

Angela Bos, Institutional Teaching Evaluations

I. Below are raw evaluation scores from four undergraduate courses taught at the University of Minnesota, Morris (a small, public liberal arts college). The questions are based on a seven point scale with one being “very poor,” four being “satisfactory” and seven being “exceptional”.

Questions:

1. Rate the instructor’s overall teaching ability
2. Rate the instructor’s knowledge of subject matter
3. Rate instructor’s respect and concern for students

Course Title (Enrollment, % Responding)	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3
American Government (46, 74%)	6.1	6.4	6.6
Political Psychology (17, 82%)	5.5	6.1	6.1
Media and Politics (15, 94%)	5.4	6.1	6.6
Experimental & Survey Design & Analysis (2, 100%)	7.0	6.5	7.0
OVERALL MEAN	6.0	6.3	6.6

II. Below are raw evaluation scores from one undergraduate course taught during the University of Minnesota, Morris summer session. The first three questions are based on a **five point scale** with one being “strongly disagree,” two being “disagree,” three being “neutral,” four being “agree” and five being “strongly agree”. The final question is measured on a scale from 1-5 with 1 being “among the very worst,” two being “below average,” three being “about average,” four being “above average,” and five being “among the very best.”

Questions:

1. Atmosphere in the course was conducive to learning
2. Evaluation of the work was fair
3. Instructor was accessible and available for consultation
4. Comparison of instructor with other teachers at UMM

Course Title (Enrollment, % Responding)	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4
Introduction to Political Science (7, 71%)	4.3 (of 5)	4.3 (of 5)	4.3 (of 5)	4.0 (of 5)

Angela Bos, Personal Teaching Evaluations

Below are the results from a pre- post-evaluation I conducted in my American government course. I asked students to respond to various questions specific to my course objectives and measured progress at the end of the semester.

All items are measured on a 1-5 scale. For the first four items, I measured confidence on a fully, labeled scale from 1 being “not confident at all” to 5 being “very confident”. For the final item the score reflects the number of items, out of five, correct on a standard five question political knowledge scale (Delli Carpini and Keeter 1996).

Question	Pre-Mean	Post-Mean	Significance
Confidence in knowledge of political system	3.14	3.65	.070*
Confidence in ability to analyze a current public policy issue	3.07	3.57	.083*
Confidence in your ability to be a critical consumer of public opinion polls reported in the media	3.21	4.15	.000***
Confidence in your ability to participate effectively in politics	3.33	3.88	.046**
Political knowledge sum score	3.38	3.76	.051*

+: $p < .15$, *: $p < .10$, **: $p < .05$, ***: $p < .01$. Pre-test $n=40$, Post-test $n=33$.

For each item students' mean confidence level increased after taking my course; for several items the increase is statistically significant even with a small number of respondents overall. Students in my American government course became more confident in their knowledge of U.S. politics, their ability analyze current political issues and critically consume public opinion polls, and their levels of political efficacy. Finally, not only were students more confident about what they knew, a semester after the course they also scored higher on objective political knowledge items not discussed in the course.

Angela Bos, Select Student Comments

American Government (Fall 2005)

- “She is good at explaining concepts so that everyone understands...(she) lectures more informally, so it’s easier to learn (she talks to students, not just to an audience)”
- “She knew what she was talking about and allowed the class to give their opinions.”
- “Established excellent rapport with students. Very clear and understandable.”
- “She knew a lot about what she was teaching.”
- “Had a great way of getting people involved and enjoying politics.”
- “She cares so much about each individual and truly wants her students to succeed.”
- “I learned that I do need to be more involved in American government.”
- “Angie was really great about being involved with us as students. She made it very clear that if we needed help with anything we could come to her.”
- “She tries to increase class participation and she also makes class interesting.”
- “Angie was very organized. She explained things very well and was very thoughtful. She helped students whenever she could.”
- “She made the lectures easy to understand. I liked all the group activities and TA sections.”
- “She was knowledgeable and charismatic.”
- “She was willing to meet me even outside her office hours to help with my coursework.”
- “Good listener, good presenter, prepared for class.”
- Instructor strengths: “examples, illustrations” – “getting students to participate” – “Energetic, knowledgeable, concerned. Tried to make class interesting and responsive.”

Political Psychology (Fall 2005)

- “She really knew material. Made class interesting.”
- “She really cared about the material and had a strong understanding of it.”
- “Up to date knowledge of subject matter. Very willing to work with students.”
- “Listened to students, responsive to comments and questions. Good at leading discussion and getting people to talk.”
- “Angie helped to support and conduct good and fruitful discussion, a strong part of the course.”
- “Related really well to students. Conducted good class discussions. Also, was very accessible and helpful with projects and just to talk to.”
- “Very friendly, good-natured, and enthusiastic. She gets assignments returned very quickly.”
- “Very knowledgeable. Class discussion was stimulated/conducted well and set up so it was conducive to learning. Very approachable. Challenged me.”
- “She is really prepared for class and arranges the period so that it is appropriately mixed between small group/discussion/presentation. Open and supportive. Stimulates discussion!”
- “She involved students in the teaching. Lots of discussion.”

Media and Politics (Spring 2006)

- “She used lots of visuals and adjusted her style to suit the class.”
- “Always available, really helpful, cheerful and organized.”
- “Great discussion opportunity, many relevant readings.”
- “She assigned readings from diverse sources; did not limit to textbooks”

Angela Bos, Select Student Comments, Continued

- “Projects prepared us for future studies in political science”
- “Willingness to help students individually.”
- “She is a very knowledgeable person with great ideas. She is always helpful and very approachable.”
- “Fun, relatable, and put things in perspective; ties issue together.”

Design and Analysis of Experiments and Surveys (Spring 2006)

- “Willingness to work with students.”
- “Great knowledge of the subject matter.”
- “We applied the learning. Practical application of the subject matter.”

Introduction to Political Inquiry (Summer 2006)

- No written comments collected.