60 282	4.28 1.06 6256
17 The text/readings were valuable in learning course content	12 71%	3 18%	1 6%	1 6%	%0 O	4.53 0.87 17	4.77 0.58 282	4.16 1.10 6248
18 The assignments helped me learn the subject matter	12 71%	3 18%	1 6%	1 6%	%0 0	4.53 0.87 17	4.83 0.45 282	4.30 1.00 6258
19 Tests and papers were graded and returned promptly	15 88%	2 12%	%0 0	%0 0	%0 0	4.88 0.33 17	4.59 0.75 281	4.47 0.89 6241
20 The amount of work was appropriate for the credit received	14 82%	3 18%	%0 0	%0 0	%0 0	4.82 0.39 17	4.78 0.55 282	4.40 0.98 6267
21 I would recommend this course to other students	14 82%	1 6%	2 12%	%0 0	%0 0	4.71 0.69 17	4.73 0.65 282	4.19 1.15 6267
Distributed by Office of Institutional Research - June 2013		C	= # of valid responses	oonses	*Dept	l and College stats base	 *Dept and College stats based on Full-Time Faculty only	only



CRN: 10404

Course: ENGL 002-020

Title: COMPOSITION & LIT II

Instructor: McAdams, James

Departn

College:	partment:
AS	English

588	1.16	4.05 1	-	5.00		0%	0	0%	0	0 0% -	0 0%	0%	0 0	urse	31 The lab added to the overall value of the course
591	1.24	4.02 1	_	5.00	. 0	0%	0	0%	0	0 0%	0 0%	0%	0	1b	30 The amount of work was appropriate for a lab
592	0.93	4.47 0		5.00	. 0	0%	0	0%	0	0 0%	0 0%	0%	0	estions	29 The lab instructor was helpful answering questions
592	0.91	4.44 0		5.00	0	0%	0	0%	0	0 0%	0 0%	0%	0		28 The lab instructor explained the labs
594	1.09	3.96 1		5.00	·, 0	0%	0	0%	0	0 0%	0 0%	0%	0 0		27 The lab clarified the lecture material
604	1.31	4.08 1	ω	5.00 0.00	0	0%	0	0%	0	0 0%	0 0%	0%	0	he course	26 The recitation added to the overall value of the course
606	1.17	4.25 1	ω	5.00 0.00	0	0%	0	0%	0	0 0%	0 0%	0%	0 0	the material	25 The recitation instructor was able to explain the material
608	1.00	4.38 1	100	5.00 0.00	0	0%	0	0%	0	0 0%	0 0%	0%	0		24 The recitation instructor was well prepared
612	1.23	4.11 1	2	5.00 0.00	0	0%	0	0%	0	0 0%	0 0%	0%	0	cussion leader	23 The recitation instructor was an effective discussion leader
623	1.18	4.13 1	ω	4.67 0.58	0	0%	0	0%	0	0 0%	0 0%	0%	0 0		22 Discussions clarified lecture material
COLL:	HOME (YOUR HOME COLL: Mean, StDev, Count	DEPT: Count	YOUR HOME DEPT: Mean, StDev, Count	THIS COURSE: Mean, StDev, Count	Disagree Strongly (1)	Str.	Disagree Somewhat (2)	Sor	Neutral (3)	Agree Somewhat (4)		Agree Strongly (5)		QUESTIONS:
	*			*	_										



CRN: 10402

Spring 2014 Course Evaluation Summary Report

Course: ENGL 002-019

Title: Composition And Literature II

Instructor: McAdams, James Department: English

College: AS

								-			*			*	
QUESTIONS:	Agree Strongly (5)	Agree Somewhat (4)	e hat	Neutral (3)	<u>o</u> S	Disagree Somewhat (2)	Disagree Strongly (1)	ree igly	THIS C Mean, St	THIS COURSE: Mean, StDev, Count	YOUR HOME DEPT: Mean, StDev, Count		YOUR HOME Mean, StDev,	HOME CC StDev, Co	COLL: Count
1 Overall, the instructor's teaching was effective	19 100%	0	% 0	0	0 %0	%0	0	%0	5.00 0	0.00 19	4.65 0.70 3	393 4.	38 0.	9 06	6463
2 Overall the quality of the course was good	18 95%	-	2%	o o	0 %0	%0	0	%0	4.95 0	0.23 19	4.65 0.69 3	394 4.	37 0	.89 63	6332
3 The instructor stated clearly what was expected of the students	14 74%	4	21%	<u>ب</u>	2% 0	%0	0	%0	4.68 0	0.58 19	4.51 0.85 3	396. 4.	47 0.	.84 64	6474
4 The instructor presented the material clearly	16 84%	N	11%	1 5	2% 0	%0	0	%0	4.79 0	0.54 19	4.63 0.74 3	394 4.	36 0.	94 6	6460
5 The instructor gave good examples of the concepts	18 95%	-	5%	0	0 %0	%0	0	%0	4.95 0	0.23 19	4.70 0.69 3	395 4	4.49 0.8	0.84 64	6473
6 The instructor answered questions clearly and concisely	18 95%	-	5%	0 0	0 %0	%0	0	%0	4.95 0	0.23 19	4.64 0.70 3	395 4	4.38 0.9	0.94 6	6471
7 The instructor knew the subject well	19 100%	0	%0	0	0 %0	%0	0	%0	5.00 0	0.00 19	4.88 0.40 3	392 4	4.81 0.51		6470
8 The instructor was generally well prepared for the class	16 84%	က	16%	0	0 %0	%0	0	%0	4.84 0	0.37 19	4.77 0.55 3	394 2	4.72 0.0	0.63 64	6472
9 The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching	17 89%	-	2%	0	1 %0	2%	0	%0	4.79 0	0.71 19	4.88 0.43 3	394 4	4.68 0.6	0.68 64	6469
10 The instructor was helpful when students were confused	19 100%	0	%0	0	0 %0	%0	0	%0	5.00 0	0.00 19	4.65 0.71 3	394 4	42	0.92 64	6469
11 The instructor treated students with respect	19 100%	0	%0	0	0 %0	%0	0	%0	5.00 0	0.00 19	4.81 0.53 3	394 7	4.67 0.	0.73 64	6469
12 Interaction between students and instructor was positive	19 100%	0	%0	0	0 %0	%0	0	%0	5.00 0	0.00 19	4.81 0.52 3	394 4	4.61 0.	0.77 64	6474
13 The instructor was available for conferences with students	19 100%	0	%0	0 0	0 %0	%0	0	%0	5.00 0	0.00 19	4.69 0.69	393 4	4.52 0.	81 6	6442
14 I learned a great deal in this course	14 74%	4	21%	1 5	5% 0	%0	0	%0	4.68 0	0.58 19	4.59 0.79	394 4	4.34 0.	94 6	6315
15 The course objectives were clear	15 79%	m	16%	1 5	2% 0	%0	0	%0	4.74 0	0.56 19	4.51 0.87	394 7	4.42 0.8	0.88 6	6312
16 The grading procedures for the class were fair	16 84%	1	5%	1 5	5% 1	2%	0	%0	4.68 0.	.82 19	4.49 0.87 3	394	4.29 1.	1.04 6	6308
17 The text/readings were valuable in learning course content	15 79%	က	16%	0 0	0 %0	%0	-	2%	4.63 0.	96 19	4.59 0.76	394	4.17 1.	1.10 6	6295
18 The assignments helped me learn the subject matter	16 84%	1	2%	1 5	5% 1	2%	0	%0	4.68 0	0.82 19	4.68 0.61	394	4.32 0.	92 93	6297
19 Tests and papers were graded and returned promptly	19 100%	0	%0	0 0	0 %0	%0	0	%0	5.00 0	0.00 19	4.57 0.75	394	4.45 0.	.89	6288
20 The amount of work was appropriate for the credit received	18 95%	0	%0	1 5	2% 0	%0	0	%0	4.89 0	0.46 19	4.65 0.75	394 4	4.41 0.	95 6	6310
21 I would recommend this course to other students	18 95%	-	5%	0	0 %0	%0	0	%0	4.95 0	0.23 19	4.60 0.83	393 4	4.21 1.	1.12 6	6303
Distributed by Office of Institutional Research - June 9, 2014			II C	= # of valid responses	response	S.		*Dept ar	d Colleg	stats bas	 *Dept and College stats based on Full-Time Faculty only	Faculty o	yln		



CRN: 10402

Course: ENGL 002-019

Instructor: McAdams, James

Department: English College: AS

Title: Composition And Literature II

698		4.06 1.07	4	5.00 0.00	0	0 0%	0 0%	0 0% 0	0 0%	0 0%	31 The lab added to the overall value of the course
699	1.14	4.01	4	5.00 0.00	0	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0 0%	0 0%	30 The amount of work was appropriate for a lab
702		4.31 1.03	4	5.00 0.00	0	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	29 The lab instructor was helpful answering questions
705	0.95	4.37	4	5.00 0.00	0	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	28 The lab instructor explained the labs
708	•	3.98 1.10	4	5.00 0.00 4	0	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	27 The lab clarified the lecture material
702	1.24	4.13	ഗ	5.00 0.00	0	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	26 The recitation added to the overall value of the course
702	1.05	4.35	7	5.00 0.00 7	0	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	25 The recitation instructor was able to explain the material
707	0.98	4.41	œ	5.00 0.00	0	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	24 The recitation instructor was well prepared
713	1.18	4.18	œ	5.00 0.00	0	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	23 The recitation instructor was an effective discussion leader
733		4.25 1.08	10	5.00 0.00 10	0	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	22 Discussions clarified lecture material
COLL:	YOUR HOME COLL: Mean, StDev, Count	YOUR Mean,	DEPT: Count	YOUR HOME DEPT: Mean, StDev, Count	THIS COURSE: Mean, StDev, Count	Disagree Strongly (1)	Disagree Somewhat (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree Somewhat (4)	Agree Strongly (5)	QUESTIONS:
	*			*	_	_					



CRN: 10412

Spring 2014 Course Evaluation Summary Report

Course: ENGL 002-026

Title: Composition And Literature II

Instructor: McAdams, James Department: English

College: AS

												,	
QUESTIONS:	Agree Strongly (5)	Agree Somewhat (4)	ee what ·)	Neutral (3)		Disagree Somewhat (2)		Disagree Strongly (1)	THIS COURSE: Mean, StDev, Count	YOUR HOME DEPT: t Mean, StDev, Count		YOUR HOME COLL: Mean, StDev, Count	COLL:
1 Overall, the instructor's teaching was effective	7 58%	4	33%	-	8%	0	0 %0	%0	4.50 0.67 12	4.65 0.70 393	4.38	0.90	6463
2 Overall the quality of the course was good	9 75%	7	17%	_	8%	0	0 %0	%0	4.67 0.65 12	4.65 0.69 394	4.37	0.89	6332
3 The instructor stated clearly what was expected of the students	5 42%	Ŋ	42%	-	8%	7 8	0 %8	%0	4.17 0.94 12	4.51 0.85 396	4.47	0.84	6474
4 The instructor presented the material clearly	5 42%	22	42%	7	17%	ŏ	0 %0	%0	4.25 0.75 12	4.63 0.74 394	4.36	0.94	6460
5 The instructor gave good examples of the concepts	7 58%	ro.	42%	0	%0	ŏ	0 %0	%0	4.58 0.51 12	4.70 0.69 395	4.49	0.84	6473
6 The instructor answered questions clearly and concisely	10 83%	-	8%	-	8%	0 0,	0 %0	%0	4.75 0.62 12	4.64 0.70 395	4.38	0.94	6471
7 The instructor knew the subject well	10 83%	2	17%	0	%0	,0 0	0 %0	%0	4.83 0.39 12	4.88 0.40 392	4.81	0.51	6470
8 The instructor was generally well prepared for the class	4 33%	ro	42%	2	17%	1 8	8% 0	%0	4.00 0.95 12	4.77 0.55 394	4.72	0.63	6472
9 The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching	9 75%	2	17%	-	8%	, ,	0 %0	%0	4.67 0.65 12	4.88 0.43 394	4.68	0.68	6469
10 The instructor was helpful when students were confused	11 92%	0	%0	- -	8%	,0 0	0 %0	%0	4.83 0.58 12	4.65 0.71 394	4.42	0.92	6469
11 The instructor treated students with respect	11 92%	~	8%	0	%0	ŏ o	0 %0	%0	4.92 0.29 12	4.81 0.53 394	4.67	0.73	6469
12 Interaction between students and instructor was positive	11 92%	_	8%	0	%0	o o	0 %0	%0	4.92 0.29 12	4.81 0.52 394	4.61	0.77	6474
13 The instructor was available for conferences with students	12 100%	0	%0	0	%ò	0	0 %0	%0	5.00 0.00 12	4.69 0.69 393	4.52	0.81	6442
14 I learned a great deal in this course	5 42%	Ω.	42%	, —	8%	1 8	0 %8	%0	4.17 0.94 12	4.59 0.79 394	4.34	0.94	6315
15 The course objectives were clear	8 67%	-	8%	2	17%	1 8	0 %8	%0	4.33 1.07 12	4.51 0.87 394	4.42	0.88	6312
16 The grading procedures for the class were fair	8 67%	1	8%	-	%8	2 17	17% 0	%0	4.25 1.22 12	4.49 0.87 394	4.29	40.1	6308
17 The text/readings were valuable in learning course content	6 50%	5	42%	0	%0	1 8	8% 0	%0	4.33 0.89 12	4.59 0.76 394	4.17	1.10	6295
18 The assignments helped me learn the subject matter	6 50%	9	20%	0	%0	Ŏ O	0 %0	%0	4.50 0.52 12	4.68 0.61 394	4.32	0.95	6297
19 Tests and papers were graded and returned promptly	11 92%	-	8%	0	%0	0	0 %0	%0	4.92 0.29 12	4.57 0.75 394	4.45	0.89	6288
20 The amount of work was appropriate for the credit received	9 75%	က	25%	0	%0	0	0 %0	%0	4.75 0.45 12	4.65 0.75 394	4.41	0.95	6310
21 I would recommend this course to other students	9 75%	က	25%	0	%0	0	0 %0	%0	4.75 0.45 12	4.60 0.83 393	4.21	1.12	6303
Distributed by Office of Institutional Research - June 9, 2014			Ë	=# of va	n = # of valid responses	ses		*Dept	 and College stats ba	 *Dept and College stats based on Full-Time Faculty only	ulty only		


CRN: 10412

Course: ENGL 002-026

Instructor: McAdams, James

Department: English

Ø 0000 10712		Title: Co	Title: Composition And Literature II	d Literature II		College: AS	\S		
							*	*	
QUESTIONS:	Agree Strongly (5)	Agree Somewhat (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree Somewhat (2)	Disagree Strongly (1)	THIS COURSE: Mean, StDev, Count	YOUR HOME DEPT: Mean, StDev, Count	YOUR HOME COLL: Mean, StDev, Count	ount OLL:
22 Discussions clarified lecture material	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0	5.00 0.00 10	4.25 1.08	733
23 The recitation instructor was an effective discussion leader	0 0%	0, 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0	5.00 0.00 8	4.18 1.18	713
24 The recitation instructor was well prepared	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0	5.00 0.00 8	4.41 0.98	707
25 The recitation instructor was able to explain the material	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0	5.00 0.00 7	4.35 1.05	702
26 The recitation added to the overall value of the course	. 0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0	5.00 0.00 6	4.13 1.24	702
27 The lab clarified the lecture material	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0	5.00 0.00 4	3.98 1.10	708
28 The lab instructor explained the labs	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0	5.00 0.00 4	4.37 0.95	705
29 The lab instructor was helpful answering questions	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0	5.00 0.00 4	4.31 1.03	702
30 The amount of work was appropriate for a lab	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0	5.00 0.00 4	4.01 1.14	699
31 The lab added to the overall value of the course	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0	5.00 0.00 4	4.06 1.07	698



Course: ENGL 170-010

Title: Amaranth

Instructor: McAdams, James Department: English

College: AS

									+				
QUESTIONS:	Agree Strongly (5)	Agree Somewhat (4)		Neutral (3)	Dis	Disagree Somewhat (2)	Disagree Strongly (1)		THIS COURSE: Mean, StDev, Count	* YOUR HOME DEPT: Mean, StDev, Count	YOUR H Mean, St	* YOUR HOME COLL: Mean, StDev, Count	nt nt
1 Overall, the instructor's teaching was effective	6 100%		%0	%0 0	0 %	%0 }	%0 0	:	5.00 0.00 6	4.65 0.70 393	4.38 0.	90 6463	က္ထ
2 Overall the quality of the course was good	6 100%	0	%0	%0 0	0	%0	%0 · · · 0		5.00 0.00 6	4.65 0.69 394	4.37 0.	89 6332	22
3 The instructor stated clearly what was expected of the students	6 100%	0	%0	%0 0	0	%0	%0 0		5.00 0.00 6	4.51 0.85 396	4.47 0.	0.84 6474	4
4 The instructor presented the material clearly	7 100%	0	%0	%0 0	0	%0	%0 0		5.00 0.00 7	4.63 0.74 394	4.36 0.	94 6460	စ္က
5 The instructor gave good examples of the concepts	7 100%	0	%0	%0 0	0 %	%0	%0 0		5.00 0.00 7	4.70 0.69 395	4.49 0.	84 6473	ည
6 The instructor answered questions clearly and concisely	7 100%	0	%0	%0 0	0	%0	%0 0		5.00 0.00 7	4.64 0.70 395	4.38 0.	94 6471	-
7 The instructor knew the subject well	7 100%	0	%0	%0 0	0 1 3	%0	%0 °0		5.00 0.00 7	4.88 0.40 392	4.81 0.	51 6470	5
8 The instructor was generally well prepared for the class	7 100%	0	%0	%0 0	0	%0	%0 0		5.00 0.00 7	4.77 0.55 394	4.72 0.	0.63 6472	2
9 The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching	7 100%	0	%0	%0 0	0	%0	%0 0		5.00 0.00 7	4.88 0.43 394	4.68 0.	0.68 6469	တ္ထ
10 The instructor was helpful when students were confused	7 100%	0	%0	%0 0	0	%0	%0 0		5.00 0.00 7	4.65 0.71 394	4.42 0.	92 6469	ရွ
11 The instructor treated students with respect	7 100%	0	%0	%0 0	0 %	%0	%0 0		5.00 0.00 7	4.81 0.53 394	4.67 0.	0.73 6469	6
12 Interaction between students and instructor was positive	7 100%	0	%0	%0 0	0	%0	%0 0		5.00 0.00 7	4.81 0.52 394	4.61 0.77	77 6474	4
13 The instructor was available for conferences with students	7 100%	0	%0	%0 0	0	%0	%0 0		5.00 0.00 7	4.69 0.69 393	4.52 0.	81 6442	23
14 I learned a great deal in this course	7 100%	0	%0	%0 ° 0	۰ ۰	%0	%0 0		5.00 0.00 7	4.59 0.79 394	4.34 0.	94 6315	2
15 The course objectives were clear	7 100%	0	%0	%0 0	0	%0	%0 0		5.00 0.00 7	4.51 0.87 394	4.42 0.	0.88 6312	2
16 The grading procedures for the class were fair	7 100%	0	%0	%0 0	0	%0	%0 0		5.00 0.00 7	4.49 0.87 394	4.29 1.	1.04 6308	8
17 The text/readings were valuable in learning course content	7 100%	0	%0	%0 0	0	%0	%0 O		5.00 0.00 7	4.59 0.76 394	4.17 1.	1.10 6295	35
18 The assignments helped me learn the subject matter	7 100%	0	%0	%0 0	0 %	%0	%0 0		5.00 0.00 7	4.68 0.61 394	4.32 0.	95 6297	76
19 Tests and papers were graded and returned promptly	7 100%	0	%0	%0 0	.0	%0	%0 0		2.00 0.00 7	4.57 0.75 394	4.45 0.	0.89 6288	82
20 The amount of work was appropriate for the credit received	7 100%	0	%0	%0 0	0 %	%0	%0 O		5.00 0.00 7	4.65 0.75 394	4.41 0.	95 6310	0
21 I would recommend this course to other students	7 100%	0	%0	%0 0	0 %	%0	%0 0		5.00 0.00 7	4.60 0.83 393	4.21 1.	1.12 6303	33
Distributed by Office of Institutional Research - June 9, 2014	·		#=	of valid r	= # of valid responses		٢	ept and	College stats base	 *Dept and College stats based on Full-Time Faculty only	only		



CRN: 11428

Course: ENGL 170-010

Title: Amaranth

Instructor: McAdams, James

Department: English
College: AS

							*	*	
QUESTIONS:	Agree Strongly (5)	Agree Somewhat (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree Somewhat (2)	Disagree Strongly (1)	THIS COURSE: Mean, StDev, Count	YOUR HOME DEPT: Mean, StDev, Count	YOUR HOME COLL: Mean, StDev, Count	Count
22 Discussions clarified lecture material	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0	5.00 0.00 10	4.25 1.08	733
23 The recitation instructor was an effective discussion leader	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	. 0	5.00 0.00 8	4.18 1.18	713
24 The recitation instructor was well prepared	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0	5.00 0.00 8	4.41 0.98	707
25 The recitation instructor was able to explain the material	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	[0]	5.00 0.00 7	4.35 1.05	702
26 The recitation added to the overall value of the course	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0	5.00 0.00 6	4.13 1.24	702
27 The lab clarified the lecture material	0 0%	0 0%	0 : 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0	5.00 0.00 4	3.98 1.10	708
28 The lab instructor explained the labs	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0	5.00 0.00 4	4.37 0.95	705
29 The lab instructor was helpful answering questions	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0	5.00 0.00 4	4.31 1.03	702
30 The amount of work was appropriate for a lab	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0	5.00 0.00 4	4.01 1.14	699
31 The lab added to the overall value of the course	0 0%	0 0 0%	0 0% 0	0 0%	0 0%	0	5.00 0.00 4	4.06 1.07	698

33	- A

CRN: 11428

Spring 2015 Course Evaluation Summary Report

Course: ENGL 170-010

Title: Amaranth

Department: English

Instructor: McAdams, James

College: AS

			ine. All	Amaranın						Š	oneye. As			
QUESTIONS:	Agree Strongly (5)	Agree Somewhat (4)	se what)	Neutral (3)		Disagree Somewhat (2)		Disagree Strongly (1)	Tt Mea	THIS COURSE: Mean, StDev, Count	SE: Count	* YOUR HOME DEPT: Mean, StDev, Count	* YOUR HOME Mean, SlDev,	* HOME COLL: SlDev, Count
1 Overall, the instructor's teaching was effective	11 92%	0	%0	-	8%	%0 0	0	%0	4.83	0.58	12	4.78 0.52 250	4.32 1.00	6009 (
2 Overall the quality of the course was good	12 100%	0	%0	0	%0	%0 0	0	%0	5.00	0.00	12	4.75 0.59 250	4.35 0.97	5843
3 The instructor stated clearly what was expected of the students	11 92%	-	8%	0	%0	%0 0	0 ,,	%0	4.92	0.29	12	4.74 0.58 252	4.45 0.90	5998
4 The instructor presented the material clearly	11 92%	0	%0	-	8%	%0 0	0	%0	4.83	3 0.58	12	4.78 0.53 252	4.31 1.02	5993
5 The instructor gave good examples of the concepts	11 92%	0	%0	-	8%	%0 0	0 ,0	%0	4.83	0.58	12	4.80 0.50 252	4.45 0.91	5985
6 The instructor answered questions clearly and concisely	11 92%	-	8%	0	%0	%0 0	0	%0	4.92	0.29	12	4.73 0.62 252	4.38 0.96	5990
7 The instructor knew the subject well	11 92%	-	8%	0	%0	%0 0	0 9	%0	4.92	0.29	12	4.93 0.27 252	4.77 0.60	5993
8 The instructor was generally well prepared for the class	11 92%	+	8%	0	%0	%0 o	0 %	%0	4.92	2 0.29	12	4.87 0.40 251	4.67 0.72	5993
9 The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching	11 92%	0	%0	-	8%	%0 0	0	%0	4.83	3 0.58	12	4.87 0.40 252	4.67 0.73	3 5992
10 The instructor was helpful when students were confused	11 92%	-	8%	0	%0	%0 0	0	%0	4.92	0.29	12	4.73 0.60 252	4.42 0.95	5 5986
11 The instructor treated students with respect	12 100%	0	%0	0	%0	%0 0	0 %	%0	5.00	0.00	12	4.85 0.51 252	4.66 0.77	, 5991
12 Interaction between students and instructor was positive	11 92%	0	%0	-	8%	%0 0	0	%O.	4.83	0.58	12	4.84 0.52 251	4.60 0.82	5988
13 The instructor was available for conferences with students	11 92%	0	%0	~ -	8%	%0 0	0 9	%0	4.83	0.58	12	4.88 0.39 250	4.54 0.83	5969
14 I learned a great deal in this course	11 92%	γ-	8%	0	%0	%0 o	0 ,	%0	4.92	0.29	12	4.61 0.69 250	4.33 0.98	5823
15 The course objectives were clear	11 92%	0	%0	- -	8%	%0 o	0 %	%0	4.83	0.58	12	4.73 0.60 250	4.41 0.93	5822
16 The grading procedures for the class were fair	11 92%	~	8%	0	%0	%0 0	0	%0	4.92	0.29	12	4,71 0.62 250	4.29 1.05	5 5812
17 The text/readings were valuable in learning course content	12 100%	0	%0	0	%0	%0 0	0	%0	5.00	00.00	12	4.77 0.55 250	4.18 1.10	5779
18 The assignments helped me learn the subject matter	11 92%	-	8%	0	%0	%0 0	0	%0	4.92	0.29	12	4.69 0.66 250	4.35 0.98	1673
19 Tests and papers were graded and returned promptly	11 92%	0	%0	~	8%	%0 o	0	%0	4.83	0.58	12	4.66 0.73 250	4.47 0.89	5783
20 The amount of work was appropriate for the credit received	12 100%	0	%0	0	%0	%0 0	0	%0	5.00	0.00	12	4.79 0.56 250	4.43 0.95	5817
21 I would recommend this course to other students	12 100%	0	%0	. 0	%0	%0 0	0	%0	5.00	00.0	12	4.68 0.73 250	4.23 1.13	5817
Distributed by Office of Institutional Research - June 19, 2015			c	= # of val	n = # of valld responses	ses		*Dept	and Co	llege sta	ts based	 *Dept and College stats based on Full-Time Faculty only	ty only	



Course: ENGL 170-010

CRN: 11428

Instructor: McAdams, James

Department: English

			Titl	Title: Amaranth	aranth						Callege: AS	Ś					
QUESTIONS:	Agree Strongly (5)		Agree Somewhat (4)	hat e	Neutral (3)	<u>ಬ</u>	Disagree Somewhat (2)	ree vhat	Disagree Strongly (1)	ree	THIS COURSE: Mean, StDev, Count	YOUR Mean	* YOUR HOME DEPT: Mean, S(Dev, Count	DEPT: Count	YOUR Mean,	* YOUR HOME COLL: Mean, StDev, Count	Count
22 Discussions clarified lecture material	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	%0	0	0%	0	5.00	0.00	თ	4.06	1.17	856
23 The recitation instructor was an effective discussion leader	0	0%	0	0%	.0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	5.00	0.00	တ	4.04	1.23	843
24 The recitation instructor was well prepared	0	0%	Ó	0%	0	%0	0	0%	0	0%	0	5.00	0.00	6	4.28	1.10	839
25 The recitation instructor was able to explain the material	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	5.00	0.00	6	4.17	1.14	836
26 The recitation added to the overall value of the course	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	5.00	0.00	6	3.95	1.34	832
27 The lab clarified the lecture material	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	5.00	0.00	4	3.94	1.12	796
28 The lab instructor explained the labs	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	5.00	0.00	ω	4.37	0.95	793
29 The lab instructor was helpful answering questions	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	5.00	0.00	ω	4.37	1.01	793
30 The amount of work was appropriate for a lab	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	5.00	0.00	ω	4.13	1.12	794
31 The lab added to the overall value of the course	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	5.00	0.00	ω	4.07	1.13	786