Dr. Linda Cohen

Compiled CEQ statistics for Sociology 3307: Health

2009 - 2019 (12 courses)


Ave. response rate 25.49%

Ratings, Q7: 1=poor; 2=fair; 3=good; 4= very good; 5=excellent

7. Overall, the quality of instruction was ...

	<u>Rating</u>	Count	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.0%
Fair	2	0	0.0%
Good	3	3	2.9%
Very Good	4	31	30.4%
Excellent	5	68	66.7%
	N =	102	

Average of Means 4.84




Ratings, next Qs: 1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neutral; 4=agree; 5=strongly agree

1. The student requirements in the course were clear.


	Rating	Count	Percent
s.disagree	1	0	0.0%
disagree	2	3	2.9%
neutral	3	2	1.9%
agree	4	23	22.3%
s.agree	5	75	72.8%
	N =	103	

Average of Means: 4.79



2. The instructor responded to students' questions effectively.

	Rating	Count	Percent
s.disagree	1	0	0.0%
disagree	2	0	0.0%
neutral	3	0	0.0%
agree	4	10	12.0%
s.agree	5	78	91.0%
	N =	88	



Dr. Linda Cohen

Compiled CEQ statistics for Sociology 3307: Health

2009 - 2019 (12 courses)


Ave. response rate 25.49%

Ratings, next Qs: 1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neutral; 4=agree; 5=strongly agree

3. The instructor treated students respectfully.

	<u>Rating</u>	Count	Percent
s.disagree	1	0	0.0%
disagree	2	0	0.0%
neutral	3	1	1.0%
agree	4	14	13.6%
s.agree	5	88	85.4%
	N =	103	


Average of Means: 4.96



4. The instructor stimulated my interest in learning the subject matter of the course.


	Rating	<u>Count</u>	Percent
s.disagree	1	0	0.0%
disagree	2	3	2.9%
neutral	3	11	10.8%
agree	4	31	30.4%
s.agree	5	57	55.9%
	N =	102	

Average of Means: 4.68



5. Useful feedback was provided on my work.

	Rating	Count	Percent
s.disagree	1	0	0.0%
disagree	2	1	1.0%
neutral	3	0	0.0%
agree	4	19	18.6%
s.agree	5	82	80.4%
	N =	102	



Dr. Linda Cohen

Compiled CEQ statistics for Sociology 3307: Health

2009 - 2019 (12 courses)


Ave. response rate 25.49%

Ratings, next Qs: 1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neutral; 4=agree; 5=strongly agree

13. Overall the course was well organized.

	Rating	Count	Percent
s.disagree	1	0	0.0%
disagree	2	2	2.0%
neutral	3	1	1.0%
agree	4	24	24.0%
s.agree	5	73	73.0%
	N =	100	


Average of Means: 4.76



6. The instructor communicated course concepts effectively (new CIAP question since 2012)

	Rating	Count	Percent
s.disagree	1	0	0.0%
disagree	2	0	0.0%
neutral	3	2	3.3%
agree	4	12	20.0%
s.agree	5	46	76.7%
	N =	60	


Average of Means: 4.84



* The following question was omit by CIAP since 2012

7. I would recommend this course taught by this instructor to another student ...

	Rating	Count	Percent
s.disagree	1	1	2.6%
disagree	2	1	2.6%
neutral	3	3	7.9%
agree	4	9	23.7%
s.agree	5	24	63.2%
	N =	38	



2015-2019: new questions added by CIAP in 2015


Average response rate: 24.03% (7 courses)

Ratings, all but Q7: 1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neutral; 4=agree; 5=strongly agree

8. The texts helped me learn course content.

	<u>Rating</u>	Count	Percent
s.disagree	1	0	0.0%
disagree	2	0	0.0%
neutral	3	3	5.5%
agree	4	15	27.3%
s.agree	5	37	67.3%
	N =	55	


Average of Means: 4.69



10. The assessments (tests, assignments, presentations) helped me learn course content.


	<u>Rating</u>	Count	Percent
s.disagree	1	0	0.0%
disagree	2	0	0.0%
neutral	3	1	1.8%
agree	4	16	29.1%
s.agree	5	38	69.1%
	N =	55	

Average of Means: 4.68



11. The technology used (e.g., D2L, email, ... film) helped me learn course content.

	<u>Rating</u>	Count	Percent
s.disagree	1	0	0.0%
disagree	2	1	1.9%
neutral	3	5	9.3%
agree	4	9	16.7%
s.agree	5	39	72.2%
	N =	54	



2015-2019: new questions added by CIAP in 2015

Average response rate: 24.03%

Ratings, all but Q7: 1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neutral; 4=agree; 5=strongly agree

12. The workload was appropriate to the course.

	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Percent</u>
s.disagree	1	0	0.0%
disagree	2	1	1.8%
neutral	3	1	1.8%
agree	4	16	29.1%
s.agree	5	37	67.3%
-	N =	55	

