

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT

Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Bothell Science, Tech, Engr. & Math Term: Autumn 2021 (COVID)

Evaluation Delivery: Online

Responses: 23/36 (64% high)

Evaluation Form: A

Taught by: Yusuf Pisan

Computer Programming I

Course type: Face-to-Face

CSS 142 D

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 3.9 (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: 5.7 (1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median		LE RANK College
The course as a whole was:	23	30%	39%	17%	13%			4.0	4	5
The course content was:	22	32%	45%	23%				4.1	4	5
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	23	22%	35%	30%	9%	4%		3.7	1	2
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	23	13%	43%	13%	13%	13%	4%	3.6	2	3

STUDEN	IT ENGAG	SEMENT																
Relative to other college courses you have taken:							Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median		LE RANK College		
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:						23	26%	39%	17%	9%	4%	4%		5.9	7	8		
The intellectual challenge presented was:					23	22%	57%	17%				4%	6.0	8	7			
The amou	The amount of effort you put into this course was:						23	17%	65%	4%	4%	4%		4%	6.0	7	7	
The amou	unt of effor	t to succe	ed in this c	course was	3:		23	30%	43%	17%	4%			4%	6.0	7	7	
	Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:						23	35%	39%	9%	4%	13%			6.1	7	7	
including	0 ,	classes, d	oing readir	ngs, review		nis course, writing					Class	media	n: 6.9	Hours	oer credi	t: 1.4	(N=23)	
Under 2	2-3		4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	I	12-13		14-15	1	6-17	18	3-19	20-21	22	or more	
4%	4%	, 1	7%	35%	17%	9%				4%			9	1%				
	total avera in advancir	_		w many do	you cons	ider were					Class	mediaı	n: 6.1	Hours	oer credi	t: 1.2	(N=23)	
Under 2	2-3		4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	I	12-13		14-15	1	6-17	18-19		20-21		22 or more	
4%	22%	6 1	7%	22%	13%	9%				9%	4	4%						
What grad	de do you	expect in t	his course	e?										Clas	s mediar	ո։ 3.9	(N=23)	
A (3.9-4.0) 57%	A- (3.5-3.8) 17%	B+ (3.2-3.4) 9%	B (2.9-3.1) 9%	B- (2.5-2.8) 4%	C+ (2.2-2.4)	C (1.9-2.1)	C- (1.5-1. 4%	, ,	D+ .2-1.4)	D (0.9-1.1) (0.7)- -0.8)	E (0.0)	Pas	s Cre	edit	No Credit	
In regard	to your ac	ademic pr	ogram, is	this course	e best desc	cribed as:											(N=23)	
A core/distribution In your major requirement			An	elective		In your mii		ninor	Ар	rogram	requir	ement		Other				
57% 13%					4%			4%			_	7%			4%			



COURSE SUMMARY REPORT

Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Bothell Science, Tech, Engr. & Math Term: Autumn 2021 (COVID)

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median		LE RANK College
Course organization was:	22	41%	32%	18%	5%	5%		4.2	4	5
Clarity of instructor's voice was:	23	13%	35%	26%	22%	4%		3.4	0	1
Explanations by instructor were:	23	13%	39%	30%	9%	9%		3.6	2	2
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	23	17%	48%	22%		13%		3.8	2	2
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	23	35%	26%	22%	9%	9%		3.9	2	2
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	23	35%	43%	9%	9%	4%		4.2	3	4
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	22	50%	36%	14%				4.5	3	4
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	23	39%	35%	13%	13%			4.2	2	3
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	23	26%	30%	22%	17%	4%		3.7	1	1
Answers to student questions were:	23	30%	48%	9%	9%	4%		4.1	3	4
Availability of extra help when needed was:	23	48%	26%	13%	9%	4%		4.4	4	4
Use of class time was:	23	43%	30%	9%	13%	4%		4.3	4	5
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	23	39%	35%	17%	9%			4.2	3	3
Amount you learned in the course was:	23	43%	26%	13%	9%	4%	4%	4.2	4	5
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	23	48%	26%	13%	13%			4.4	4	5
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	23	30%	30%	17%	13%	9%		3.9	2	3
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	23	43%	26%	17%	9%		4%	4.2	4	5
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	23	39%	30%	22%	9%			4.1	3	4



COURSE SUMMARY REPORT

Student Comments

University of Washington, Bothell Science, Tech, Engr. & Math Term: Autumn 2021 (COVID)

Evaluation Delivery: Online Evaluation Form: A

Responses: 23/36 (64% high)

Computer Programming I
Course type: Face-to-Face

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 was intellectually stimulating and required me to think out of the box nearly every assignment because it was learning a completely new language combined with refining my problem solving skills.
- 2. Kind of. I never learned JAVA before so it was cool to see how a different programming language works and how you can automate it to do a various amount of task.
- 3. Yes. It didn't stretch my thinking because the methods are used in a certain order.
- 4. Nope, I've done lots of programming and it was really easy.
- 5. This class really stretched my thinking in that I had to learn something new, but there were absolutely moments where I sat there in lecture for 1 hour not having a clue whether I was doing something right. Which isn't a very effective use of time, then I'd ask a question to either my friend beside me, the professor, or PF, and that would help me get through the exercise but not in the long run of getting through other examples with the similar ideas & concepts. I had gone to office hours with the professor which was really helpful when I asked for him to go over a what we learned in lecture- that really helped me in the long run. But going to office hours for homework and other things, weren't that helpful for me. However, there were times I didn't understand what we were doing in lecture so I'd go to the QSC, which did help but what helped me most in understanding what was happening in the class was this Peer facilitator I happened to walk into at the QSC and after a few visits with him and walking through class exercises- I am now able to get through code from the lecture and not just sit there for an hour not understanding anything.
- 6. The practice problems during class were extremely stimulating
- 7. I feel like this class was intellectually stimulating because it made us think of solutions through coding.
- 8. Because the class is mostly about understanding concepts that you will use in your code, it was intellectually stimulating trying to fit certain concepts into the code and figuring out if it works and going through trials/errors to make it work.
- 9. Yes; I took the class multiple times, but I still learned so much.
- 10. i already to a course equivalent to this in high school so i was mostly reviewing but when we went over things i did not learn before it was very interesting.
- 11. Very much so! I have been coding before in other languages, but learning Java through this class was very intellectually stimulating and enjoyable. Coding tests also were challenging but I felt well prepared and that we learned everything we needed to know in class and through the homework.
- 12. yes, the assignments require to look for possible solutions
- 13. Yes, the class activities and the exercises were intellectually simulating. They challenged me and taught me to improve my programming and problem solving skills.
- 14. Yes, I really liked the way the class was laid out and the ICAs we did. I think it was a good way to get a little practice and get help when needed.
- 16. This class was definitely stimulating. It forced me to think of solutions to many problems in a variety of ways, making my understanding of the subject deeper.
- 17. This class is intellectually stimulating and it stretched my thinking outside the box.
- 18. Yes because I had never coded before so I had to learn how to think outside the box on solving problems and learn different techniques.
- 19. It was not because I have already learned all of the course materials. I just had to take this class per UWB requirements.
- 20. At the beginning of the course, it was my fault for underestimating it since I had a tiny bit of coding knowledge to begin with. However, I quickly learned that this class was actually very challenging for me. I was always afraid to ask the professor for assistance since I felt like he expected students to come in already having some sort of understanding. Each day, I came to class feeling confused and unready. I tried to work with the TA to troubleshoot my problems, but I just felt like I couldn't nail down the logic. I'm trying to do better in the class since I understand how it runs now, however, it's too late in the quarter and I feel lost and hopeless. This class definitely stretched my thinking. I don't think it's right to say that this class does not require any prereqs, the content presented goes at a fast pace so it's challenging for beginning programmers to try to keep up.
- 21. Yes, it was because the process and brain thinking required time.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

- 1. The homeworks
- 2. The peers who are gifted at coding and has been coding for various amount of years are great tutors for the subjects that we needed to learn per week.
- 3. Learning each method in java.
- 4. Nothing
- 5. Office hours and doing the in class exercises with friends in the class that knew what they were doing.
- 6. Practice problems within class and projects
- 7. I think when we did practice problems, it really helped.

© 2011–2021 IASystem, University of Washington Survey no: 26051

Printed: 12/27/21

Page 3 of 6

- 8. The in class practices that we worked on to build upon the knowledge and skills we can input to our code.
- 9. The in-person assignments and weekly projects
- 10. the practice problems and projects.
- 11. Homework assignments helped a ton with building on my knowledge and letting us actually apply the concepts learned in class in a way that actually felt meaningful. Just hard enough to be a challenge, but a doable challenge.
- 12. class activities
- 13. Practicing in and out of class helped me improve my skills in programming. It helped me understand how I should approach and solve problems.
- 14. I think the ICAs and PCAs were helpful and effective as it forced us to get more practice in besides the hw.
- 15. I think using GitHub to turn in assignments was good!
- 16. The in-class assignments were very helpful
- 17. The class work and readings contributed most to my learning.
- 18. The in-class activities and the homework.
- 19. The homework tested our knowledge the best.
- 20. I wish I could say that the lectures were helpful. Sometimes the instructor presents the information in an unclear manner. I believe the in-class practices were the most helpful. But I found it tricky since I didn't understand the lecture before the in-class activities were assigned.
- 21. The assignments and the lesson were taught by the professor.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

- 1. The exams
- 2. The class is too fast for people who hadn't coded before, or hadn't coded in many years. It feels too catered to the gifted peers who can formulate a program in a few minutes.
- 3. Using the methods in an actual coding problem.
- 4. Nothing
- 5. When the professor went over new concepts and ideas, especially with the order of which subjects he taught were confusing.
- 7. I feel like when we do not go over some concepts, i feel a little lost
- 8. Nothing really detracted from my learning, but I did struggle to understand the guestions on the exams which may have resulted in my grade lowering.
- 9. nothing
- 10. the readings, the readings did not convey the material as well as seeing examples and such as well as applying the new concepts myself.
- 11. I felt like sometimes there were things in the textbook that weren't explicitly covered in detail in class (string methods specifically) that were tested. I would have liked to go over this in class.
- 12. n/a
- 13. None.
- 14. Nothing I can think of at the moment.
- 15. During homework assignments, mostly in the latter half of the course, the given templates had checkstyle errors. I didn't enjoy being required to fix errors I didn't make to get full points.
- 16. Some parts of a study guide for exams were a little misleading as they barely reflected what would be on the actual exam.
- 18. The readings because it was hard for me to understand what I was reading and didn't get how to implement any of it until we did something with it in class.
- 19. None I can think of.
- 20. This class went at a fast pace. I felt like there wasn't a lot of time to learn everything at my pace and I wasn't able to build a solid foundation. Overall, I just felt like the way the class was taught made it difficult to learn the content. However, this is my first quarter so I'm still trying to learn how courses work in university. This professor starts off thinking that students already have the knowledge needed to understand the material, so there isn't room for learning during lectures, just practice and a brief overview.
- 21. None.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

- 1. I suggest preparing a better review guide for the exams
- 2. Lessen the amount of ICA, and actually explain the concepts taught in the book to reinforce what the functions do. Do more guided examples before going into the ICA so we can understand and apply what was taught during lecture.
- 3. Maybe explain what each one does for example classes or double arrays.
- 4. Go slower, the class went to fast in the beginning and didn't explain topics well or help other students understand the subjects.
- 5. 1) At the beginning of the course, I think it's good first to teach how to map out code before jumping into the computer and typing code out. Like, something I had learned in the QSC & from Peer Facilitators was to map out how to do the program, like writing out what methods, conditions, variables, etc. that would be needed to run the program. Once I learned how to do that, it become much easier to create programs & methods. 2) When teaching new subjects- teach the students about the "right approach", there's a lot of different ways to create programs that do a certain task and to not risk getting docked off on exams, teaching the right approach that would give us some points (not an automatic 0) would be very useful.
- 6. Possibly going over certain concepts more in depth in class

- 7. I think if we go in depth with some topics and then do more practice problems, it will help alot.
- 8. N/A.
- 9. I'm not the biggest fan of written exams, but I still would say that you should keep them.
- 10. more projects instead of exams, the exams are not super helpful for applying knowledge as projects are and i enjoyed the projects much more.
- 11. Sometimes I felt like during lecture, a new concept was presented, but no real example was given of how to use it. I would have liked it if you introduced the concept with a basic explanation, opened a new code file and very quickly showed how it works with printing and returning methods using it, and then sent us to try it. I felt like the demonstration step was missing a lot of the time and I would have to always google the syntax and how to actually use it. It worked fine for me and other people with prior coding knowledge, but I would feel completely lost if I hadn't had this knowledge before starting this guarter.
- 12. more sample exam review
- 13. None.
- 14. Provide in class time to work on hw assignments.
- 15. Fix the checkstyle errors in the template code?
- 16. Making homework assignments, study guides, and in-class assignments more challenging to be better prepared for the exams.
- 18. N/A
- 19. Make optional resources for coding practice outside of class more clearer for others to use.
- 20. I would have chosen a professor who understands the struggles of students who are just learning. The exams in this course were difficult for me and all in all, I just had a rough time. I felt like I couldn't speak to my professor because during the times that I've tried, his instruction wasn't that clear or helpful. I noticed that I left lectures with more questions and confusion. I also would have practiced more and would have tried to just teach myself instead of hoping that my instructor would. This class seems more self-taught and that students can only use the professor as an additional resource, not a primary way to learn the material. I just wished that I understood the material and worked harder to learn how to teach myself course content.
- 21. None.



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. 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.