CourseWorks @Columbia

Program Evaluation System

Report: **Stats Distribution**

Course:	**Wkshp: Booz Allen: Monitor & Eval (SIPAU9004_001_2009_1)**
Instructor:	**Esser Daniel**
Evaluation:	**Spring 2009 SIPA Core Workshop Evaluations**
Dates:	**April 17, 2009 - May 07, 2009**
No. of Respondents:	5
No. of Students:	7
Percent Completed:	**71%**

Section: Workshop Setup and Implementation

1: **How would you rate the workshop application process?** n = 5

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	1	20.00
Fair	2	1	20.00
Good	3	1	20.00
Very Good	4	1	20.00
Excellent	5	1	20.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
	Mean: 3.00	Median: 3	Std. Dev.: 1.58

2: **How well did the workshop choices align with your interests?** n = 5

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	1	20.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	2	40.00
Very Good	4	2	40.00
Excellent	5	0	0.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
	Mean: 3.00	Median: 3	Std. Dev.: 1.22

3: **How well did the workshop meet your expectations?** n = 5

(1=no, not at all; 5=yes, very much so)

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	2	40.00
Good	3	2	40.00

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Very Good	4	1	20.00
Excellent	5	0	0.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
	Mean: 2.80	Median: 3	Std. Dev.: 0.84

4: **Please evaluate the relevance and quality of the class sessions.**   n =5

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	1	20.00
Good	3	2	40.00
Very Good	4	2	40.00
Excellent	5	0	0.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
	Mean: 3.20	Median: 3	Std. Dev.: 0.84

5: **Overall evaluation of workshop.**   n =5

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	2	40.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	2	40.00
Excellent	5	1	20.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
	Mean: 3.40	Median: 4	Std. Dev.: 1.34

Section: Faculty Advisor Performance

1: **Was the faculty advisor well organized and prepared?**   n =5

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	3	60.00
Very Good	4	1	20.00
Excellent	5	1	20.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
	Mean: 3.60	Median: 3	Std. Dev.: 0.89

2: **How was the faculty advisor's attitude towards the students? (1=very negative, 5=very positive)**   n =5

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00

Good	3	2	40.00
Very Good	4	1	20.00
Excellent	5	2	40.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
	Mean: 4.00	Median: 4	Std. Dev.: 1.00

3: **How accessible was the faculty advisor?**   n = 5

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	2	40.00
Excellent	5	3	60.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
	Mean: 4.60	Median: 5	Std. Dev.: 0.55

4: **How clearly did the faculty advisor present his/her expectations of the workshop overall?**   n = 5

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	1	20.00
Good	3	1	20.00
Very Good	4	2	40.00
Excellent	5	1	20.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
	Mean: 3.60	Median: 4	Std. Dev.: 1.14

5: **How clearly did the faculty advisor present his/her expectations for the individual deliverables?**   n = 5

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	1	20.00
Good	3	1	20.00
Very Good	4	2	40.00
Excellent	5	0	0.00
Not Applicable	0	1	20.00
	Mean: 3.25	Median: 3.5	Std. Dev.: 0.96

6: **How would you evaluate the faculty advisor's ability to explain the material?**   n = 5

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Fair	2	1	20.00
Good	3	2	40.00
Very Good	4	2	40.00
Excellent	5	0	0.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
	Mean: 3.20	Median: 3	Std. Dev.: 0.84

7: Overall evaluation of the faculty advisor.   n = 5

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	2	40.00
Very Good	4	2	40.00
Excellent	5	1	20.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
	Mean: 3.80	Median: 4	Std. Dev.: 0.84

Section: Group Performance

1: What was the quality and level of teamwork?   n = 5

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	1	20.00
Very Good	4	1	20.00
Excellent	5	3	60.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
	Mean: 4.40	Median: 5	Std. Dev.: 0.89

2: What was the quality and level of participation of group members?   n = 5

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	1	20.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	4	80.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
	Mean: 4.60	Median: 5	Std. Dev.: 0.89

3: How well was the work divided/assigned?   n = 5

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00

Response			
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	1	20.00
Very Good	4	2	40.00
Excellent	5	2	40.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
	Mean: 4.20	Median: 4	Std. Dev.: 0.84

4:   Overall evaluation of the group.   n = 5

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	1	20.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	4	80.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
	Mean: 4.60	Median: 5	Std. Dev.: 0.89

Section: Client Interaction

1:   n = 5

Were the expectations of the client clearly defined at the beginning of the workshop?

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	1	20.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	1	20.00
Very Good	4	3	60.00
Excellent	5	0	0.00
	Mean: 3.20	Median: 4	Std. Dev.: 1.30

2:   n = 5

How would you rate the client project director's overall attitude towards the project?

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	2	40.00
Good	3	1	20.00
Very Good	4	1	20.00
Excellent	5	1	20.00
	Mean: 3.20	Median: 3	Std. Dev.: 1.30

3:   Was your client project director available and accessible to the extent you needed?   n = 5

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	1	20.00
Fair	2	1	20.00
Good	3	1	20.00
Very Good	4	1	20.00
Excellent	5	1	20.00
	Mean: 3.00	Median: 3	Std. Dev.: 1.58

4:   Would you recommend working with this client again?   n = 5

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	5	100.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	0	0.00
Yes	1	5	100.00
	Mean: 1.00	Median: 1	Std. Dev.: 0.00

Section: Additional Comments