

**Assessment : Table Results (Mean over 7 instructors with 11 student responses per instructor; the range of means for 2003-2006 are shown in brackets and this year's ranges across instructors are shown in parentheses)**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>
The instructor clearly defined their lecture and workshop objectives.	37.6% [50-55%] (9-64%)	45.5% [34-38%] (27-64%)	9% [3-17%] (0-18%)	5.23% [0-4%] (0-9%)	0% [0-1%] (0%)	0% [0%] (0%)	2.7% [1-5%] (0-18%)
The instructor clearly described any required student work products.	25.9% [45-50%] (9-64%)	48.1% [29-39%] (27-64%)	18.1% [8-13%] (0-36%)	3.9% [1-7%] (0-18%)	1.4% [0-1%] (0-9%)	0% [0%] (0%)	2.6% [4-6%] (0-18%)
The instructor clearly presented the lecture/workshop material.	33.7% [37- 49%] (18-64%)	44.2% [30- 42%] (27-64%)	11.7% [12 - 24%] (0-27%)	7.7% [1-9%] (0-18%)	0% [0-1%] (0%)	0% [0%] (0%)	2.7% [0- 4%] (0-18%)
Text and electronic resources selected for use by the instructor served well the purpose of their lecture(s)/workshop(s).	37.5% [35-44%] (9-91%)	40.2% [35-46%] (9-55%)	14.2% [10-14%] (0-27%)	2.7% [1-3%] (0-9%)	1.4% [0%] (0-9%)	0% [0%] (0%)	4% [3- 6%] (0-18%)
Required student work products were a clear extension of material presented in the formal lecture/workshop.	37.6% [42- 48%] (9-73%)	42.5% [29- 39%] (27-55%)	14.3% [9- 16%] (0-27%)	2.7% [2- 5%] (0-9%)	0% [0- 1%] (0%)	0% [0%] (0%)	2.6% [2- 10%] (0-18%)
The instructor was responsive to student requests for help and feedback.	48.1% [46- 70%] (27-73%)	37.5% [22- 42%] (18-64%)	7.8% [1- 10%] (0-9%)	2.7% [0-1%] (0-9%)	0% [0-1%] (0%)	0% [0%] (0%)	3.9% [0- 6%] (0-18%)
The instructor interacted with students in ways that were free of racial prejudice or discrimination.	82% [50- 84%] (73-91%)	11.6% [11- 46%] (9-18%)	0% [0-4%] (0%)	0% [0-1%] (0%)	0% [0-1%] (0%)	0% [0%] (0%)	6.4% [0-3%] (0-18%)

**Assessment : Table Results (Mean over 63 specific objectives with 11 student responses per objective; the range of means for 2003-2006 are shown in brackets and this year's ranges across instructors and specific objectives are shown in parentheses)**

	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>
Specific objectives for individual workshop instructors	29.5% [34- 45%] (15-35%)	39.5% [30- 41%] (25-57%)	15.1% [13- 16%] (4-32%)	7.4% [2- 9%] (0-18%)	1.7% [0.4 - 2%] (0-5%)	1.3% [0- 0.6%] (0-5%)	5.5% [0.2 - 8%] (0-11%)

**Assessment : Table Results (Mean over 7 instructors with 11 student responses per instructor; the range of means for 2003-2006 are shown in brackets and this year's ranges across instructors are shown in parentheses)**

	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Very Poor</b>	<b>No opinion</b>
How would you rate this instructor's overall teaching ability?	29.9% [36- 47%] (9-73%)	32.4% [20- 36%] (18-64%)	32.5% [19- 20%] (9-64%)	3.9% [7- 14%] (0-9%)	0% [0-1%] (0%)	0% [0%] (0%)	1.3% [1- 4%] (0-9%)