

# eValuate Report (Public) - Fall 2010

Course: RCPL 5013-001 / P SC 5013-001 / SOC 5013-001

College of Architecture

Total Enrollment: 14

Section Title: History & Theory of Urban Plan

Course Level: All

Instructor: Kathleen Wieters

Section Size: All

Question	Level	Mean Response	Median Response	Standard Deviation	ZScore	Responses	Percent #1	Percent #2	Percent #3	Percent #4	Percent #5	Dept Rank	College Rank
2. The course projects/assignments provided good opportunity for learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.55556	5	0.72648		9	0.00	0.00	11.11	22.22	66.67	66.67	68.48
	DEPARTMENT	4.38462	4	0.70027		65	0.00	1.54	7.69	41.54	49.23		
	COLLEGE	3.94483	4	1.14824	-0.53	1,015	4.93	7.88	15.57	31.03	40.59		
9. The course provided an appropriate challenge which enhanced my learning and development	INDIVIDUAL	4.66667	5	0.50000		9	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.33	66.67	66.67	81.52
	DEPARTMENT	4.36923	5	0.78201		65	0.00	3.08	9.23	35.38	52.31		
	COLLEGE	3.88083	4	1.18795	-0.66	1,007	6.75	7.25	14.90	33.37	37.74		
Kathleen Wieters													
12. Instructor made effective use of class/studio time	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	88.89	91.75
	DEPARTMENT	4.66154	5	0.53843		65	0.00	0.00	3.08	27.69	69.23		
	COLLEGE	3.99905	4	1.16934	-0.86	1,049	5.82	6.58	13.73	29.65	44.23		
17. Instructor provided clear objectives for projects, assignments, exams, etc.	INDIVIDUAL	4.77778	5	0.66667		9	0.00	0.00	11.11	0.00	88.89	100.00	86.60
	DEPARTMENT	4.36923	5	0.87624		65	0.00	6.15	7.69	29.23	56.92		
	COLLEGE	3.94561	4	1.19770	-0.69	1,048	6.11	7.44	15.55	27.58	43.32		
21. Instructor provided for student consultation	INDIVIDUAL	4.62500	5	0.51755		8	0.00	0.00	0.00	37.50	62.50	66.67	78.35
	DEPARTMENT	4.46032	5	0.79971		63	1.59	1.59	4.76	33.33	58.73		
	COLLEGE	4.16332	4	1.02599	-0.45	1,047	3.25	3.82	14.80	29.61	48.52		

## Response Key

2. The course projects/assignments provided good opportunity for learning

1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Satisfactory, 4 = Good, 5 = Excellent

9. The course provided an appropriate challenge which enhanced my learning and development

1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Satisfactory, 4 = Good, 5 = Excellent

12. Instructor made effective use of class/studio time

1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Satisfactory, 4 = Good, 5 = Excellent

17. Instructor provided clear objectives for projects, assignments, exams, etc.

1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Satisfactory, 4 = Good, 5 = Excellent

21. Instructor provided for student consultation

1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Satisfactory, 4 = Good, 5 = Excellent