

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2019

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 4220-001

Section Title: Theories of the Policy Process

Instructor: Wesley Wehde

Total Enrollment: 20

Course Level: Upper 3000 - 4000

Section Size: Small 16-25

Question	Level	Mean Response	Median Response	Standard Deviation	ZScore	Responses	Percent #1	Percent #2	Percent #3	Percent #4	Percent #5	Dept Rank	College Rank
1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.25000	4	0.75378		12	0.00	0.00	16.67	41.67	41.67	54.55	56.81
	DEPARTMENT	4.18966	4	0.84353		116	0.00	3.45	17.24	36.21	43.10		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.10545	4	0.92365	0.16	2,513	1.11	4.18	18.70	35.06	40.95		
	COLLEGE	3.97446	4	0.99984	0.28	30,691	2.26	5.32	21.79	33.99	36.65		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	4.83333	5	0.38925		12	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	83.33	72.73	87.79
	DEPARTMENT	4.63793	5	0.65137		116	0.00	0.86	6.90	19.83	72.41		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.36107	5	0.93592	0.50	2,512	1.23	4.34	11.82	22.29	60.31		
	COLLEGE	4.22829	5	1.01707	0.59	30,654	2.28	5.09	13.98	24.83	53.82		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		12	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.18103	5	1.16170		116	4.31	6.03	15.52	15.52	58.62		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.23973	5	0.99257	0.77	2,507	1.76	4.83	15.12	24.29	54.01		
	COLLEGE	4.06244	4	1.10514	0.85	30,639	3.31	6.76	17.99	24.24	47.69		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	4.33333	5	0.88763		12	0.00	8.33	0.00	41.67	50.00	45.46	57.75
	DEPARTMENT	4.34483	5	0.98778		116	3.45	2.59	8.62	26.72	58.62		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.19856	5	0.98677	0.14	2,508	1.99	4.47	15.35	28.07	50.12		
	COLLEGE	4.08251	4	1.05062	0.24	30,615	2.51	6.11	18.01	27.36	46.01		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	4.41667	5	0.79296		12	0.00	0.00	16.67	25.00	58.33	54.55	67.14
	DEPARTMENT	4.18261	5	1.06444		115	1.74	8.70	12.17	24.35	53.04		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.09432	4	1.08895	0.30	2,502	2.80	6.83	17.71	23.46	49.20		
	COLLEGE	3.93047	4	1.17990	0.41	30,590	4.87	8.34	19.10	24.26	43.43		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	4.58333	5	0.51493		12	0.00	0.00	0.00	41.67	58.33	72.73	77.93
	DEPARTMENT	4.22609	5	0.98284		115	2.61	3.48	13.04	30.43	50.43		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.14702	4	1.02913	0.42	2,503	2.12	5.75	16.70	26.17	49.26		
	COLLEGE	4.00078	4	1.14173	0.51	30,608	4.32	7.18	17.69	25.74	45.08		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.50000	5	0.52223		12	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	72.73	71.36
	DEPARTMENT	4.19298	4	1.02082		114	2.63	6.14	9.65	32.46	49.12		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.16141	4	1.02151	0.33	2,503	2.04	5.51	16.62	25.93	49.90		
	COLLEGE	4.06855	4	1.09629	0.39	30,574	3.45	6.17	17.66	25.50	47.22		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	4.25000	4	0.75378		12	0.00	0.00	16.67	41.67	41.67	80.00	72.68
	DEPARTMENT	4.00000	4	0.90104		102	0.00	4.90	25.49	34.31	35.29		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.97211	4	0.94565	0.29	2,259	1.55	4.78	22.49	37.27	33.91		
	COLLEGE	3.85379	4	0.98178	0.40	28,869	2.09	5.97	26.14	36.09	29.72		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.08333	3	1.08362		12	8.33	8.33	66.67	0.00	16.67	20.00	15.46
	DEPARTMENT	3.49515	3	0.92751		103	0.97	7.77	51.46	20.39	19.42		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.48297	3	0.85045	-0.47	2,261	0.75	5.84	53.34	24.50	15.57		
	COLLEGE	3.43691	3	0.87334	-0.40	28,873	1.27	7.00	53.50	23.22	15.01		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	4.00000	5	1.12815		12	0.00	8.33	33.33	8.33	50.00	50.00	65.98
	DEPARTMENT	3.96078	4	0.99426		102	0.00	8.82	24.51	28.43	38.24		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.82504	4	1.02978	0.17	2,252	2.35	7.77	25.84	33.08	30.95		
	COLLEGE	3.67481	4	1.06500	0.31	28,832	3.06	9.67	30.91	29.46	26.90		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.41667	5	0.79296		12	0.00	0.00	16.67	25.00	58.33	60.00	75.26
	DEPARTMENT	4.18447	4	0.91553		103	0.00	3.88	22.33	25.24	48.54		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.02480	4	1.03945	0.38	2,258	1.90	7.31	19.44	29.10	42.25		
	COLLEGE	3.87572	4	1.12294	0.48	28,839	3.92	8.02	22.43	27.81	37.82		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	4.91667	5	0.28868		12	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.33	91.67	90.00	82.99
	DEPARTMENT	4.77451	5	0.46473		102	0.00	0.00	1.96	18.63	79.41		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.62705	5	0.69392	0.42	2,255	0.49	1.51	4.92	20.98	72.11		
	COLLEGE	4.55912	5	0.77649	0.46	28,815	0.85	2.29	5.87	22.09	68.90		

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2019

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 4220-001

Section Title: Theories of the Policy Process

Instructor: Wesley Wehde

Total Enrollment: 20

Course Level: Upper 3000 - 4000

Section Size: Small 16-25

Question

1. What were the strong points of the course?
2. What were the weak points of the course?
3. What should the instructor do to improve their teaching?
4. What is your overall opinion of this course?

Comment

1. Class discussions, slide shows, Friday activities

2. N/A

3. N/A

4. I loved this class and felt like Professor Wehde did an excellent job!

1. Wesley as a professor was great. He always did his best when trying to engage the class and form discussion when you could tell the class just did not want to. He was the only reason this course wasn't bad because if there were any other professors this class would be very boring. Wesley's personality makes this class a lot more fun to come to.

2. None that I can think of.

3. Nothing

4. This was a great course and very informative. Wesley made the course fun and engaging. I have taken a lot of PSC classes here at OU with some very drab professors, but Wesley is young and understands how his students function a lot better than most. I hope he gets to teach a course with more people because they'll like him a lot. And this is Saxon. I am more than happy to attach my name to this evaluation because Wesley did a great job this semester.

1. Professor Wehde was always willing to stay after class to answer any questions that we had.

2. Some of the readings were very extensive and there was simply not enough time to complete them before class, especially since there was no follow-up assignment, but merely a discussion.

3. Indicate which parts of the reading are most important, so students are able to continually be good stewards of their time.

4. I thoroughly enjoyed the course, and would recommend it to anyone who asked.

1. He is a nice and understanding professor. He helps you with anything you need.

2. N/A

3. Just keep being a nice and understanding professor and everything else will be good.

4. I really enjoyed this course.

1. I liked the activities that we did every Friday they were very consistent and engaging.

2. I think the only weak point of this course was that I wished there was more presentation type activities.

3. I thought that the professor did a great job of teaching

4. I thought this was a very interesting class and it will definitely impact the way in which I evaluate policy in the future.

1. The powerpoints and the professor's ability to discuss the information simply.

2. N/A

3. Stop purposefully being awkward! You are so smart, own it and teach. Also, make attendance required I know it's a college course but without having the class where the conversations are beyond dry and almost pointless. Also, make activities for both Wednesday AND Friday that's where we learn the most.

4. Great professor, can't wait to see how he will be in a few years of teaching.

1. Lecture and Assignments

2. I can't think of any

3. Nothing, he did a great job

4. I highly enjoyed it, one of my favorite classes yet

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2019

1. This class was very laid-back, but also taught a lot. I really enjoyed the way it was structured. Wehde is an awesome professor.

2. None

3. I think he is doing a great job.

4. I liked this course a lot and never felt a huge weight of anxiety when going to this class like I do with my other classes. I really loved this course

1. The slides and lectures were very well-made. They conveyed the information in an understandable way, and I felt that I was actually learning rather than just copying notes.

2. The students were not very responsive, so some discussion elements failed, so maybe the course should have included less discussions.

3.

4.

1. I think the Friday activities really helped me understand the lectures and readings better. It helped me see how each theory could apply to actual policy rather than just understanding the components of each.

2. We covered so many different theories, I think it would have been beneficial if we could have reviewed them at the halfway mark and the end of the semester rather than just the end.

3.

4. I really liked this course, I learned a lot. I think the organization of the class was very beneficial.

1. This course was engaging and interesting. The materials were useful and related directly to the next lecture. The practical exercises were effective in allowing the students to apply the learned policy theories to doctrine or recent political bills. The conversations were open and non-bias which created a learning environment which supported a variety of opinions. Students knowledge and experience with politics were acknowledged and sometimes used in the current discussion. Overall, this course was very beneficial and pleasant to be a part of.

2. The allowance of laptops, while lecture took place, was a distraction at times and hindered some students ability to focus on the lecture and engage in conversation.

3. There is not much improvement needed for Professor Wehdes' teaching methods. His language was easy to follow. His presentations with lecture paired well. His mannerisms were respectful and polite. Professor Wehde is an excellent professor and I would recommend his expertise and courses to my fellow Political Science majors.

4. This course provided relevant and useful knowledge which could be applied to future research and a career in law or politics. Additionally, it expands upon the teachings of a lower level course I took the prior semester, which was beneficial in my ability to comprehend the reading material. I enjoyed the diversity in teaching methods which included lecture, practical application, writing assignments, and presentations. Great course which I will highly recommend to fellow Political Science majors.

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2019

Response Key

1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
7. Instructor's management of the course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
8. Amount you learned in this class	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
11. Overall, this course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
12. This course was graded fairly	1 = Never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Occasionally, 4 = Usually, 5 = Always