

CSS 132 A
Computer Programming For Engineers I
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: D
Responses: 7/19 (37% moderate)

Taught by: Yusuf Pisan
Instructor Evaluated: Yusuf Pisan-Lecturer

Overall Summative Rating represents the combined responses of students to the four global summative items and is presented to provide an overall index of the class's quality:

Median 3.1 (0=lowest; 5=highest)	College Decile 1 (0=lowest; 9=highest)
--	--

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI) combines student responses to several IASystem items relating to how academically challenging students found the course to be and how engaged they were:

CEI: 5.2 (1=lowest; 7=highest)
--

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	DECILE RANK	
									Inst	College
The course as a whole was:	7	29%		43%	29%			3.0	0	1
The course content was:	7	14%	14%	71%				3.2	1	1
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	7	43%		57%				3.4	1	1
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	7	14%		57%	29%			2.9	0	0

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median	DECILE RANK	
										Inst	College
Relative to other college courses you have taken:											
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	7	14%		29%	57%				4.4	1	1
The intellectual challenge presented was:	7		57%	14%	29%				5.6	4	4
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	7	14%	57%	14%	14%				5.9	5	5
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	7	14%	29%	14%	29%	14%			5.0	2	1
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	7	43%	29%		29%				6.2	7	7

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?

Class median: 10.0 Hours per credit: 2 (N=7)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
			29%	14%	29%	14%				14%	

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?

Class median: 8.5 Hours per credit: 1.7 (N=7)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
		29%	14%	14%	14%	14%				14%	

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.2 (N=7)

A (3.9-4.0)	A- (3.5-3.8)	B+ (3.2-3.4)	B (2.9-3.1)	B- (2.5-2.8)	C+ (2.2-2.4)	C (1.9-2.1)	C- (1.5-1.8)	D+ (1.2-1.4)	D (0.9-1.1)	D- (0.7-0.8)	E (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
29%		29%		43%										

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as:

(N=7)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
29%				71%	

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	DECILE RANK	
									Inst	College
Course organization was:	7	14%	14%	57%	14%			3.1	1	1
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	7	29%		57%	14%			3.1	0	1
Explanations by instructor were:	7	14%		43%	43%			2.7	0	0
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	7	43%	14%	29%	14%			4.0	3	4
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	7	29%		43%	14%	14%		3.0	0	0
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	7	29%	14%	43%	14%			3.3	1	1
Contribution of assignments to understanding course content was:	7	14%		71%	14%			3.0	0	0
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	7	43%	14%	43%				4.0	1	2
Instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	7	14%	29%	57%				3.4	1	1
Answers to student questions were:	7	29%	29%	29%	14%			3.8	2	2
Availability of extra help when needed was:	7	29%	29%	29%	14%			3.8	1	2
Use of class time was:	7	14%	14%	57%	14%			3.1	0	1
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	7	43%		43%	14%			3.3	0	0
Amount you learned in the course was:	7	29%	14%	57%				3.4	1	1
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	7	29%	29%	43%				3.8	2	2
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	7	14%		43%	29%	14%		2.7	0	0
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	7	29%		43%	29%			3.0	0	0
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	7	14%		57%	14%	14%		2.9	0	0

CSS 132 A
Computer Programming For Engineers I
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: D
Responses: 7/19 (37% moderate)

Taught by: Yusuf Pisan
Instructor Evaluated: Yusuf Pisan-Lecturer

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Was this class intellectually stimulating? Did it stretch your thinking? Why or why not?

1. yes, it's at least very new concepts I haven't dealt before
2. It was intellectually stimulating. This has helped me learn a new computer language. But, the pace at which this class went by made it difficult for first timers to cope up and understand everything.
3. Yes the class was intellectually stimulating
4. Yes, I have never done any programming before and this class was a very good introduction to the topic.
5. Yes it was, because it taught very good programming practices

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

2. The labs were the most helpful. The homework was difficult but pretty helpful.
3. homework assignments
4. The homework assignments were great for reinforcing material, while the lectures were great for explaining the nuanced and difficult topics that don't easily come across from the textbook.
5. The assignments and in class work

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

2. The in class lectures were really vague and felt as though they weren't covering everything. They were lengthy. The quizzes were a complete waste of time. They were the least helpful. Some of the homework was confusing.
3. Exams were all pen-and-paper without no computers. Poor justification provided for running the exams without computers. Inconsistent grading-periods for homework assignment. Didn't utilize slack environment as much as he should have.
4. The textbook is a little hard to read but I'm not sure if that is just what programming textbooks look like.
5. Nothing really, I think it was a very well focused class

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. go easy on the exam
2. The class for a beginners course is too challenging. The professors expects too much out of the students. The pace at which this class goes is too hard to catch up. The quizzes could be much better and the exams can be reworked. The exams consists of new and challenging problems which makes no sense and deteriorates the purpose of them. Lectures need to be more clear and thorough. The textbook was not helpful too. Overall this felt like a core class. The overall expectation need to be lowered because the course is a base class. It should be more about understanding topics rather than covering everything.
3. Make exams computer based. Require weekly usage of slack environment (post weekly assignments on there).
5. More written assessments that allow for practice without the IDE

IASystem Course Summary Reports summarize student ratings of a particular course or combination of courses. They provide a rich perspective on student views by reporting responses in three ways: as frequency distributions, average ratings, and either comparative or adjusted ratings. Remember in interpreting results that it is important to keep in mind the number of students who evaluated the course relative to the total course enrollment as shown on the upper right-hand corner of the report.

Frequency distributions. The percentage of students who selected each response choice is displayed for each item. Percentages are based on the number of students who answered the respective item rather than the number of students who evaluated the course because individual item response is optional.

Median ratings. IASystem reports average ratings in the form of item medians. Although means are a more familiar type of average than medians, they are less accurate in summarizing student ratings. This is because ratings distributions tend to be strongly skewed. That is, most of the ratings are at the high end of the scale and trail off to the low end.

The median indicates the point on the rating scale at which half of the students selected higher ratings, and half selected lower. Medians are computed to one decimal place by interpolation.¹ In general, higher medians reflect more favorable ratings. To interpret median ratings, compare the value of each median to the respective response scale: *Very Poor, Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent (0-5); Never/None/Much Lower, About Half/Average, Always/Great/Much Higher (1-7); Slight, Moderate, Considerable, Extensive (1-4)*.

Comparative ratings. IASystem provides a normative comparison for each item by reporting the decile rank of the item median. Decile ranks compare the median rating of a particular item to ratings of the same item over the previous two academic years in all classes at the institution and within the college, school, or division. Decile ranks are shown only for items with sufficient normative data.

Decile ranks range from 0 (lowest) to 9 (highest). For all items, higher medians yield higher decile ranks. The 0 decile rank indicates an item median in the lowest 10% of all scores. A decile rank of 1 indicates a median above the bottom 10% and below the top 80%. A decile rank of 9 indicates a median in the top 10% of all scores. Because average ratings tend to be high, a rating of "good" or "average" may have a low decile rank.

Adjusted ratings. Research has shown that student ratings may be somewhat influenced by factors such as class size, expected grade, and reason for enrollment. To correct for this, IASystem reports **adjusted medians** for summative items (items #1-4 and their combined global rating) based on regression analyses of ratings over the previous two academic years in all classes at the respective institution. If large classes at the institution tend to be rated lower than small classes, for example, the adjusted medians for large classes will be slightly higher than their unadjusted medians.

When adjusted ratings are displayed for summative items, **relative rank** is displayed for the more specific (formative) items. Rankings serve as a guide in directing instructional improvement efforts. The top ranked items (1, 2, 3, etc.) represent areas that are going well from a student perspective; whereas the bottom ranked items (18, 17, 16, etc.) represent areas in which the instructor may want to make changes. Relative ranks are computed by first standardizing each item (subtracting the overall institutional average from the item rating for the particular course, then dividing by the standard deviation of the ratings across all courses) and then ranking those standardized scores.

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI). Several IASystem items ask students how academically challenging they found the course to be. IASystem calculates the average of these items and reports them as a single index. *The Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI)* correlates only modestly with the global rating (median of items 1-4).

Optional Items. Student responses to instructor-supplied items are summarized at the end of the evaluation report. Median responses should be interpreted in light of the specific item text and response scale used (response values 1-6 on paper evaluation forms).

¹ For the specific method, see, for example, Guilford, J.P. (1965). *Fundamental statistics in psychology and education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, pp. 49-53.