IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Bothell
Sci, Tech, Engr. & Math
Science, Tech, Engr. & Math
Term: Autumn 2020

CSS 132 A
Computer Programming For Engineers I
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: I
Responses: 10/18 (56% high)

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

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	College Decile
3.8	**2**
(0=lowest; 5=highest)	(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: 5.5
(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	DECILE RANK College
The distance learning course as a whole was:	10	10%	60%	20%		10%		3.8	3	3
The course content was:	10	10%	50%	30%		10%		3.7	2	2
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	10	20%	60%	10%		10%		4.0	2	3
The effectiveness of the distance learning format was:	10	10%	40%	40%		10%		3.5	1	2

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Relative to other college courses you have taken:	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median	DECILE RANK Inst	DECILE RANK College
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	10		50%	40%		10%			5.5	6	7
The intellectual challenge presented was:	10	20%	50%	20%		10%			5.9	7	6
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	10		70%	10%		20%			5.8	5	5
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	10		60%	30%	10%				5.7	4	4
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	10		60%	30%	10%				5.7	3	3

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: 8.2 Hours per credit: 1.6 (N=10)

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
		20%	20%	30%		10%		20%			

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

Class median: 7.5 Hours per credit: 1.5 (N=10)

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
	20%	10%	20%	30%			10%	10%			

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.5 (N=10)

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
20%	40%	20%	10%	10%										

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

(N=10)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
50%	20%			30%	

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	DECILE RANK Inst	DECILE RANK College
The helpfulness of the distance learning staff overall was:	10	20%	50%	20%		10%		3.9	1	
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	10	50%	30%	10%	10%			4.5	3	4
Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was:	10	30%	40%	20%		10%		4.0	3	3
Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was:	10	30%	40%	20%		10%		4.0	3	3
Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was:	10	20%	50%	20%	10%			3.9	2	
Clarity of course objectives was:	10	30%	30%	30%		10%		3.8	2	3
The organization of the study guide was:	10	20%	50%	20%		10%		3.9	0	
Content of the study guide was:	10	10%	60%	20%	10%			3.8	0	
Relevance of textbook for self-study was:	10	40%	30%	20%	10%			4.2	3	
Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding course content was:	10	20%	60%	10%	10%			4.0	4	5
Usefulness of written assignments in understanding course content was:	10	20%	60%	10%	10%			4.0	3	4
Usefulness of video media in understanding course content was:	10	20%	30%	40%		10%		3.5	0	
Usefulness of online resources in understanding course content was:	10	10%	40%	40%		10%		3.5	1	2
Usefulness of audio media in understanding course content was:	10	20%	30%	30%		20%		3.5	0	
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	9	44%	11%	33%	11%			4.0	3	3
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	10	20%	40%	20%	20%			3.8	2	3
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	10	20%	50%	20%		10%		3.9	2	3
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	10	30%	30%	30%		10%		3.8	2	2

CSS 132 A
Computer Programming For Engineers I
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: I
Responses: 10/18 (56% high)

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

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. It is a great course to go through when learning computer programming.

2. the class was intellectually stimulating for me since it was my first coding experience

3. Yes. Yes. Way better language than java

4. It was extremely intellectually stimulating. It was like a foreign language class in a sense where you have to learn what certain words mean in certain contexts and how to properly utilize them. The logic that's required for iterating through loops and going down 'pointer trains' (for lack of a better term) takes a lot of thinking. My brain has been fried numerous times throughout the quarter.

5. I had taken an intro to programming class before this. As a result of this, the first few topics we went over the quarter were familiar and not challenging. The later topics though were new to me. These topics were challenging to wrap my head around and get a good grasp of.

6. Yes, I think so. I had some prior coding experience that translated easily in the early course work, but later in the quarter I really began to be challenged.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. In class instruction with a little help from zybooks.

2. the in-class examples that we did relating to the chapter helped my learning

3. Good class organization

4. Professor Pisan did an excellent job instructing this course. He went at a reasonable pace and made sure that all of the course content was well understood. He could have breezed through the material and let us figure it out on our owns (as I've seen with instructors in the past), but he really cared that we understood the material. I really liked when various example problems of the same type were shown. Seeing the same type of problem solved in various ways (i.e. iterating through a string && iterating through a vector) helped me understand what exactly the logic was to solve the problem. I'd like to continue to see many examples!

5. Doing homework or similarly structed problems. Trying to solve problems on my own is when I discover what I don't get. It also pushes me to actually do it on my own, and once I do that I feel like I get a concept pretty well.

6. Zybooks and lecture both had a strong impact, but personally I think that the in class exercises that we did in week 9 were the most useful. The Cal Poly exercises on the subject of pointers were a really great use of class time and I think it would be good to have more of that in the future.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. none.

2. none

3. Lots of exams

4. The nature of the course itself was the biggest detraction. Some concepts were hard for me to grasp quickly and would take me some time to think about. This led to me being unable to fully understand various example problems as they were being done.

5. Not a whole lot, I felt like this has been one of the best classes I have taken in terms of usefulness of time spent on it.

6. Well the interpersonal aspects of zoom class are hard to navigate, and it certainly wasn't easy making connections with other students. Communication could be difficult, but I think that that's just the nature of the platform.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. The homework lessons in Zybooks are great problems but they don't have offer any assistance on their problems. It's just a pass or don't pass system and if you're struggling on their programming question there is no help besides having to ask the instructor or other students.

2. none

3. Lower the number of exams but increase the amount of projects or work that has to be done to make it more stimulating for students

4. None! Great class!

5. Again, not a whole lot, it was set up great!

6. I feel like I did best when we had one hour of lecture and one hour of exercise, as we did Thursday of last week.

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.