

Course - Program Comparison

Data as of: 6/5/09 All ratings on 5-point scale; 1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree

SUS - PSYC - ADLPH - Spring 2009 - Online Session 3 - ONL

Questions		Course Rating								Mean			STD			No.		
		PSYC 100		7381		Instructor: Brooke, Stephanie L												
		Str Disagree		Str Agree	NA	NR												
05	Fac well prep	1	0	2	6	9	0	0	4.22	1.06	18							
06	Good pres	1	2	3	3	9	0	0	3.94	1.30	18							
07	Stim Intrst	2	1	3	6	6	0	0	3.72	1.32	18							
08	Fair Grade	1	1	1	4	11	0	0	4.28	1.18	18							
09	Hlpfl Fdback	2	1	2	5	8	0	0	3.89	1.37	18							
10	Access	0	1	2	5	10	0	0	4.33	0.91	18							
11	Concrn	2	0	5	6	5	0	0	3.67	1.24	18							
12	Int Chlngng	0	1	4	4	9	0	0	4.17	0.99	18							
13	Clr Obj	0	0	3	6	9	0	0	4.33	0.77	18							
14	Clr Grd Crit	0	1	2	6	9	0	0	4.28	0.89	18							
15	Valu Asgmt	0	4	2	4	8	0	0	3.89	1.23	18							
16	Rqrd Text	0	1	1	7	9	0	0	4.33	0.84	18							
17	Othr Crs Mtrl	0	0	2	5	7	4	0	4.36	0.74	14							
18	Eff Use Tech	0	1	4	3	3	7	0	3.73	1.01	11							
19	Eff Writing	1	2	3	4	5	3	0	3.67	1.29	15							
20	Cmptr Skills	1	3	3	3	3	5	0	3.31	1.32	13							
21	Use Rsrch	1	1	3	7	6	0	0	3.89	1.13	18							
22	Glbl Prspctv	1	2	5	4	5	0	1	3.59	1.23	17							
23	Crit Thnkng	1	2	2	4	8	0	1	3.94	1.30	17							
24	Lab Actvty	0	2	2	4	2	7	1	3.60	1.07	10							
25	Rcmd CORS	1	0	5	4	7	0	1	3.94	1.14	17							
26	Rcmd FAC	1	3	2	2	9	0	1	3.88	1.41	17							
27	Pers Goals	1	2	3	8	3	0	1	3.59	1.12	17							
28	Prof Goals	1	2	1	8	5	0	1	3.82	1.19	17							
29	Struc to Lrng	1	3	3	5	5	0	1	3.59	1.28	17							
30	Stdnt Intract	0	0	3	6	8	0	1	4.29	0.77	17							
31	Fac-Stud Intr	0	2	4	5	6	0	1	3.88	1.05	17							
32	Tech on Own	1	0	1	8	8	0	0	4.22	1.00	18							

Questions		Program Rating								Mean			STD			No.		
		PSYC		7381		Instructor: Brooke, Stephanie L												
		Str Disagree		Str Agree	NA	NR												
6	2	39	167	241	0	9	4.40	0.77	455									
6	10	48	170	220	0	10	4.30	0.84	454									
9	20	64	154	204	0	13	4.16	0.96	451									
11	12	46	177	205	0	13	4.23	0.91	451									
10	24	62	166	189	0	13	4.11	0.98	451									
7	7	50	172	216	0	12	4.29	0.84	452									
13	28	87	135	184	0	17	4.00	1.06	447									
3	11	38	180	224	0	8	4.34	0.78	456									
4	2	25	189	234	0	10	4.43	0.70	454									
3	6	25	192	228	0	10	4.40	0.71	454									
3	12	41	202	197	0	9	4.27	0.78	455									
6	7	45	188	206	0	12	4.29	0.81	452									
6	5	49	168	127	87	22	4.14	0.83	355									
4	10	63	108	106	147	26	4.04	0.92	291									
6	15	89	173	122	34	25	3.96	0.90	405									
8	32	110	126	81	76	31	3.67	1.00	357									
5	5	48	199	180	10	17	4.24	0.78	437									
3	13	72	175	152	26	23	4.11	0.85	415									
4	11	52	195	183	0	19	4.22	0.81	445									
2	10	56	106	91	172	27	4.03	0.88	265									
12	14	54	178	193	0	13	4.17	0.94	451									
13	19	54	157	206	0	15	4.17	0.99	449									
8	12	64	198	164	0	18	4.12	0.88	446									
5	18	56	190	164	0	31	4.13	0.87	433									
8	18	70	196	159	0	13	4.06	0.91	451									
2	11	51	209	177	0	14	4.22	0.77	450									
11	32	76	180	147	0	18	3.94	1.00	446									
4	5	27	205	206	0	17	4.35	0.72	447									

Instructor Overall	4.00	1.08	4.20	0.78
Course Overall	3.99	0.86	4.17	0.65
Course Design	4.16	0.75	4.28	0.63
Pedagogy	3.99	1.06	4.29	0.72
Interaction	4.07	0.93	4.13	0.76
Course Objectives	3.75	1.03	4.05	0.71

Course - Program Comparison



Course: PSYC 100 Section: 7381

Strong Features

how to think better

I feel the strongest feature was the reading of the chapters because of how in depth they were, especially with the brain. It was difficult to understand, yet interesting.

Nothing.

The interaction in the confrence with the other students.

The student to student interaction.

The textbook, although too heavy to be carting around everywhere, is chock full of very interesting data and is presented in a nice fashion. The learning outcomes sections are particularly helpful.

the time allotted to first read the chapters and develop and response before we were actually required to respond

Improve/Recommend

I believe, as with any course, whether on-line or on campus should have an instructor who teaches us something about the subject matter that isn't included in our textbook, sharing their perspective. A professor should be able to apply the concepts we're learning in class into situations relevant to us in order to help us can understand the subject more deeply. Otherwise, we're just taking a self study course by reading the text, answering the questions, and taking the final exam.

I don't think there should be so many conference questions to answer at once. We students only have so much time to read these chapters and most of us are enrolled in more than one class. With multiple questions to answer, one starts to cram, and when that happens, you don't always do your best work because you are focusing more on getting it done on time rather than the quality. I think it would be more beneficial to have to answer no more than two questions for each conference. Plus, requiring a response to your peers for every question is also very time consuming. Requiring a response to one question would also be more beneficial.

It would have helped if we could have had better feedback with writing our term papers such as a schedule or study group rather than just an ambiguous topic and due date.

Make the students correct their spelling and grammar before submitting work. I found it difficult to understand what some were trying to say because I couldn't read and make sense of what they had written.

none

None

The syllabus needs to include the length of the paper, was in the dark of how long it was required to be until about a week prior.

_The teacher should elaborate more when commenting on work.

Course - Program Comparison

Data as of: 6/5/09 All ratings on 5-point scale; 1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree

SUS - PSYC - ADLPH - Spring 2009 - Online Session 3 - ONL

Course Rating

Questions		PSYC 310		7381		Instructor: Brooke, Stephanie L					
		Str Disagree		Str Agree	NA	NR	Mean	STD	No.		
05	Fac well prep	0	0	1	11	3	0	0	4.13	0.52	15
06	Good pres	0	3	0	9	3	0	0	3.80	1.01	15
07	Stim Intrst	0	2	2	8	3	0	0	3.80	0.94	15
08	Fair Grade	1	1	1	9	3	0	0	3.80	1.08	15
09	Hlpfl Fdback	0	2	6	3	4	0	0	3.60	1.06	15
10	Access	0	0	1	10	4	0	0	4.20	0.56	15
11	Concrn	1	4	5	3	2	0	0	3.07	1.16	15
12	Int Chlngng	0	1	2	8	4	0	0	4.00	0.85	15
13	Clr Obj	1	0	0	10	4	0	0	4.07	0.96	15
14	Clr Grd Crit	1	0	1	8	5	0	0	4.07	1.03	15
15	Valu Asgmt	0	1	2	8	4	0	0	4.00	0.85	15
16	Rqrd Text	0	0	1	9	5	0	0	4.27	0.59	15
17	Othr Crs Mtrl	0	2	1	7	3	2	0	3.85	0.99	13
18	Eff Use Tech	0	3	3	6	2	1	0	3.50	1.02	14
19	Eff Writing	1	1	5	5	3	0	0	3.53	1.13	15
20	Cmptr Skills	0	3	4	3	3	2	0	3.46	1.13	13
21	Use Rsrch	0	1	3	7	4	0	0	3.93	0.88	15
22	Glbl Prspctv	0	3	2	5	4	1	0	3.71	1.14	14
23	Crit Thnkng	0	3	2	6	4	0	0	3.73	1.10	15
24	Lab Actvty	0	1	2	3	2	6	1	3.75	1.04	8
25	Rcmnd CORS	1	0	2	9	3	0	0	3.87	0.99	15
26	Rcmnd FAC	1	2	3	6	3	0	0	3.53	1.19	15
27	Pers Goals	0	1	2	9	3	0	0	3.93	0.80	15
28	Prof Goals	0	3	2	7	3	0	0	3.67	1.05	15
29	Struc to Lrng	1	2	3	7	2	0	0	3.47	1.13	15
30	Stdnt Intract	0	0	1	11	3	0	0	4.13	0.52	15
31	Fac-Stud Intr	1	2	3	7	2	0	0	3.47	1.13	15
32	Tech on Own	0	0	2	10	3	0	0	4.07	0.59	15

Program Rating

Questions		PSYC		NA		NR		Mean		STD		No.	
		Str Disagree		Str Agree									
6	2	39	167	241	0	9	4.40	0.77	455				
6	10	48	170	220	0	10	4.30	0.84	454				
9	20	64	154	204	0	13	4.16	0.96	451				
11	12	46	177	205	0	13	4.23	0.91	451				
10	24	62	166	189	0	13	4.11	0.98	451				
7	7	50	172	216	0	12	4.29	0.84	452				
13	28	87	135	184	0	17	4.00	1.06	447				
3	11	38	180	224	0	8	4.34	0.78	456				
4	2	25	189	234	0	10	4.43	0.70	454				
3	6	25	192	228	0	10	4.40	0.71	454				
3	12	41	202	197	0	9	4.27	0.78	455				
6	7	45	188	206	0	12	4.29	0.81	452				
6	5	49	168	127	87	22	4.14	0.83	355				
4	10	63	108	106	147	26	4.04	0.92	291				
6	15	89	173	122	34	25	3.96	0.90	405				
8	32	110	126	81	76	31	3.67	1.00	357				
5	5	48	199	180	10	17	4.24	0.78	437				
3	13	72	175	152	26	23	4.11	0.85	415				
4	11	52	195	183	0	19	4.22	0.81	445				
2	10	56	106	91	172	27	4.03	0.88	265				
12	14	54	178	193	0	13	4.17	0.94	451				
13	19	54	157	206	0	15	4.17	0.99	449				
8	12	64	198	164	0	18	4.12	0.88	446				
5	18	56	190	164	0	31	4.13	0.87	433				
8	18	70	196	159	0	13	4.06	0.91	451				
2	11	51	209	177	0	14	4.22	0.77	450				
11	32	76	180	147	0	18	3.94	1.00	446				
4	5	27	205	206	0	17	4.35	0.72	447				

Instructor Overall	3.74	0.78	4.20	0.78
Course Overall	3.81	0.77	4.17	0.65
Course Design	3.95	0.66	4.28	0.63
Pedagogy	3.95	0.72	4.29	0.72
Interaction	3.71	0.76	4.13	0.76
Course Objectives	3.63	0.99	4.05	0.71

Course - Program Comparison



Course: PSYC 310 Section: 7381

Strong Features

For some reason, i taught i new everyone in this course already, due to the interaction we all had. It made the class more comfortable and express what was on our mind. The professor was always available and very helpful, so as the students.

I liked the iniative to encourage student to student interaction. This gave a number of different perspective on one subject, giving it depth.

I like the fact that the other students were generally nice when you ask for help or input and also that the instructor responded to emails fairly quickly
interaction with other students

it was ok ay in general

Making you repsond to other students forced interation and discussion.

Student to student interaction

The text book.

Improve/Recommend

I would recommend that assignments be due at midnight instead of 9pm and incorporate a couple homework type assignments for a grade or extra credit

More instructor interaction

Never have i taken an online course. I always said to myself, not to take an online courses. But this class is the best and reliable course i have ever taken. All i can say to the Professor is keep doing what is best for you and the students. There is no need for improvement.

none

None

six postings as a minimum was a bit extreme.

teacher should explain more on the topics, like give notes, we were basically doing all the work, the only thing the instructor did wwas give assignmets.

The professor would make positive comments on the portfolio, however, she would give a low grade. I was not sure why she would make positive comments and deduct points. Very ambiguous. The course design is also very exhausting for a 300 level course. Very dissapointed.