IASystem The Course Evaluation Standard

CSS 382 A
Introduction To Artificial Intelligence
Course type: Face-to-Face

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

Evaluation Delivery:	Online
Evaluation Form:	A
Responses:	38/42 (90% 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
3.9	**4**
(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: 5.1
(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:	38	21%	47%	29%	3%			3.9	3	4
The course content was:	38	26%	37%	32%	5%			3.9	2	3
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	38	37%	37%	24%	3%			4.1	3	4
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	38	34%	24%	34%	8%			3.8	2	3

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:	37	8%	16%	35%	30%	8%	3%		4.8	2	4
The intellectual challenge presented was:	38	24%	34%	26%	16%				5.7	5	5
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	38	13%	24%	42%	16%	3%	3%		5.2	2	2
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	38	18%	34%	34%	11%	3%			5.6	4	4
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	38	26%	29%	26%	16%	3%			5.7	4	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: 9.2 Hours per credit: 1.8 (N=36)

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
	3%	11%	22%	17%	11%	17%	14%		3%	3%	

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=36)

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
3%	14%	17%	17%	22%	8%	11%	3%	3%		3%	

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.6 (N=35)

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%	31%	20%	11%		3%	6%								

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

(N=36)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
42%		56%			3%

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:	37	30%	27%	38%	5%			3.8	2	3
Clarity of instructor's voice was:	38	32%	29%	29%	8%	3%		3.9	1	2
Explanations by instructor were:	38	24%	39%	29%	8%			3.8	2	3
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	37	38%	24%	35%	3%			4.0	3	4
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	37	41%	27%	30%	3%			4.2	3	4
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	38	32%	34%	26%	8%			4.0	2	3
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	38	47%	26%	18%	8%			4.4	3	3
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	37	51%	22%	22%	5%			4.5	3	5
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	38	45%	26%	21%	8%			4.3	3	4
Answers to student questions were:	38	42%	32%	24%	3%			4.2	3	5
Availability of extra help when needed was:	38	37%	32%	24%	8%			4.1	2	4
Use of class time was:	38	39%	26%	21%	13%			4.1	3	5
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	38	47%	26%	21%	5%			4.4	3	5
Amount you learned in the course was:	38	39%	24%	26%	11%			4.1	3	5
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	38	32%	32%	32%	5%			3.9	2	3
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	38	42%	29%	26%	3%			4.2	4	5
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	38	39%	29%	26%	5%			4.1	3	4
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	37	41%	32%	24%	3%			4.2	3	4

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

CSS 382 A
Introduction To Artificial Intelligence
Course type: Face-to-Face

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A
Responses: 38/42 (90% very high)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. It definitely was, enjoyable AI topic, even if it was a bit more general than I expected, but that might just be AI in itself. Or shaded expectations due to my personal focus in LLMs.

2. Yes the class was stimulating because it caused me to look more into how AI around me worked.

3. Yes, I need to know how to calculate the minimum and maximum of the function.

4. Yes, the class had a lot of new and tricky concepts that required us to sit down and think about the problems as we worked through them.

5. Yes, provided many opportunities to consider why and how something would work the way it needed to (and determining what something needed to do).

6. Yes it was! There are certain concept that I would not know before and it really challenges my logic of coding

8. Yes, we had to understand the concepts and algorithms to be able to do the homework, exercises and exams.

9. For the most part, most of the concepts brought up in this course I had already learned from 342 and 343. I never felt like I really learned new concepts

10. It was fairly intellectually stimulating, as the concepts taught to were new to me.

11. Yes, I think the project itself is very fun and quite challenging. It forces you to read and study the code in order for things to work

12. Yes, we have learned interesting topics in this class

13. Yes it did, the assignments were challenging and understanding the different algorithms and such.

14. I did find the class intellectually simulating as the world AI is quickly evolving and in this class we learned not only the basics of AI but also had great discussions on how AI might change our lives as it continues to grow.

15. ye, ye, because the class is intellectually stimulating and it stretch my thinking.

16. Yes. Thinking about game states and agents and policies was challenging and fun.

17. Yes it was. It made me think about AI not as magic but rather as smart code.

18. yes, because expands on concept that is important for my future as human and as developers.

19. Yes it was stimulating, I have never learned AI before and this is the first time i learned this material

20. I found the course very intellectually stimulating as it required me to spend time on the subject to comprehend it. Intro to AI is a very relative class to technology today, and I think it will help me in my career.

21. It was because I needed to think about if I was implementing the search algorithms correctly

22. Yes, it felt like IQ tests.

24. The material is really challenging and hard to implement in code.

25. Yes, this class was definitely intellectually stimulating, it was an introductory class so there was a lot of expansion in terms of my thinking.

27. Yes. Good introduction into AI

28. Yes, I learned more about search methods and programming in Python

29. Yes

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Lectures were insightful, projects were fun

2. Failure on the projects had excellent feedback by autograder to aid in better understanding from concepts to implementation.

3. I have learned a new language "python".

4. The lectures had lots of visual demos and examples that helped me. Also, the professor did a lot of practice problems and walked through them step by step.

5. The projects were very helpful. The whiteboard drawings for examples were also frequently very useful in understanding new concepts.

6. The project

8. The algorithms were hard to understand at first but I appreciated how the professor solved the practice problems with us which is hard to find in any other courses. I felt I learned the most by that way.

9. I like that the lectures were recorded, it really aided in completing the homework.

10. The lecture slides contributed the most to my learning.

11. The lectures

12. assignments

13. the assignments and exams

14. I found the practice quizzes and projects to be the greatest contributor to my learning.

15. The class

16. The visuals used in the slides were very useful for learning the material.

17. The autograder made it easy and fast to check my work

18. everything is this contributed to my learning.

19. assignments

20. Going through problems with Mr. Pisan and listening to his explanations to answers contributed the most to my learning.

21. The lectures

22. The teacher's availability and helpfulness.

24. Professor going through example problems.

25. Pretty much everything, quizzes/lectures helped explain the concepts. Tests and projects helped give concrete examples of how they'd work. Every part of this class seemed valuable to me.

26. Learning more practical algorithms

27. I liked the pacman games

28. The projects

29. The projects

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. In-class quizzes sometimes took a long while, especially if I got stuck, there wasn't really a good way to progress. But going over the answers in class is a perfect remedy!

2. None

3. Nothing

4. Sometimes, the professor was confused about questions and it took him a little bit of time to figure out the answers. Usually he got to the answer, but sometimes he had a little bit of trouble figuring it out.

5. Can't think of anything.

6. None, even though I hope this class is not offered at 8:45AM as many students are still sleepy

8. There are many different concepts that were introduced in class at once so that sometimes we found it hard to absorb. It could be better if we know which concepts we should pay more attention to than the others.

9. I felt like the lectures were not that engaging, and the concepts brushed over to quickly. I often felt confused by the end of class.

10. Sometimes the class time was not used user effectively, which detracted from my learning.

11. Morning classes

12. quizzes

13. nothing

14. I personally didn't gain too much from the midterm and final as I have test anxiety, but I understand why it is necessary to include in the course.

15. The class

17. Nothing

18. nothing detracted from my learning

19. nothing

20. Only the fact that it was so early in the morning.

21. None

22. Nothing from this class.

24. Sometimes the material was very confusing.

25. Nothing that I can think of

27. I did not like the length of the projects.

28. The projects were somewhat difficult

29. Python

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. LLM stuff earlier on, somehow...

2. Link lectures to sections in the book for extra/additional information.

3. Nothing

4. No suggestions

5. Trying to have some of the problem solving time more towards the middle of the class time, with less at the beginning or end, while it is probably challenging to always make it work timing wise, the times we were able to learn something (like the first basic version of something), Work out a few examples, then move back into the more complex details was very effective. So overall, while it probably can't be applied to every topic, the incremental learn-do-learn cycle, was helpful in learning the new concepts.

6. I hope the exam would be graded more leniently with partial credit

7. Have more related questions on the practice for exams

8. I think the professor was doing his job very well. He showed his understanding for the students and wanted to help us better.

10. Have weekly quizzes to improve learning, so students would be more inclined to be up to date on the material.

11. Nothing I enjoyed the class really well

12. none

13. not much

14. I personally would love to see further exploration of recent topics in AI or just further discussion on what we might see with the raise of AI platforms such as Chat GPT.

16. More check-ins for assignment progress would help.

17. Maybe share useful videos that goes over the concepts

18. I don't have suggestion.

19. none

20. I thought the course was very well structured. I do not have any suggestions to improve it.

21. It would be nice if we talked more about the projects and walkthrough them like how we did in project 3

22. Maybe more consistency with completing the quizzes, other than that everything was good

23. This class was great but could probably benefit from a curriculum overhaul with all the new developments in AI.

24. Not really, it is pretty fair.

26. Add more calculation processes to illustrate bet

27. Shorter projects.

28. NA

29. 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.[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.