

Instructor Evaluations

(Updated September 30, 2008)

James Murray
Dahl School of Business
Viterbo University
900 Viterbo Dr.
La Crosse, WI 54601
E-mail: jmmurray@viterbo.edu

Table 1: Indiana University Purdue University Columbus - Spring 2007¹

Statement	E270 ²		E270 ³	
	MR ^{4,5}	N ⁶	MR ^{4,5}	N ⁶
This course is logically designed.	3.80	9	2.00	8
The syllabus explains the objectives for the course.	3.92	9	3.50	8
The syllabus describes the grading system for the course.	3.88	9	3.83	8
My instructor makes good use of examples and illustrations.	3.13	9	3.00	8
My instructor welcomes questions and discussions in class.	3.38	9	3.83	8
My instructor seems to be fair and impartial with students.	3.63	9	3.50	8
My instructor is available to help students who have problems.	3.40	9	3.50	8
My instructor uses the scheduled class time for course material.	3.80	9	4.00	8
Course assignments help clarify the subject matter.	3.20	9	3.83	8
With appropriate effort, students can learn a lot in this course.	3.67	9	3.83	8
I understand easily what my instructor is saying.	3.38	9	2.50	8
My instructor has an effective style of presentation.	3.25	9	3.00	8
My instructor seems well prepared for class.	3.75	9	3.00	8
My instructor displays enthusiasm for class.	4.00	9	3.50	8
My instructor challenges me to think.	3.88	9	4.00	8
I would enjoy taking another course from this instructor.	2.50	9	4.75	8
I like the way the instructor conducts this course.	2.88	9	2.50	8
My instructor motivates me to do my best work.	3.38	9	3.50	8
My instructor explains difficult material clearly.	3.13	9	2.50	8
Overall this college course is among the best I have ever taken.	3.00	9	3.50	8
Overall this college teacher is among the best I have known.	2.88	9	3.00	8

1. E202: Introductory Macroeconomics

2. E270: Introductory Statistics for Business and Economics

3. The course evaluation system does not provide comparative scores for departments or units over the same semester.

4. MR = Median response

5. Scale: 1.0 - 5.0 (5.0 being the highest)

6. N = number of responses

Table 2: Indiana University Purdue University Columbus - Fall 2007¹

Statement	E270 ²		E270 ³	
	MR ^{4,5}	N ⁶	MR ^{4,5}	N ⁶
This course is logically designed.	4.17	10	4.67	10
The syllabus explains the objectives for the course.	4.21	10	4.67	10
The syllabus describes the grading system for the course.	4.50	10	4.33	10
My instructor makes good use of examples and illustrations.	4.17	10	4.30	10
My instructor welcomes questions and discussions in class.	4.40	10	4.79	10
My instructor seems to be fair and impartial with students.	4.33	10	4.79	10
My instructor is available to help students who have problems.	4.67	10	4.50	10
My instructor uses the scheduled class time for course material.	4.67	10	4.79	10
Course assignments help clarify the subject matter.	4.67	10	4.67	10
With appropriate effort, students can learn a lot in this course.	4.50	10	4.63	10
I understand easily what my instructor is saying.	4.30	10	4.50	10
My instructor has an effective style of presentation.	4.50	10	4.50	10
My instructor seems well prepared for class.	4.79	10	4.79	10
My instructor displays enthusiasm for class.	4.67	10	4.79	10
My instructor challenges me to think.	4.67	10	4.50	10
I would enjoy taking another course from this instructor.	4.67	10	4.75	10
I like the way the instructor conducts this course.	4.50	10	4.67	10
My instructor motivates me to do my best work.	4.50	10	4.50	10
My instructor explains difficult material clearly.	4.50	10	4.67	10
Overall this college course is among the best I have ever taken.	4.00	10	3.83	10
Overall this college teacher is among the best I have known.	4.30	10	4.10	10

1. E270: Introductory Statistics for Business and Economics, Section 7147

2. E270: Introductory Statistics for Business and Economics, Section 27806

3. The course evaluation system does not provide comparative scores for departments or units over the same semester.

4. MR = Median response

5. Scale: 1.0 - 5.0 (5.0 being the highest)

6. N = number of responses

Table 3: Viterbo University - Math 130: Introductory Statistics¹

Statement	Summer 2007		Summer 2006	
	AR ^{2,3}	N ⁴	AR ^{2,3}	N ⁴
The syllabus for the class clearly communicated objectives, requirements and evaluation methods.	4.77	22	4.68	19
The course design caused me to think in depth about this subject.	4.77	22	4.47	19
The content of the assignments contributed to my understanding of the subject.	4.77	22	4.16	19
I had opportunities to ask questions in and out of class.	5.00	22	4.68	19
The instructor cared about my learning.	4.81	22	4.16	19
The instructor demonstrated knowledge of the subject matter.	4.95	22	4.89	19
The instructor conducted class in an organized and clear manner.	4.81	22	4.63	19
The instructor started class on time.	5.00	22	4.89	19
The instructor ended class on time.	4.91	22	4.63	19
The instructor returned assignments within 2 weeks.	4.95	22	4.84	19
The instructor provided useful feedback on student progress.	4.91	22	4.74	19
Overall, I rate this instructor as an effective teacher.	4.95	22	4.79	19

1. The Viterbo University course evaluation system does not provide comparative scores for departments or units.
2. AR = average response
3. Scale: 1.0 - 5.0 (5.0 being the highest)
4. N = number of responses

Table 4: Indiana University - Econ E201: Principles of Microeconomics

Statement	Spring 2007			Fall 2005		
	AR ^{1,2}	N ³	A200 ⁴	AR	N	A200
The amount you learned in this class compared to all 200 level courses at Indiana University.	2.2	31	2.3	2.2	22	2.4
Enthusiasm about teaching.	2.4	31	2.5	2.6	22	2.6
Preparation for class meetings.	2.4	31	2.7	2.0	21	2.8
Availability for out-of-class consultation.	2.3	22	2.6	2.9	12	2.4
Making course objectives clear and giving students a good idea of what they are expected to learn.	2.3	31	2.3	2.2	22	2.3
Ability to construct exams and quizzes consistent with major learning objectives.	2.6	31	2.0	2.0	22	2.2
Providing helpful feedback on how well students are learning.	1.9	31	2.3	1.9	22	2.0
Ability to explain basic (textbook-type) material.	2.0	31	2.3	2.0	22	2.4
Ability to go beyond basic material and develop more sophisticated understanding.	1.9	31	2.2	2.2	22	2.3
Overall teaching effectiveness.	2.2	31	2.3	2.0	22	2.2

1. AR = average response for my section.

2. Scale: 0.0 - 4.0 (4.0 being the highest)

2. N = number of responses for my section.

3. A200 = average response in all 200 level courses

Table 5: Indiana University - Econ E201: Principles of Microeconomics (continued)

Statement	Spring 2005			Fall 2004		
	AR ^{1,2}	N ³	A200 ⁴	AR	N	A200
The amount you learned in this class compared to all 200 level courses at Indiana University.	2.2	35	2.2	2.3	14	2.2
Enthusiasm about teaching.	2.9	35	2.4	2.7	14	2.2
Preparation for class meetings.	3.1	35	2.8	2.8	14	2.7
Availability for out-of-class consultation.	2.9	25	2.8	2.9	14	2.6
Making course objectives clear and giving students a good idea of what they are expected to learn.	2.9	35	2.5	2.7	14	2.3
Ability to construct exams and quizzes consistent with major learning objectives.	2.8	35	2.6	2.7	14	2.3
Providing helpful feedback on how well students are learning.	2.0	35	2.1	1.9	14	1.9
Ability to explain basic (textbook-type) material.	2.7	35	2.4	2.4	14	2.1
Ability to go beyond basic material and develop more sophisticated understanding.	2.6	35	2.1	2.5	14	1.9
Overall teaching effectiveness.	2.7	35	2.3	2.5	14	2.1

1. AR = average response for my section.

2. Scale: 0.0 - 4.0 (4.0 being the highest)

2. N = number of responses for my section.

3. A200 = average response in all 200 level courses in the Economics Department.

Table 6: Indiana University - Econ E201: Principles of Microeconomics (continued)

Statement	Spring 2004			Fall 2003		
	AR ^{1,2}	N ³	A200 ⁴	AR	N	A200
The amount you learned in this class compared to all 200 level courses at Indiana University.	2.3	25	2.3	1.9	27	2.3
Enthusiasm about teaching.	3.2	25	2.4	2.5	28	2.3
Preparation for class meetings.	2.9	25	2.8	2.2	28	2.8
Availability for out-of-class consultation.	2.7	19	2.4	2.4	19	2.4
Making course objectives clear and giving students a good idea of what they are expected to learn.	2.6	25	2.3	2.4	28	2.3
Ability to construct exams and quizzes consistent with major learning objectives.	2.8	25	2.3	2.4	28	2.4
Providing helpful feedback on how well students are learning.	2.7	25	2.0	2.1	28	2.2
Ability to explain basic (textbook-type) material.	2.8	25	2.4	2.3	28	2.4
Ability to go beyond basic material and develop more sophisticated understanding.	2.5	25	2.1	2.0	28	2.2
Overall teaching effectiveness.	2.8	25	2.2	2.0	28	2.2

1. AR = average response for my section.

2. Scale: 0.0 - 4.0 (4.0 being the highest)

2. N = number of responses for my section.

3. A200 = average response in all 200 level courses in the Economics Department.

Table 7: Indiana University - Econ E202: Principles of Macroeconomics

Statement	Fall 2006			Spring 2006		
	AR ^{1,2}	N ³	A200 ⁴	AR	N	A200
The amount you learned in this class compared to all 200 level courses at Indiana University.	2.1	31	2.1	2.2	22	2.3
Enthusiasm about teaching.	2.3	31	2.2	2.4	22	2.5
Preparation for class meetings.	2.3	31	2.5	2.5	22	2.8
Availability for out-of-class consultation.	2.8	23	2.5	2.3	14	2.3
Making course objectives clear and giving students a good idea of what they are expected to learn.	2.1	31	2.0	2.1	22	2.2
Ability to construct exams and quizzes consistent with major learning objectives.	2.5	31	2.4	2.4	22	2.2
Providing helpful feedback on how well students are learning.	1.9	31	1.9	1.9	21	2.0
Ability to explain basic (textbook-type) material.	2.0	31	2.1	2.1	22	2.3
Ability to go beyond basic material and develop more sophisticated understanding.	1.9	31	1.9	2.0	22	2.2
Overall teaching effectiveness.	2.1	31	1.9	2.0	22	2.2

1. AR = average response for my section.

2. Scale: 0.0 - 4.0 (4.0 being the highest)

2. N = number of responses for my section.

3. A200 = average response in all 200 level courses in the Economics Department.

Table 8: Indiana University - Econ E322: Intermediate Macroeconomics

Statement	Summer 2005			Summer 2004		
	AR ^{1,2}	N ³	A300 ⁴	AR	N	A300
The amount you learned in this class compared to all 200 level courses at Indiana University.	2.3	19	2.6	2.5	11	2.4
Enthusiasm about teaching.	2.7	19	2.7	3.1	11	2.5
Preparation for class meetings.	2.5	19	2.9	2.7	11	2.6
Availability for out-of-class consultation.	2.6	15	2.7	3.1	7	2.4
Making course objectives clear and giving students a good idea of what they are expected to learn.	2.4	19	2.5	3.3	11	2.3
Ability to construct exams and quizzes consistent with major learning objectives.	2.4	19	2.8	3.1	11	2.1
Providing helpful feedback on how well students are learning.	2.3	19	2.5	2.6	11	2.3
Ability to explain basic (textbook-type) material.	2.5	19	2.5	3.1	11	2.5
Ability to go beyond basic material and develop more sophisticated understanding.	2.7	19	2.5	2.8	11	2.1
Overall teaching effectiveness.	2.3	19	2.4	3.0	11	2.3

1. AR = average response for my section.

2. Scale: 0.0 - 4.0 (4.0 being the highest)

2. N = number of responses for my section.

3. A300 = average response in all 300 level courses at Indiana University.