

**INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM**
**OFFICE OF THE PROVOST**
**Richard M. Englert**  
 Interim Provost

 Phone: (215) 204-4775  
 Fax: (215) 204-5816  
 E-mail: [provost@temple.edu](mailto:provost@temple.edu)

To: Instructors Who Taught Courses During the Fall 2006 Term

From: Richard M. Englert *Richard M. Englert*

Subject: Fall 2006 Course and Teaching Evaluations

Date: January 24, 2007

Included in this envelope are the results from the student evaluations for the fall 2006 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:

		Strongly Agree = 5	Agree = 4	Neutral = 3	Disagree = 2	Strongly Disagree = 1	Not Applicable or Did Not Answer	Mean	SD	Pct'l Rank
ENROLLMENT:	14									
RETURNED FORMS:	12									
1. The instructor clearly explained the educational objectives of this course.	n = 12	(7)	(4)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	58%	33%	8%	0%	0%		4.50	0.65	
	Department	41%	43%	11%	4%	2%		4.17	0.89	74
	College	44%	42%	9%	3%	1%		4.25	0.85	68
	Level	46%	40%	9%	3%	2%		4.24	0.89	59
	University	45%	41%	9%	4%	2%		4.23	0.89	66

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 66<sup>th</sup> 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 the way the data are reported, please send your suggestions to me at [provost@temple.edu](mailto:provost@temple.edu). Thank you for your participation.

Processed in Fall 2006 Cycle

Temple University Course and Teaching Evaluation - Summer II 2006

CRN: 308670  
 INSTR. NAME: DU, XIUHONG  
 DEPARTMENT: MATH (01305)  
 COURSE #: 0127  
 SECT. #: 023  
 CAMPUS: BROAD AND MONTGOMERY  
 COLLEGE: SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

TIMES TAUGHT: FIRST TIME  
 INSTR. TUID: 908985411  
 COURSE NAME: CALCULUS III  
 INSTRUCTOR: 1 of 1

ENROLLMENT: 11  
 COMPLETED EVALUATIONS: 10

		Low = 1	Moderate = 2	High = 3	Not Answered	Mean	SD	Pct'l Rank
<b>1. Before enrolling, my level of interest in the subject matter of this course was</b>	<b>n= 9</b>	(2)	(5)	(2)	(1)			
Section		22%	56%	22%		2.00	0.67	
Department		36%	47%	18%		1.82	0.71	68
College		25%	51%	24%		1.99	0.70	52
Level		11%	44%	45%		2.33	0.67	16
University		17%	47%	36%		2.20	0.70	30

		A = 4	B = 3	C = 2	D = 1	F = 0			
<b>2. Expected grade in this course</b>	<b>n= 10</b>	(0)	(8)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(0)		
Section		0%	80%	20%	0%	0%		2.80	0.40
Department		34%	42%	21%	2%	1%		3.07	0.83
College		35%	45%	18%	1%	0%		3.14	0.77
Level		46%	44%	9%	0%	0%		3.36	0.67
University		45%	45%	10%	1%	0%		3.33	0.69

		Required = 1	Elective = 2					
<b>3. Course was: Required or Elective</b>	<b>n= 9</b>	(9)	(0)			(1)		
Section		100%	0%				1.00	0.00
Department		94%	6%				1.06	0.23
College		89%	11%				1.11	0.31
Level		68%	32%				1.32	0.47
University		73%	27%				1.27	0.45

		Less than 1 = 1	1-3 = 2	4-6 = 3	7-9 = 4	More than 9 = 5			
<b>4. Hours per week spent preparing for course</b>	<b>n= 9</b>	(0)	(2)	(2)	(3)	(2)	(1)		
Section		0%	22%	22%	33%	22%		3.56	1.07
Department		14%	47%	29%	7%	3%		2.37	0.92
College		10%	45%	30%	9%	6%		2.55	0.99
Level		9%	46%	31%	8%	5%		2.55	0.96
University		11%	47%	30%	7%	5%		2.47	0.94

Processed in Fall 2006 Cycle

Temple University Course and Teaching Evaluation - Summer II 2006

CRN: 308670  
 INSTR. NAME: DU, XIUHONG  
 DEPARTMENT: MATH (01305)  
 COURSE #: 0127  
 SECT. #: 023  
 CAMPUS: BROAD AND MONTGOMERY  
 COLLEGE: SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

TIMES TAUGHT: FIRST TIME  
 INSTR. TUIID: 908985411  
 COURSE NAME: CALCULUS III  
 INSTRUCTOR: 1 of 1

ENROLLMENT: 11  
 COMPLETED EVALUATIONS: 10

		Strongly Agree = 5	Agree = 4	Neutral = 3	Disagree = 2	Strongly Disagree = 1	Not Answered	Mean	SD	Pct'l Rank
1. The instructor clearly explained the educational objectives of this course.	<b>n= 9</b>	(4)	(4)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(1)			
	Section	44%	44%	11%	0%	0%		4.33	0.67	
	Department	41%	40%	12%	4%	2%		4.13	0.94	58
	College	40%	42%	11%	4%	2%		4.13	0.94	57
	Level	49%	39%	8%	3%	1%		4.31	0.84	43
University	46%	40%	9%	3%	2%		4.27	0.86	46	
2. The instructor was well organized and prepared for class.	<b>n= 9</b>	(6)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(1)			
	Section	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%		4.67	0.47	
	Department	46%	40%	10%	3%	1%		4.26	0.86	82
	College	45%	40%	10%	3%	2%		4.23	0.88	83
	Level	52%	37%	7%	3%	1%		4.35	0.83	75
University	50%	38%	8%	3%	1%		4.32	0.85	77	
3. So far, the instructor has graded fairly.	<b>n= 9</b>	(3)	(5)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(1)			
	Section	33%	56%	11%	0%	0%		4.22	0.63	
	Department	47%	38%	10%	4%	1%		4.26	0.88	39
	College	43%	38%	12%	4%	2%		4.15	0.96	43
	Level	48%	36%	10%	4%	2%		4.24	0.92	39
University	46%	37%	11%	4%	2%		4.22	0.92	40	
4. The instructor scheduled time and was available to students outside of class.	<b>n= 9</b>	(4)	(5)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(1)			
	Section	44%	56%	0%	0%	0%		4.44	0.50	
	Department	42%	37%	16%	3%	2%		4.15	0.91	69
	College	40%	38%	17%	3%	2%		4.11	0.92	73
	Level	45%	37%	14%	2%	1%		4.23	0.86	65
University	43%	37%	16%	2%	1%		4.19	0.87	67	
5. The instructor provided prompt feedback about exams, projects, rehearsals, and performances.	<b>n= 9</b>	(6)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(1)			
	Section	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%		4.67	0.47	
	Department	45%	40%	10%	4%	2%		4.22	0.89	83
	College	41%	40%	12%	4%	2%		4.14	0.95	87
	Level	46%	38%	10%	4%	2%		4.22	0.92	84
University	44%	39%	11%	4%	2%		4.19	0.92	84	
6. The instructor consistently started and ended class on time.	<b>n= 9</b>	(4)	(3)	(1)	(1)	(0)	(1)			
	Section	44%	33%	11%	11%	0%		4.11	0.99	
	Department	48%	40%	7%	3%	1%		4.31	0.83	24
	College	46%	43%	8%	3%	1%		4.29	0.83	25
	Level	51%	39%	6%	3%	1%		4.35	0.82	22
University	49%	40%	7%	3%	1%		4.33	0.82	22	
7. The instructor promoted a classroom atmosphere in which I felt free to ask questions and express my opinions.	<b>n= 9</b>	(3)	(5)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(1)			
	Section	33%	56%	11%	0%	0%		4.22	0.63	
	Department	46%	36%	11%	5%	3%		4.17	0.99	45
	College	45%	37%	11%	4%	3%		4.17	0.98	39
	Level	55%	33%	8%	3%	2%		4.35	0.88	27
University	52%	34%	9%	3%	2%		4.31	0.90	29	
8. The instructor taught this course well.	<b>n= 9</b>	(4)	(5)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(1)			
	Section	44%	56%	0%	0%	0%		4.44	0.50	
	Department	43%	33%	14%	6%	4%		4.04	1.09	67
	College	42%	35%	13%	6%	4%		4.05	1.07	65
	Level	51%	33%	10%	4%	3%		4.24	0.98	53
University	48%	34%	11%	4%	3%		4.19	0.99	56	

Processed in Fall 2006 Cycle

Temple University Course and Teaching Evaluation - Summer II 2006

CRN: 308670  
 INSTR. NAME: DU, XIUHONG  
 DEPARTMENT: MATH (01305)  
 COURSE #: 0127  
 SECT. #: 023  
 CAMPUS: BROAD AND MONTGOMERY  
 COLLEGE: SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

TIMES TAUGHT: FIRST TIME  
 INSTR. TUID: 908985411  
 COURSE NAME: CALCULUS III  
 INSTRUCTOR: 1 of 1

ENROLLMENT: 11  
 COMPLETED EVALUATIONS: 10

		Strongly Agree = 5	Agree = 4	Neutral = 3	Disagree = 2	Strongly Disagree = 1	Not Answered	Mean	SD	Pct'l Rank
1. The course materials (textbook, handouts, etc.) and course activities were useful and of high quality.	<b>n= 10</b>	(4)	(5)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	40%	50%	10%	0%	0%		4.30	0.64	
	Department	28%	43%	18%	7%	4%		3.83	1.05	87
	College	28%	43%	18%	7%	4%		3.83	1.04	85
	Level	35%	41%	15%	6%	3%		4.00	1.00	71
University	33%	42%	16%	6%	3%		3.97	0.99	73	
2. I learned a great deal in this course.	<b>n= 10</b>	(4)	(5)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	40%	50%	10%	0%	0%		4.30	0.64	
	Department	26%	40%	22%	8%	3%		3.78	1.03	84
	College	28%	44%	19%	6%	3%		3.89	0.98	79
	Level	42%	40%	12%	4%	2%		4.16	0.92	54
University	38%	41%	14%	5%	2%		4.09	0.94	61	
3. I increased my ability to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view.	<b>n= 10</b>	(4)	(4)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	40%	40%	20%	0%	0%		4.20	0.75	
	Department	23%	36%	29%	9%	3%		3.67	1.02	85
	College	24%	38%	28%	8%	3%		3.72	1.00	82
	Level	36%	39%	18%	5%	2%		4.04	0.94	59
University	33%	40%	20%	5%	2%		3.96	0.96	64	
4. Information technology (Internet, e-mail, courseware, etc.) was used effectively in the course.	<b>n= 5</b>	(1)	(3)	(0)	(1)	(0)	(5)			
	Section	20%	60%	0%	20%	0%		3.80	0.98	
	Department	25%	32%	28%	10%	5%		3.62	1.11	62
	College	31%	38%	21%	6%	3%		3.88	1.02	42
	Level	38%	39%	17%	4%	2%		4.08	0.93	26
University	35%	40%	18%	5%	2%		4.01	0.95	31	
5. I gained an interest in learning more about the material covered in this course.	<b>n= 10</b>	(3)	(3)	(1)	(3)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	30%	30%	10%	30%	0%		3.60	1.20	
	Department	18%	26%	29%	17%	10%		3.24	1.22	72
	College	22%	34%	25%	12%	7%		3.53	1.16	48
	Level	39%	37%	15%	6%	3%		4.03	1.02	17
University	34%	37%	18%	7%	4%		3.90	1.07	25	
6. This course had value to me.	<b>n= 10</b>	(4)	(4)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	40%	40%	20%	0%	0%		4.20	0.75	
	Department	23%	37%	24%	10%	6%		3.59	1.13	88
	College	26%	41%	21%	7%	5%		3.77	1.07	77
	Level	43%	39%	12%	4%	2%		4.16	0.94	45
University	38%	40%	14%	5%	3%		4.05	0.99	54	

		Too Heavy = 5	Heavy = 4	Average = 3	Light = 2	Too Light = 1	Not Answered	Mean	SD	Pct'l Rank
7. The workload for this course was	<b>n= 10</b>	(1)	(7)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(0)			
	Section	10%	70%	20%	0%	0%		3.90	0.54	
	Department	3%	22%	62%	11%	1%		3.16	0.70	94
	College	9%	31%	51%	8%	1%		3.41	0.78	86
	Level	6%	30%	56%	7%	0%		3.35	0.73	87
University	6%	28%	57%	9%	1%		3.29	0.73	90	

Processed in Fall 2006 Cycle

Temple University Course and Teaching Evaluation - Summer II 2006

CRN: 308670  
INSTR. NAME: DU, XIUHONG

INSTRUCTOR: 1 of 1

**Additional Items Report**

Below is an analysis of responses in the "Additional Items" section of the student sheets.

---

**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:

she knows her stuff, work w/ the students unlike other prof.

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:

- PROMPT FEEDBACK

2. The strengths of the course were:

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

- SOFT SPOKE (HARD TO HEAR AT TIMES)  
- AT TIMES HARD TO UNDERSTAND

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

- A LOT OF MATERIAL FOR SUMMER COURSE  
- 5 DAYS A WEEK (M-TH WOULD BE BETTER)  
- NOT ENOUGH TIME TO ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS DURING CLASS (SEE ME AFTER CLASS!)

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

- FORMULA SHEETS FOR TESTS + QUIZZES  
- GRADE HOMEWORK

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:

*explaining, quizzes,*

2. The strengths of the course were:

---

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

---

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

*condensing much material in short  
amounts of time.*

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

*spend less time on  
easier material  
(vectors) and more on**Section 16.1-4*

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:

Easy to communicate and interact with teacher

2. The strengths of the course were:

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

When the teacher leaves for a week and the sub gives 2 quizzes it's bad when the teacher has no power to change the grade of the quiz, even if it was graded incorrectly

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

Too much to learn, not enough time  
Went slow through the easy parts, and fast through the tough parts

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

take out some sections  
teach the harder sections more slowly

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:

examples used were somewhat helpful.  
 review of homework problems were helpful

2. The strengths of the course were:

Good amount of information

3. The weaknesses of the teaching were:

Too many proofs not enough examples

4. The weaknesses of the course were:

Amount of problems suggested was too heavy for  
 a summer session.  
 No practice exams were given.

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

less proof more examples to help with  
 homework

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.

Good.

**Part 6. Comments**

Please comment on the quality of the course and instruction.

1. The strengths of the teaching were:

Material explained thoroughly

2. The strengths of the course were:

The class was small so the instructor was able to help each individual student. She knew what each of us needed help with.

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.

