To: Instructors Who Taught Courses During the Spring 2007 Term

From: Richard M. Englert

Subject: Spring 2007 Course and Teaching Evaluations

Date: June 15, 2007

Included in this envelope are the results from the student evaluations for the spring 2007 term for your course. 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENROLLMENT: 14</th>
<th>RETURNED FORMS: 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. The instructor clearly explained the educational objectives of this course.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 12</td>
<td>Strongly Agree = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable or Did Not Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 2007

- **CRN:** 091835
- **TIMES TAUGHT:** 5 - 7
- **INSTR. NAME:** NEWMAN, STEVEN
- **INSTR. TUid:** 908795848
- **DEPARTMENT:** ENGLISH (02407)
- **COURSE NAME:** SURVEY ENG LIT 1660-19
- **INSTRUCTOR:** 1 of 1
- **SECT. #:** 003
- **CAMPUS:** BROAD AND MONTGOMERY
- **COLLEGE:** LIBERAL ARTS

**ENROLLMENT:** 28  
**COMPLETED EVALUATIONS:** 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n=20</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Pct' Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n=20</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Elective</th>
<th>Elective</th>
<th>Elective</th>
<th>Elective</th>
<th>Elective</th>
<th>Elective</th>
<th>Elective</th>
<th>Elective</th>
<th>Elective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n=21</th>
<th>Less than 1</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>More than 6</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Pct' Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n=20</th>
<th>Less than 1</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>5-6</th>
<th>More than 6</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Pct' Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Temple University Course and Teaching Evaluation - Spring 2007

CRN: 091835
TIMES TAUGHT: 5 - 7
INSTR. NAME: NEWMAN, STEVEN
INSTR. TUid: 908795848
DEPARTMENT: ENGLISH (02407)
COURSE #: 0115
COURSE NAME: SURVEY ENG LIT 1660-19
INSTRUCTOR: 1 of 1
SECT. #: 003
CAMPUS: BROAD AND MONTGOMERY
COLLEGE: LIBERAL ARTS

| ENROLLMENT: | 28 |
| COMPLETED EVALUATIONS: | 21 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>n=20</th>
<th>n=21</th>
<th>n=21</th>
<th>n=21</th>
<th>n=21</th>
<th>n=21</th>
<th>n=21</th>
<th>n=21</th>
<th>n=21</th>
<th>n=21</th>
<th>n=21</th>
<th>n=21</th>
<th>n=21</th>
<th>n=21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>#5</td>
<td>#6</td>
<td>#7</td>
<td>#8</td>
<td>#9</td>
<td>#10</td>
<td>#11</td>
<td>#12</td>
<td>#13</td>
<td>#14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree = 5</th>
<th>Agree = 4</th>
<th>Neutral = 3</th>
<th>Disagree = 2</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree = 1</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Pct'l Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. The instructor clearly explained the educational objectives of this course.
   - **Strongly Agree**
   - **Agree**
   - **Neutral**
   - **Disagree**
   - **Strongly Disagree**
   - **Not Answered**

2. The instructor was well organized and prepared for class.

3. So far, the instructor has graded fairly.

4. The instructor scheduled time and was available to students outside of class.

5. The instructor provided prompt feedback about exams, projects, rehearsals, and performances.

6. The instructor consistently started and ended class on time.

7. The instructor promoted a classroom atmosphere in which I felt free to ask questions and express my opinions.

8. The instructor taught this course well.
1. The course materials (textbook, handouts, etc.) and course activities were useful and of high quality.

```
n= 21
Section 57% 38% 5% 0% 0% 4.52 0.59
Department 38% 43% 13% 4% 2% 4.13 0.89 85
College 37% 43% 14% 5% 2% 4.08 0.93 86
Level 36% 41% 15% 6% 3% 4.00 1.00 87
University 34% 42% 16% 6% 3% 3.98 0.99 88
```

2. I learned a great deal in this course.

```
n= 21
Section 57% 24% 19% 0% 0% 4.38 0.79
Department 36% 42% 16% 4% 2% 4.06 0.93 74
College 40% 41% 14% 4% 2% 4.12 0.92 68
Level 42% 40% 12% 4% 2% 4.16 0.92 62
University 38% 41% 14% 5% 2% 4.09 0.94 68
```

3. I increased my ability to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view.

```
n= 21
Section 57% 29% 14% 0% 0% 4.43 0.73
Department 38% 42% 15% 4% 1% 4.12 0.89 77
College 35% 39% 19% 5% 2% 4.01 0.94 83
Level 37% 39% 18% 5% 2% 4.04 0.94 78
University 33% 39% 20% 5% 2% 3.97 0.96 82
```

4. Information technology (Internet, e-mail, courseware, etc.) was used effectively in the course.

```
n= 20
Section 75% 20% 5% 0% 0% 4.70 0.56
Department 33% 40% 20% 4% 2% 3.99 0.93 97
College 35% 40% 19% 4% 2% 4.01 0.94 97
Level 39% 39% 16% 4% 2% 4.09 0.93 93
University 36% 40% 18% 4% 2% 4.02 0.95 94
```

5. I gained an interest in learning more about the material covered in this course.

```
n= 21
Section 57% 24% 10% 5% 5% 4.24 1.11
Department 31% 35% 22% 8% 4% 3.81 1.08 76
College 35% 36% 18% 7% 3% 3.93 1.06 68
Level 39% 37% 15% 6% 3% 4.04 1.02 58
University 34% 37% 18% 7% 4% 3.91 1.07 66
```

6. This course had value to me.

```
n= 21
Section 57% 24% 5% 10% 5% 4.19 1.18
Department 35% 40% 16% 5% 3% 4.00 0.99 59
College 38% 39% 15% 5% 3% 4.03 1.00 55
Level 43% 39% 12% 4% 2% 4.16 0.95 43
University 38% 40% 14% 5% 3% 4.05 0.99 52
```

7. The workload for this course was

```
n= 19
Section 5% 42% 53% 0% 0% 3.53 0.60
Department 5% 33% 58% 4% 0% 3.38 0.65 68
College 4% 24% 63% 8% 0% 3.23 0.67 78
Level 6% 30% 56% 8% 1% 3.34 0.73 69
University 6% 27% 58% 9% 1% 3.28 0.73 73
```
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. The strengths of the teaching were:
   Obvious passion for the material being taught. Organized set-up, good promotion of classroom discussion.

2. The strengths of the course were:

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, 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. The strengths of the teaching were:

2. The strengths of the course were:

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, 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. The strengths of the teaching were:
   Dr. Neuron was always available for extra help.

2. The strengths of the course were:
   All of Montreal covered.

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:
   N/A

4. The weaknesses of the course were:
   Too much reading.

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?
   No more Internet chats required.

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, 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. The strengths of the teaching were:

2. The strengths of the course were:

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:
   *often used vocabulary most of us were unfamiliar with*

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, 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. The strengths of the teaching were:
   Depth of knowledge, enthusiasm for teaching, use of Blackboard.

2. The strengths of the course were:
   Varied readings.

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, 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. The strengths of the teaching were:

   Excellent

2. The strengths of the course were:

   Excellent

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

   Sometimes we rushed readings

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

   SAME AS ABOVE

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

   NOTHING

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and disability) of the students in the class.

   He was a fair, open and always accessible to students
Part 6. Comments
Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

   Neillman managed to make me care about English Lit.
   Best professor I've ever had

2. The strengths of the course were:

   

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

   I have absolutely no complaints.

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

   

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and disability) of the students in the class.

   Very sensitive, included everyone in discussions,
   Very fair.
Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:
   
   everything - excellent professor

2. The strengths of the course were:

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, 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. The strengths of the teaching were:
   Prof. Newman was the most enthusiastic, kind and helpful teacher I've ever had. She made me want to go to class.

2. The strengths of the course were:

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, 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. The strengths of the teaching were:
   
   So many - preparation was excellent. Always substantial literature and notes to prepare students for. Wonderful instruction - well thought and articulated.

2. The strengths of the course were:

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

4. The weaknesses of the course were:
   
   As in many survey classes - too big a bite!

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, 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. The strengths of the teaching were:
   comprehensive, analytic, & argumentative ability

2. The strengths of the course were:
   
   

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:
   we really we should not read a little more

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, 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. The strengths of the teaching were:
   - Great preparation for classes
   - Powerpoint prepwork on blackboard

2. The strengths of the course were:

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, 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. The strengths of the teaching were:

   - Knowledgeable & informative lectures
   - Thought-provoking class discussions
   - Amazing ability to cover and educate us about so many texts in one semester.
   - Best English class I've had so far!

2. The strengths of the course were:

   - Professor Asuamnen made this class as strong and valuable as it was.
   - He enhanced the material to the highest possible degree with his passion and dedication to his field.

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

   -

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

   -

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

   -

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and disability) of the students in the class.

   Very appropriate
Part 6. Comments
Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:
   
   none

2. The strengths of the course were:

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:
   
   none

4. The weaknesses of the course were:
   
   I think for me it is a difficult subject to understand because I cannot relate to it on any level. I think if there was more of an attempt to draw the past to the present and tie the lives of men and women racially and socially one might get more of the times and see relation to all people.

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

   Give further explanation of the times and how it can relate to all people.

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and disability) of the students in the class.

   It was never an issue
Part 6. Comments

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

   well organized, fair, open to debate

2. The strengths of the course were:

   always by syllabus

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

   

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

   

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

   

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and disability) of the students in the class.

   very professional
Part 6. Comments
Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

2. The strengths of the course were:

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and disability) of the students in the class.
1. The strengths of the teaching were:
   - His knowledge of the subject matter.
   - He cared about his students' success.

2. The strengths of the course were:

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

5. To improve this course, what would you have the instructor do differently?

6. Please comment on the instructor's sensitivity to the diversity (race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and disability) of the students in the class.