

CE-Vue®

Reports

Background and Methodology for the Evaluation of College/University Instruction

Over the years, extensive research has shown that effective instruction at the college level is determined by seven factors. These factors, or constructs, have been identified by Centra (1996) to be as follows: (1) good organization of subject matter and course, (2) effective communication, (3) enthusiasm for the subject matter and teaching, (4) positive attitude toward students, (5) fairness in examinations and grading, (6) flexibility in approaches to teaching, (7) appropriate student learning outcomes. These seven constructs were used to develop a course evaluation instrument called the *Student Questionnaire on Instruction* (SQOI). The process of developing the SQOI (copy attached) began with the generation of a large set of potential evaluation items. Following extensive pilot testing with undergraduates, the initial set of items was reduced to the 20 that were deemed most appropriate; these 20 items were then used to make up the SQOI. The SQOI is currently being used at a number of colleges and universities in the United States and could meet your institution's needs as well. Accompanying the SQOI is a powerful reporting tool (CE-Vue) developed by College Survey Services (CSS) that summarizes, on a single-page format, a very broad range of information about the course section that has been evaluated. CE-Vue allows extensive comparisons to be made between and within instructors for a given semester as well as over any number of semesters.

Since it is clear that higher education institutions differ from one another (along the lines of mission, type of student served, academic programs offered, and so forth) it is not necessarily the case that a particular evaluation instrument will be suitable for each and every institution. This realization has led us at CSS to offer your institution the opportunity either to adopt the SQOI as it is now or, if desired, to customize the SQOI so that you can assemble an evaluation form that most closely reflects the instructional values and criteria established by your faculty and administration. To help you with this customization option, shown below are suggested statements that could be used in place of, or in addition to, those that are currently in the SQOI. As can be seen, these optional statements are grouped under the seven constructs that were used to create the SQOI in the first place. By restricting these options to the seven basic constructs, the integrity of the original SQOI approach can be maintained. Should you choose to modify the SQOI, CSS will gladly produce for your review a proof of your customized form at no cost to your institution. Thus, whether you use the SQOI in its original form or wish to customize it to fit your institution's specific needs, CSS can provide you with the evaluation form and the matching CE-Vue reporting tool that can allow you to evaluate meaningfully and comprehensively the instructional effectiveness of your teaching faculty.

Student Questionnaire on Instruction

Title of Course: _____

Discipline, Number, and Section: _____

Department: _____





Instructor: _____

Current Semester and Year: _____

Date: _____

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

USE A PENCIL, PLEASE!
 Completely fill the oval
 Erase cleanly any changes you wish to make
 Erase any stray marks

Correct Mark: 
 Incorrect Marks:   


To Students at

Your Institution is committed to providing its students with instruction of the highest quality. Students can help us fulfill this commitment by furnishing candid and honest reactions to the instruction they are receiving. This questionnaire gives you the opportunity to express your views concerning this course and the way it has been taught. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the statements shown below by marking one of the following choices: 5 = strongly agree, 4 = agree, 3 = somewhat agree, 2 = disagree, 1 = strongly disagree, n/a = statement is not applicable to this course or this instructor.

IMPORTANT: Using, as a point of reference, your experience in other courses you've taken at this institution, please mark one response for each of the following statements as appropriate to this course.

Statement	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Somewhat Agree (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (n/a)
1. The subject matter for this course was presented in a well organized manner.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. The criteria used for grading student work were clearly explained by the instructor.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. The instructor showed concern (by providing written or oral feedback) for the progress students made in learning course material.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. The instructor spoke in a clear, understandable manner.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. The instructor's grading methods were fair and reasonable.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. I am satisfied with the amount of knowledge I gained as a result of taking this course.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. It is clear that this instructor enjoys teaching.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. The instructor encouraged students to ask questions and express opinions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. The instructor used various teaching methods (e.g., class discussion, lecture, demonstrations, etc.) to explain course material.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. In general, class time was used constructively.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. The instructor was willing to help students outside of class (e.g., through the use of office hours, 1-on-1 scheduled meetings, e-mail, etc.).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Graded work (tests, papers, projects, etc.) was returned in a reasonable amount of time.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Copyright © RBW (2004) All rights reserved.

(OVER, please) 

Statement	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Somewhat Agree (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (n/a)
13. Course materials written by the instructor (e.g., syllabus, notes, test questions, assignments, etc.) were clear and understandable.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. The instructor succeeded in increasing my interest in the subject matter covered in this course.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. Overall, the instructor treated me in a fair, even-handed manner.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. Sufficient time was allowed from the time assignments (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were given and when they were due.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. Required materials (textbooks, library readings, etc.) seemed to be appropriate for this course.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. The instructor appeared to be genuinely interested in the subject matter covered in this course.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. In general, the instructor followed the policies stated in the syllabus/course outline.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. If the opportunity presented itself, I would be willing to take another course from this instructor.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Additional Statements (provided by Instructor)	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Somewhat Agree (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (n/a)
21.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
23.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
24.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
25.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Your Turn! Feel free to comment in the space below on any aspects (strengths, weaknesses) of this course.

Copyright © RBW (2004) All rights reserved.

The College of Anywhere

COURSE TITLE: Arithmetic INSTRUCTOR: TEREN, SUSAN

DISCIPLINE, NUMBER, CRN: MATH-016-1 DELIVERY: P DIVISION: _____

NUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRES COMPLETED FOR THIS SECTION: 12 ENROLLMENT: 19 DEPARTMENT: MATH CAMPUS: _____ SEMESTER AND YEAR: Fall 2010

STATE- MENT	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES						AVERAGE SCORE (N/A EXCLUDED) FOR THIS STATEMENT FOR ...			THIS STATEMENT'S COLLEGE-WIDE PERCENTILE BRACKETS*	
	5	4	3	2	1	N/A	THIS SECTION	ALL COURSES THIS DEPARTMENT MATH	ALL COURSES COLLEGE-WIDE	(10th - 90th)	
1	8	3	1	0	0	0	4.58	4.25	4.42	3.79 - 4.88	
2	6	5	1	0	0	0	4.42	4.34	4.44	3.82 - 4.88	
3	7	3	2	0	0	0	4.42	4.13	4.38	3.75 - 4.88	
4	6	4	2	0	0	0	4.33	4.14	4.47	3.83 - 4.92	
5	6	6	0	0	0	0	4.50	4.39	4.45	3.82 - 4.89	
6	7	5	0	0	0	0	4.58	4.14	4.35	3.67 - 4.86	
7	11	1	0	0	0	0	4.92	4.41	4.56	4.00 - 4.94	
8	10	2	0	0	0	0	4.83	4.29	4.49	3.94 - 4.90	
9	8	4	0	0	0	0	4.67	4.07	4.34	3.70 - 4.84	
10	8	4	0	0	0	0	4.67	4.38	4.44	3.87 - 4.88	
11	7	3	2	0	0	0	4.42	4.19	4.33	3.70 - 4.83	
12	9	3	0	0	0	0	4.75	4.52	4.51	4.00 - 4.92	
13	5	6	1	0	0	0	4.33	4.39	4.48	3.94 - 4.88	
14	6	4	2	0	0	0	4.33	4.00	4.26	3.47 - 4.83	
15	8	4	0	0	0	0	4.67	4.47	4.55	4.00 - 4.92	
16	8	4	0	0	0	0	4.67	4.43	4.52	4.00 - 4.90	
17	7	3	0	0	0	2	4.70	4.40	4.47	3.94 - 4.88	
18	10	2	0	0	0	0	4.83	4.52	4.61	4.15 - 4.95	
19	7	4	1	0	0	0	4.50	4.48	4.56	4.07 - 4.92	
20	10	1	1	0	0	0	4.75	4.15	4.33	3.38 - 4.92	

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS (as provided by instructor)

21	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00
22	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00
23	0	0	0	0	0	12	0.00
24	0	0	0	0	0	12	0.00
25	0	0	0	0	0	12	0.00

RATING SCALE: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Somewhat Agree, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly Disagree, and N/A = Not Applicable

NOTES:

* If the average score for a particular statement in this course section falls BELOW or ABOVE its corresponding 10th or 90th percentile bracket value, this means that the score is among the LOWEST or HIGHEST 10% of all scores for this statement averaged across all courses college-wide. N/A values are excluded.

College Survey Services, Inc. 800 - 755 - 9065

KEY TO SQOI STATEMENTS

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Organized presentation | 11. Students helped outside class |
| 2. Grading criteria explained | 12. Timely return of graded work |
| 3. Concern for student progress | 13. Instructor wrote clearly |
| 4. Instructor spoke clearly | 14. Student interest increased |
| 5. Grading methods fair | 15. Students treated fairly |
| 6. Students gained knowledge | 16. Time to complete assignments |
| 7. Instructor enjoys teaching | 17. Course materials appropriate |
| 8. Student expression encouraged | 18. Instructor interested in subject |
| 9. Various teaching methods used | 19. Policies in syllabus followed |
| 10. Class time used constructively | 20. Would take this instructor again |

Copyright © RBW (2004). All rights reserved.

Academic administration and Department chairs all face a similar problem when presented with a large number of course section evaluations at the end of a semester. Some evaluations will show above average teaching ability, most will show average teaching ability, and some will show below average teaching ability. The problem is how can you quickly see these groups in the pile of reports in front of you. It's like having a haystack in front of you where you know there is useful information, but how do you get to it. CE-View reports allow you to have the needles come to the top of the haystack.

There are four basic reports involved.

The first report is the "Course Section Average < 3.5" report. This report will show all course sections with an average score less than 3.5 on the 5 point Likert scale. These are the course sections that have construct rating(s) below "Somewhat Agree". Since the survey statements are positive, this would show disagreement by the class, or dissatisfaction. These are the course sections you would want to look at further. Further actions could be, is this section an anomaly when other sections taught by this instructor are viewed, and what are the comments for this section.

Course Section Averages

Overall Section Average < 3.5

Department = ENGL

C-1 = Effective Communication
 C-2 = Organization of Subject Matter
 C-3 = Enthusiasm
 C-4 = Positive Attitude Toward Students

C-5 = Fairness in Exams and Grading
 C-6 = Flexibility in Teaching Approaches
 C-7 = Appropriate Learning Outcomes
 Take Again = Would Take This Instructor Again

Instructor	Course Number	Method	Out	Back	C-1	C-2	C-3	C-4	C-5	C-6	C-7	TAKE AGAIN	OAS avg
CEMPBELL, SUSAN	ENGL-098-129	P	20	14	3.40	3.16	3.50	3.38	3.19	3.79	2.79	2.23	3.21
CEMPBELL, SUSAN	ENGL-108-53	P	20	14	3.86	3.21	3.43	3.44	3.30	3.86	3.15	2.29	3.34
FREY, FRANCES	ENGL-098-2	P	19	12	2.53	3.05	3.79	3.75	3.20	2.75	2.69	2.60	3.14
FREY, FRANCES	ENGL-101-1	P	22	9	1.73	1.78	3.33	2.44	2.11	1.67	1.61	1.00	2.05
GORDON, GUIYOU P	ENGL-098-8	P	20	10	3.55	3.77	3.70	3.03	3.46	3.90	3.45	2.50	3.47
GORDON, GUIYOU P	ENGL-108-31	P	20	10	3.60	3.63	3.75	3.13	3.18	3.80	2.95	2.80	3.35
HEUSS, JANE J	ENGL-109-2	P	15	9	3.00	2.89	4.22	4.29	3.18	3.56	3.05	2.88	3.37
JONES, JOHN	ENGL-101-52	P	23	9	3.44	2.87	3.90	3.78	3.51	2.88	2.78	2.57	3.29
LECHEPELLE, JULIE	ENGL-101-79	P	20	9	3.78	3.56	3.28	3.48	3.67	3.33	3.34	2.63	3.49
NIEVES, MARY J	ENGL-098-31	P	19	9	3.56	3.36	3.50	3.07	3.56	3.56	3.38	3.00	3.39
NIEVES, MARY J	ENGL-099-32	P	19	12	3.42	3.17	3.34	2.69	3.41	3.18	3.30	2.83	3.15
PERLEE, MEL	ENGL-102-15	P	25	13	3.31	2.85	3.54	3.56	3.35	3.00	3.15	2.69	3.23
SENESE, ROBERT W	ENGL-099-19	P	18	15	3.56	3.58	3.23	3.30	3.55	2.93	2.94	2.79	3.36
SHEPIRO, ROBERT	ENGL-108-12	P	20	9	3.78	3.50	3.78	3.41	3.56	3.33	2.95	2.56	3.44
SUSEN, STEPHEN H	ENGL-101-60	P	22	16	3.63	3.92	3.44	3.42	3.36	3.19	2.97	2.81	3.44
SUSEN, STEPHEN H	ENGL-101-61	P	23	15	2.97	3.44	2.93	3.10	3.21	2.93	2.40	2.13	3.03
VEDEN, TERRY	ENGL-102-13	P	23	17	3.13	3.41	3.71	3.75	3.71	3.19	3.03	2.88	3.46
WEEVER, THOMAS V	ENGL-098-123	P	19	14	3.36	3.46	3.54	3.53	3.50	3.14	3.43	3.14	3.39

The second is the "ALL" report. This report will allow you to see an instructor's course section in relation to all other course sections taught by the instructor. Answering the question, is this course section better or worse than the others taught by this instructor. Also it is used to see an overall view of the course sections for the semester.



Course Section Averages

All Course Sections in Department
Department = ENGL

C-1 = Effective Communication
C-2 = Organization of Subject Matter
C-3 = Enthusiasm
C-4 = Positive Attitude Toward Students

C-5 = Fairness in Exams and Grading
C-6 = Flexibility in Teaching Approaches
C-7 = Appropriate Learning Outcomes
Take Again = Would Take This Instructor Again

Instructor	Course Number	Method	Out	Back	C-1	C-2	C-3	C-4	C-5	C-6	C-7	TAKE AGAIN	OAS avg
BECK, ARNOLD	ENGL-098-56	P	19	9	4.84	4.64	4.89	4.67	4.58	5.00	4.22	4.00	4.62
BECK, ARNOLD	ENGL-098-91	P	19	13	3.92	3.88	3.88	3.95	3.72	4.08	3.38	2.85	3.77
BECK, ARNOLD	ENGL-108-20	P	19	9	4.78	4.70	4.84	4.63	4.47	5.00	4.22	3.89	4.58
BECK, ARNOLD	ENGL-108-35	P	19	13	3.88	4.08	3.96	3.92	3.80	4.15	3.34	2.92	3.83
BELDWIN, ANN	ENGL-098-108	W	19	17	4.24	4.42	4.62	4.48	4.40	4.47	4.29	4.25	4.41
BELDWIN, ANN	ENGL-098-12	W	19	10	4.40	4.25	4.42	4.40	4.28	4.40	4.25	4.30	4.31
BELDWIN, ANN	ENGL-108-1	W	19	11	4.46	4.48	4.59	4.48	4.42	4.45	4.41	4.55	4.47
BELDWIN, ANN	ENGL-108-41	W	19	17	4.32	4.38	4.59	4.59	4.37	4.53	4.35	4.19	4.42
BERLOW, ANNE	ENGL-101-55	P	22	15	4.84	4.55	4.84	4.91	4.64	4.60	4.47	4.53	4.68
BERLOW, ANNE	ENGL-101-62	P	21	18	4.75	4.71	4.72	4.94	4.71	4.50	4.42	4.78	4.71
BERLOW, ANNE	ENGL-101-64	P	23	19	4.74	4.63	4.63	4.77	4.63	4.53	4.53	4.53	4.64
BERLOW, ANNE	ENGL-102-22	P	24	19	4.63	4.66	4.66	4.75	4.62	4.53	4.55	4.63	4.64
BERLOWE, ANNE	ENGL-101-75	P	21	8	4.36	4.35	4.59	4.54	4.14	4.00	4.11	4.00	4.30
BERLOWE, ANNE	ENGL-108-14	P	21	8	4.46	4.29	4.39	4.34	3.94	4.13	3.91	3.86	4.17
BERNETT, ANNE	ENGL-098-21	P	18	13	3.96	3.98	4.08	3.97	3.92	4.08	3.92	3.15	3.93
BERNETT, ANNE	ENGL-099-9	P	17	13	4.00	4.01	3.96	3.90	4.00	3.77	3.88	3.00	3.91
BERNHILL, ANNE	ENGL-072-8	P	20	16	4.68	4.38	4.50	4.50	4.55	4.63	4.38	4.31	4.49
BERNHILL, ANNE	ENGL-073-8	P	19	18	4.80	4.57	4.67	4.67	4.58	4.61	4.47	4.72	4.63
BERNHILL, ANNE	ENGL-083-2	P	20	17	4.33	4.23	4.42	4.43	4.32	4.38	4.09	4.19	4.31
BERNHILL, ANNE	ENGL-093-4	P	20	17	4.57	4.31	4.50	4.61	4.45	4.35	4.29	4.47	4.45
BERRETT, ANTHONY	ENGL-098-147	P	20	15	4.60	4.50	4.60	4.37	4.45	4.60	4.30	4.20	4.46

The third report is the "Take Again < 3" report. This report shows all course sections where the "Would you take a class from this instructor in the future" is below 3. For further clarification the individual construct values are viewed along with the comments for this course section. These are the course sections the institution is at risk of not filling in the future.



Course Section Averages

Take Again < 3

Department = ENGL

C-1 = Effective Communication
 C-2 = Organization of Subject Matter
 C-3 = Enthusiasm
 C-4 = Positive Attitude Toward Students

C-5 = Fairness in Exams and Grading
 C-6 = Flexibility in Teaching Approaches
 C-7 = Appropriate Learning Outcomes
 Take Again = Would Take This Instructor Again

Instructor	Course Number	Method	Out	Back	C-1	C-2	C-3	C-4	C-5	C-6	C-7	TAKE AGAIN	OAS avg
BECK, ARNOLD	ENGL-098-91	P	19	13	3.92	3.88	3.88	3.95	3.72	4.08	3.38	2.85	3.77
BECK, ARNOLD	ENGL-108-35	P	19	13	3.88	4.08	3.96	3.92	3.80	4.15	3.34	2.92	3.83
CEMPBELL, SUSAN	ENGL-108-53	P	20	14	3.86	3.21	3.43	3.44	3.30	3.86	3.15	2.29	3.34
CEMPBELL, SUSAN	ENGL-098-129	P	20	14	3.40	3.16	3.50	3.38	3.19	3.79	2.79	2.23	3.21
DLUGOS, DON A	ENGL-098-1	P	18	13	3.54	3.77	3.58	3.43	3.77	3.85	2.88	2.00	3.51
ELLIS, ED	ENGL-108-26	P	20	15	3.87	4.20	3.70	3.69	3.66	3.53	3.50	2.80	3.74
ELLIS, ED	ENGL-098-70	P	20	15	4.00	4.05	3.83	3.80	3.79	3.71	3.54	2.93	3.78
EXINN, ANDREW	ENGL-102-32	P	22	9	3.95	4.17	4.55	4.26	3.89	4.00	2.67	2.44	3.87
FERRENTE, ELIZABETH	ENGL-099-38	W	19	14	3.96	3.84	3.86	3.76	3.76	3.92	3.43	2.83	3.74
FLEHERTY, EMILE E	ENGL-102-19	P	23	6	4.67	4.46	4.67	4.33	4.33	3.83	3.67	2.33	4.23
FREY, FRANCES	ENGL-098-2	P	19	12	2.53	3.05	3.79	3.75	3.20	2.75	2.69	2.60	3.14
FREY, FRANCES	ENGL-101-1	P	22	9	1.73	1.78	3.33	2.44	2.11	1.67	1.61	1.00	2.05
GORDON, GUIYOU P	ENGL-108-31	P	20	10	3.60	3.63	3.75	3.13	3.18	3.80	2.95	2.80	3.35
GORDON, GUIYOU P	ENGL-098-8	P	20	10	3.55	3.77	3.70	3.03	3.46	3.90	3.45	2.50	3.47
HEUSS, JANE J	ENGL-109-2	P	15	9	3.00	2.89	4.22	4.29	3.18	3.56	3.05	2.88	3.37
HEUSS, JANE J	ENGL-101-16	P	15	9	3.27	3.06	4.55	4.48	3.58	3.67	3.00	2.50	3.62
JONES, JOHN	ENGL-101-52	P	23	9	3.44	2.87	3.90	3.78	3.51	2.88	2.78	2.57	3.29
KLIEN, JOSEPH R	ENGL-101-31	W	20	15	3.89	4.19	4.28	4.21	3.66	3.73	3.52	2.60	3.87
LECHEPELLE, JULIE	ENGL-101-79	P	20	9	3.78	3.56	3.28	3.48	3.67	3.33	3.34	2.63	3.49
LECHEPELLE, JULIE	ENGL-108-54	P	20	7	3.86	3.61	3.86	3.57	3.72	3.71	3.50	2.43	3.61
MILLEN, LYN J	ENGL-108-24	P	19	13	3.34	3.67	3.96	3.77	3.55	3.54	3.42	2.77	3.57

The fourth report is the "Course Section Average > 4.5" report. This report shows those instructors that are performing above average according to their students. The comments report can lend some insight into the instructor's standing with their students. As in any organization it is important to recognize those doing an above average job. This report can help you identify these instructors.



Course Section Averages

Overall Section Average > 4.5

Department = ENGL

C-1 = Effective Communication
 C-2 = Organization of Subject Matter
 C-3 = Enthusiasm
 C-4 = Positive Attitude Toward Students

C-5 = Fairness in Exams and Grading
 C-6 = Flexibility in Teaching Approaches
 C-7 = Appropriate Learning Outcomes
 Take Again = Would Take This Instructor Again

Instructor	Course Number	Method	Out	Back	C-1	C-2	C-3	C-4	C-5	C-6	C-7	TAKE AGAIN	OAS avg
BECK, ARNOLD	ENGL-098-56	P	19	9	4.84	4.64	4.89	4.67	4.58	5.00	4.22	4.00	4.62
BECK, ARNOLD	ENGL-108-20	P	19	9	4.78	4.70	4.84	4.63	4.47	5.00	4.22	3.89	4.58
BERLOW, ANNE	ENGL-101-55	P	22	15	4.84	4.55	4.84	4.91	4.64	4.60	4.47	4.53	4.68
BERLOW, ANNE	ENGL-101-62	P	21	18	4.75	4.71	4.72	4.94	4.71	4.50	4.42	4.78	4.71
BERLOW, ANNE	ENGL-101-64	P	23	19	4.74	4.63	4.63	4.77	4.63	4.53	4.53	4.53	4.64
BERLOW, ANNE	ENGL-102-22	P	24	19	4.63	4.66	4.66	4.75	4.62	4.53	4.55	4.63	4.64
BERNHILL, ANNE	ENGL-073-8	P	19	18	4.80	4.57	4.67	4.67	4.58	4.61	4.47	4.72	4.63
BERRETT, ANTHONY	ENGL-098-148	P	20	13	4.70	4.36	4.88	4.70	4.71	4.92	4.77	4.92	4.68
BERRETT, ANTHONY	ENGL-101-12	P	22	17	4.82	4.54	4.64	4.65	4.64	4.53	4.38	4.53	4.60
BERRETT, ANTHONY	ENGL-108-58	P	20	12	4.67	4.67	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.67	4.88	4.91	4.74
BIDDER, BARBARA B	ENGL-102-16	W	25	14	4.96	4.88	4.96	4.88	4.73	4.79	4.71	4.64	4.82
BIDDER, BARBARA B	ENGL-102-28	W	24	16	4.81	4.67	4.75	4.86	4.67	4.56	4.63	4.44	4.70
BLENKENSTEIN, BARBARA H	ENGL-098-150	P	20	17	4.97	4.94	4.97	4.86	4.96	4.94	4.97	5.00	4.95
BLENKENSTEIN, BARBARA H	ENGL-099-78	P	20	17	4.94	4.91	4.97	4.86	4.94	4.94	4.94	5.00	4.93
BLOUNT-LYON, BARRY	ENGL-098-143	P	18	12	4.38	4.59	4.75	4.55	4.57	4.33	4.54	4.58	4.55
BLOUNT-LYON, BARRY	ENGL-098-60	P	19	6	4.92	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.99
BLOUNT-LYON, BARRY	ENGL-108-23	P	19	6	5.00	4.87	5.00	4.89	4.97	5.00	4.92	5.00	4.94
BLOUNT-LYON, BARRY	ENGL-108-56	P	18	12	4.34	4.63	4.67	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.50	4.33	4.51
BOGER-HEWKINS, BARRY	ENGL-098-145	P	20	17	4.77	4.48	4.85	4.68	4.67	4.65	4.62	4.88	4.67
BOGER-HEWKINS, BARRY	ENGL-099-76	P	20	17	4.71	4.46	4.85	4.76	4.68	4.71	4.47	4.88	4.66
BOOZENG, BARRY	ENGL-101-59	P	22	20	4.89	4.84	4.95	4.80	4.81	4.75	4.58	4.85	4.81