

# PSYC 250-0017 Intro Child Psych Disc - Fall 2005

Arts And Sciences (301k8)

INSTRUCTORS: Lima, Olivia (okl6g)

Respondents: 14 / Enrollment: 20

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

**1. The instructor's overall teaching effectiveness is:**

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Department of Psychology

Results for PSYC-250-0017							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (1)	Good (2)	Average (3)	Weak (4)	Poor (5)
14	1.86	0.86	6 (42.86%)	4 (28.57%)	4 (28.57%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for Department of Psychology - Fall, 2005							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (1)	Good (2)	Average (3)	Weak (4)	Poor (5)
3395	1.67	0.79	1679 (49.46%)	1280 (37.70%)	341 (10.04%)	80 (2.36%)	15 (0.44%)

**2. The intellectual stimulation provided by this course is:**

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Department of Psychology

Results for PSYC-250-0017							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (1)	Good (2)	Average (3)	Weak (4)	Poor (5)
14	1.93	0.73	4 (28.57%)	7 (50.00%)	3 (21.43%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for Department of Psychology - Fall, 2005							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (1)	Good (2)	Average (3)	Weak (4)	Poor (5)
3388	1.80	0.86	1442 (42.56%)	1336 (39.43%)	471 (13.90%)	107 (3.16%)	32 (0.94%)

**3. The amount I have learned from taking this course is:**

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Department of Psychology

Results for PSYC-250-0017							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (1)	Good (2)	Average (3)	Weak (4)	Poor (5)
14	2.00	0.78	3 (21.43%)	9 (64.29%)	1 (7.14%)	1 (7.14%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for Department of Psychology - Fall, 2005							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (1)	Good (2)	Average (3)	Weak (4)	Poor (5)
3385	1.78	0.82	1447 (42.75%)	1380 (40.77%)	451 (13.32%)	84 (2.48%)	23 (0.68%)

**4. The quality of the text and other assigned reading for this course is:**

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Department of Psychology

Results for PSYC-250-0017							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (1)	Good (2)	Average (3)	Weak (4)	Poor (5)
14	2.29	1.07	3 (21.43%)	7 (50.00%)	1 (7.14%)	3 (21.43%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for Department of Psychology - Fall, 2005							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (1)	Good (2)	Average (3)	Weak (4)	Poor (5)
3366	2.14	0.91	858 (25.49%)	1473 (43.76%)	825 (24.51%)	140 (4.16%)	70 (2.08%)

**5. The fairness of testing and grading for this course is:**

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Department of Psychology

Results for PSYC-250-0017							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (1)	Good (2)	Average (3)	Weak (4)	Poor (5)
14	1.86	1.17	7 (50.00%)	4 (28.57%)	2 (14.29%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.14%)

Results for Department of Psychology - Fall, 2005							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (1)	Good (2)	Average (3)	Weak (4)	Poor (5)
3368	1.90	0.93	1311 (38.93%)	1345 (39.93%)	495 (14.70%)	165 (4.90%)	52 (1.54%)

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

**6. The instructor's availability outside class is:**

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Department of Psychology

Results for PSYC-250-0017							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (1)	Good (2)	Average (3)	Weak (4)	Poor (5)
14	1.71	0.61	5 (35.71%)	8 (57.14%)	1 (7.14%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for Department of Psychology - Fall, 2005							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (1)	Good (2)	Average (3)	Weak (4)	Poor (5)
3318	1.91	0.83	1148 (34.60%)	1460 (44.00%)	594 (17.90%)	92 (2.77%)	24 (0.72%)

**7. The quality of the instructor's lectures is:**

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Department of Psychology

Results for PSYC-250-0017							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (1)	Good (2)	Average (3)	Weak (4)	Poor (5)
14	2.00	0.55	2 (14.29%)	10 (71.43%)	2 (14.29%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for Department of Psychology - Fall, 2005							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (1)	Good (2)	Average (3)	Weak (4)	Poor (5)
3379	1.75	0.87	1575 (46.61%)	1251 (37.02%)	401 (11.87%)	114 (3.37%)	38 (1.12%)

**8. The instructor as a discussion leader is:**

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Department of Psychology

Results for PSYC-250-0017							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (1)	Good (2)	Average (3)	Weak (4)	Poor (5)
14	1.50	0.76	9 (64.29%)	3 (21.43%)	2 (14.29%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for Department of Psychology - Fall, 2005							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (1)	Good (2)	Average (3)	Weak (4)	Poor (5)
3337	1.86	0.88	1349 (40.43%)	1279 (38.33%)	566 (16.96%)	106 (3.18%)	37 (1.11%)

**9. What should remain the same about this course?**

Question Type: Short Answer

contributed by Department of Psychology

Results for PSYC-250-0017	
Total	Individual Answers
9	See below for Individual Results

The Dixon studies were good and the homework assignments were good because they forced me to read and they weren't too painful to write up.

no changes

the child observation lab, how the discussions are conducted, the amount of group discussion

The Dixon text was fine

Discussion structure is good. Group discussion was a great idea, never had a discussion leader do that before.

The format should stay the same.

The atmosphere of freedom to speak.

The discussions and the readings assigned were always interesting.

The amount of discussion encouraged by the instructor.

**10. What should be changed about this course?**

Question Type: Short Answer

contributed by Department of Psychology

Results for PSYC-250-0017	
Total	Individual Answers
10	See below for Individual Results

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

The discussions seemed a little forced at times and many times relied on the questions we had to write as homework.

I would like the readings and the lecture to correspond a little bit more. I would rather read more details about studies mentioned in the text in stead of the readings in dixon. Also, the weekly assignments were redundant near the end of the semester and were not as thought provoking. it might help to have options of which articles we write about instead of two questions for each section.

There should be less of a dependence on mandatory research participation.

Nothing! :-P

I felt as though the first paper was not defined well. I ended up going into it with only a vague idea of what was really needed and even though questions were asked I was still not completely sure as to how the paper was supposed to be structured, since it was emphasized that it was not to be written as a standard college paper. The second paper on the other hand had great reference material and was very clearly defined.

the discussion questions that have to be turned in every week- its hard to come up with my impressions, a question, AND the answer about every study. Often times my impressions are basically the same as the "question" so it takes a while to come up with original ideas for both.

nothing about the section needs changed

More interaction within smaller groups would be nicer

nothing

The text.

The discussions seemed a little forced at times and many times relied on the questions we had to write as homework.

I would like the readings and the lecture to correspond a little bit more. I would rather read more details about studies mentioned in the text in stead of the readings in dixon. Also, the weekly assignments were redundant near the end of the semester and were not as thought provoking. it might help to have options of which articles we write about instead of two questions for each section.

There should be less of a dependence on mandatory research participation.

Nothing! :-P

I felt as though the first paper was not defined well. I ended up going into it with only a vague idea of what was really needed and even though questions were asked I was still not completely sure as to how the paper was supposed to be structured, since it was emphasized that it was not to be written as a standard college paper. The second paper on the other hand had great reference material and was very clearly defined.

the discussion questions that have to be turned in every week- its hard to come up with my impressions, a question, AND the answer about every study. Often times my impressions are basically the same as the "question" so it takes a while to come up with original ideas for both.

nothing about the section needs changed

More interaction within smaller groups would be nicer

nothing

The text.

**11. Is there anything else you'd like the instructor to know?**

Question Type: Short Answer

contributed by Department of Psychology

Results for PSYC-250-0017	
Total	Individual Answers
7	See below for Individual Results

The expectations for the first paper should have been more clear. The syllabus was very ambiguous on the topic of whether the paper was meant to be a critique of a study in Dixon or a research paper on one of the experiments and the topic of experimentation.

no

Our discussion was rather quiet and i felt the same people talked all the time. however, i did like it when we broke into smaller groups because it seemed like people were more comfortable sharing in that situation. i would have like to do more of that to make discussion more interesting

That she is a wonderful teacher and should continue doing what she obviously does very well.

You were my favorite discussion leader this semester!

she is so sweet!

I really enjoyed this discussion and the readings were a lot more interesting than I had anticipated. Also, she did a great job clarifying any confusion in the readings and the readings were always clearer after she had explained it.

The expectations for the first paper should have been more clear. The syllabus was very ambiguous on the topic of whether the paper was meant to be a critique of a study in Dixon or a research paper on one of the experiments and the topic of experimentation.

no

Our discussion was rather quiet and i felt the same people talked all the time. however, i did like it when we broke into smaller groups because it seemed like people were more comfortable sharing in that situation. i would have like to do more of that to make discussion more interesting

That she is a wonderful teacher and should continue doing what she obviously does very well.

You were my favorite discussion leader this semester!

she is so sweet!

I really enjoyed this discussion and the readings were a lot more interesting than I had anticipated. Also, she did a great job clarifying any confusion in the readings and the readings were always clearer after she had explained it.

**12. The average number of hours per week I spent outside of class preparing for this course was:**

Question Type: Multiple Choice

contributed by Office of the Provost

Results for PSYC-250-0017					
Total	Less than 1 (NA)	1 - 3 (NA)	4 - 6 (NA)	7 - 9 (NA)	10 or more (NA)
14	3 (21.43%)	9 (64.29%)	2 (14.29%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for Department of Psychology - Fall, 2005					
Total	Less than 1 (NA)	1 - 3 (NA)	4 - 6 (NA)	7 - 9 (NA)	10 or more (NA)
3392	405 (11.94%)	1802 (53.12%)	1008 (29.72%)	150 (4.42%)	27 (0.80%)

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

**13. I learned a great deal in this course.**

Question Type: Likert  
 ~  
 contributed by Office of the Provost

Results for PSYC-250-0017							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
14	4.00	0.78	3 (21.43%)	9 (64.29%)	1 (7.14%)	1 (7.14%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for Department of Psychology - Fall, 2005							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
3395	4.20	0.79	1319 (38.85%)	1568 (46.19%)	396 (11.66%)	92 (2.71%)	20 (0.59%)

**14. Overall, this was a worthwhile course.**

Question Type: Likert  
 ~  
 contributed by Office of the Provost

Results for PSYC-250-0017							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
14	4.07	0.73	3 (21.43%)	10 (71.43%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.14%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for Department of Psychology - Fall, 2005							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
3381	4.22	0.87	1499 (44.34%)	1349 (39.90%)	369 (10.91%)	121 (3.58%)	43 (1.27%)

**15. The course's goals and requirements were defined and adhered to by the instructor.**

Question Type: Likert  
 ~  
 contributed by Office of the Provost

Results for PSYC-250-0017, Lima, Olivia							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
14	4.50	0.65	8 (57.14%)	5 (35.71%)	1 (7.14%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for Department of Psychology - Fall, 2005							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
3377	4.53	0.65	2022 (59.88%)	1171 (34.68%)	145 (4.29%)	30 (0.89%)	9 (0.27%)

**16. The instructor was approachable and made himself/herself available to students outside the classroom.**

Question Type: Likert  
 ~  
 contributed by Office of the Provost

Results for PSYC-250-0017, Lima, Olivia							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
14	4.36	0.63	6 (42.86%)	7 (50.00%)	1 (7.14%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for Department of Psychology - Fall, 2005							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
3377	4.30	0.80	1624 (48.09%)	1219 (36.10%)	457 (13.53%)	62 (1.84%)	15 (0.44%)

**17. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.**

Question Type: Likert  
 ~  
 contributed by Office of the Provost

Results for PSYC-250-0017, Lima, Olivia							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
14	4.43	0.65	7 (50.00%)	6 (42.86%)	1 (7.14%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for Department of Psychology - Fall, 2005							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
3398	4.38	0.80	1823 (53.65%)	1196 (35.20%)	263 (7.74%)	93 (2.74%)	23 (0.68%)

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

**18. Please make any overall comments or observations about this course:**

~  
Question Type: Short Answer  
~

*contributed by Office of the Provost*

Results for PSYC-250-0017

Total	Individual Answers
4	<i>See below for Individual Results</i>

This was one of the best discussion classes I've had in a good while. The students were thoroughly engaged, and the instructor was warm and thought provoking. She was neither overly aggressive, leading the conversation, nor was she overly passive, saying little and allowing gaps of silence during the class (a phenomenon rather uncomfortable and common in other discussion sections). I highly recommend her as an instructor.

This was a good section. I had three sections in three completely different subjects and this one was by far the best run and most useful. Thanks Olivia for reassuring me that sections do have a point.

See above comments.

Reading was weak, the author of it, Dixon, had a political/social agenda and was trying to advocate his/her own social viewpoints, some of which were quite extreme. Please change the discussion reading in the future, some of the things I read in this book made me downright angry. A psychology book is not a place to advocate your social/political agenda.