CSS 343 B
Data Structures, Algorithms, And Discrete Mathematics II
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Yusuf Pisan
Instructor Evaluated: Yusuf Pisan-T Prof

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A
Responses: 21/28 (75% very high)

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
3.5	**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: 4.9
(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 course as a whole was:	21	19%	24%	33%	24%			3.3	1	1
The course content was:	21	24%	24%	33%	14%	5%		3.4	1	1
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	21	33%	29%	19%	14%	5%		3.9	2	2
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	21	24%	29%	19%	24%	5%		3.6	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:	21	10%	10%	14%	38%	19%		10%	4.1	0	1
The intellectual challenge presented was:	21	29%	24%	10%	33%	5%			5.6	5	4
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	21	24%	29%	10%	29%	10%			5.6	4	4
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	21	24%	38%	5%	24%	10%			5.8	6	5
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	21	33%	19%	14%	29%	5%			5.6	3	4

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: 10.5 Hours per credit: 2.1 (N=20)

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
		10%	10%	20%	20%	15%	10%	5%	10%		

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

Class median: 8.8 Hours per credit: 1.8 (N=20)

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
5%	10%		25%	15%	25%		10%		10%		

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 2.8 (N=20)

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
10%	20%	10%	10%	5%	20%	25%								

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

(N=20)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
60%	35%			5%	

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
Course organization was:	21	19%	38%	24%	14%	5%		3.7	2	2
Clarity of instructor's voice was:	21	19%	38%	19%	19%		5%	3.7	1	1
Explanations by instructor were:	21	19%	38%	24%	19%			3.7	2	2
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	21	24%	24%	29%	24%			3.4	1	1
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	21	19%	33%	33%	5%	10%		3.6	1	1
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	21	14%	38%	29%	10%	10%		3.6	1	2
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	21	38%	29%	19%	14%			4.1	2	2
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	21	24%	29%	29%	10%	5%	5%	3.6	0	1
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	21	24%	33%	24%	10%	10%		3.7	1	1
Answers to student questions were:	21	29%	24%	33%	10%		5%	3.6	1	1
Availability of extra help when needed was:	21	29%	38%	24%	10%			3.9	2	2
Use of class time was:	21	24%	33%	19%	19%	5%		3.7	2	2
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	21	29%	24%	24%	19%		5%	3.6	1	1
Amount you learned in the course was:	21	29%	24%	24%	19%	5%		3.6	1	2
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	21	33%	33%	5%	29%			4.0	2	3
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	21	24%	14%	24%	29%	5%	5%	3.0	0	1
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	21	38%	24%	24%	14%			4.0	3	3
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	21	29%	19%	29%	19%		5%	3.4	1	1

CSS 343 B
Data Structures, Algorithms, And Discrete Mathematics II
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A
Responses: 21/28 (75% very high)

Taught by: Yusuf Pisan
Instructor Evaluated: Yusuf Pisan-T Prof

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Course contents were challenging, but ideas were changed so rapidly that there was little time to build upon what was taught.
2. Yes
3. Yes, especially the exercise that we need to write our code and theory for data structures.
4. It taught me a lot about C++ structure and algorithm.
5. Yes, the class was intellectually stimulating. The material challenged me to think more critically about the concepts rather than just memorizing them. Some topics required deeper analysis, which pushed me to approach problems in new ways.
6. Very much so, the course work was extrememly difficult and required extra work outside of class to understand the material.
7. Yes, many difficult concepts, all foreign topics and interesting.
8. Yes very challenging and leetcodes in classes hepled a lot
9. yes, the projects were challenging enough for me to learn computer science (but not overwhelming)
10. Yes, this class was intellectually stimulating because of the various difficult & theoretical topics that are taught in this class.
11. Yes and no. no bc it was so exhausting and demanding that there wasnt room for much more
12. sometimes
13. Yes, this class was intellectually simulating. I learned things I haven't before, or gained a new view on something I had already known.
14. It did, leetcode style questions are always challenging and make you think.
15. Yes, it is a data structure and algorithm class. Nothing more needs to be said.
16. Yes since I had to apply what we learned in actual problems.
17. Yes, it required me to think deeply about each of the concepts, further than the average class in order to understand the material.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Project-based learning was particularly effective, albeit in sink-or-swim format.
2. Idk
3. Textbooks for data structures and lectures.
4. Leet code practice right after we leaned about the concept.
5. The video explanations and examples helped me understand how the concepts connected to each other. I also appreciated the practice problems and the structure of the assignments. they helped reinforce the material.
6. The most important aspects of the class are the projects and tests. These are the most important for my learning and pushed me to really learn the course.
7. In class solving and examples, and class discussions.
8. in hands excersises
9. projects, lectures, and leetcode problems
10. Leetcode problems that were done in class.
11. projects
12. leetcode
13. The lectures.
14. The in class activities and going over them after
15. The lecture, and I l also appreciated the leet code problems.
16. I enjoyed how we would do actual LeetCode problems in class and discuss them.
17. The in-class lectures contributed the most to my learning.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. Overall course flow varied considerably. One lecture may contain many crucial components to learn, while others may contain none.
2. Stop using AI to generate study guides
3. Solving problem and understanding the algorithm effectively.

5. At times, the pace felt a bit fast, especially when covering more complex concepts. There were moments when I felt I needed a little more clarification or more step-by-step examples before moving on.

6. A tough part of this class was the lectures. Many of the lectures and leetcodes done in class are useful; however they could be executed better, more so the leetcodes than the lectures.

7. Long lectures, videos, and less interactive content.

8. Projects are very hard

10. N/A

11. lecture

12. n/a

13. The empty pauses after the professor asked the class for an answer. But that's on us, the students. Sorry professor.

14. nothing really detracted from my learning

15. Nothing.

16. Some of the classes in the later part of the quarter were quite lecture heavy since it was a lot of theoretical knowledge.

17. Some of the exam reviews being somewhat different from what we are expected to know for the actual exams.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Revise course flow. It's evident self-balancing trees were cut, but lecture impact fluctuates greatly, resulting in lessened lecture retention.

2. Stop using AI to generate study guides

3. None

4. Listening how algorithm works on pictures not accessible sources. If we use website i the first place, we may learn quicker.

5. One suggestion would be to offer a bit more flexibility with attendance or provide stronger online support. Some students, including myself, have to work to make it through the month, and it can be really difficult to attend every class in person. Having more accessible materials. like extra examples, recorded explanations, or optional review resources, would make it easier to keep up with the class even when work schedules get in the way.

6. I suggest doing a more incremental leetcode solving for class-time. Walkthrough the theory on the board briefly or let students do it for the question then let them work it through, in increments implement parts of it on the projector to give "hints" until it's finished.

7. More hands on, with more time to learn and fail in class to iterate and practice.

9. the amount of homework was a little low, maybe it would help to assign a few leetcode problems for homework in addition to the projects

10. The last homework assignment (movies) was very challenging. I think it could have been simplified

11. do not make it leetcode heavy it is not an interview prep class first we need to build the foundation then go to leetcode. this approach doesnt work for everyone

12. n/a

13. I don't know how you'd do this, but maybe figuring out a simpler way to introduce new material? When something new was introduced in lectures, I had a hard time wrapping my head around it until multiple examples were given and I was able to infer what the concept meant. If there's a way you can start off new material in very simple terms, or terms we learned in the past material, that would be awesome-sauce.

14. The only thing I'd say for me personally I enjoyed having a solid sample exam because it helped me be more prepared for how the questions might be presented and how I'm expected to answer them. It was pretty accurate and in depth (the answer key) so I would've loved to have that on the final as well, just feels more difficult to study and makes me feel less prepared.

15. Maybe having the grading distribution be 50% for exam instead of 60%. A little bit more extra credit wouldn't hurt, but I believe the amount that was allocated to student was good and fair.

16. None

17. I'd suggest to do more in-class activities beyond Leetcode problems, for example conceptual problems that are directly based on what we are doing in the lecture PowerPoints.

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.