

CSS 133 A
Computer Programming For Engineers II
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: D
Responses: 13/15 (87% very high)

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 3.5 (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: 5.3 (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:	13		46%	46%	8%			3.4	1	1
The course content was:	13		46%	38%	15%			3.4	1	1
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	13	15%	38%	31%	15%			3.6	1	1
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	13	8%	38%	46%	8%			3.4	1	1

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:	13	15%		46%	38%				4.8	2	3
The intellectual challenge presented was:	13	31%	23%	46%					5.7	5	4
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	13	31%	38%	15%	15%				6.0	7	7
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	13	15%	38%	38%	8%				5.6	4	3
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	13	23%	46%	15%	15%				5.9	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: 12.0 Hours per credit: 2.4 (N=13)

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
			8%	8%	31%	15%	23%		8%	8%	

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

Class median: 9.8 Hours per credit: 1.9 (N=13)

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
		15%	8%	23%	31%	8%	15%				

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.0 (N=13)

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
15%	23%		38%	15%		8%								

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

(N=13)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
46%	23%			31%	

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:	13		8%	85%	8%			3.0	1	1
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	13	15%	15%	62%	8%			3.2	1	1
Explanations by instructor were:	13	15%	15%	62%	8%			3.2	1	1
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	13	8%	38%	31%	23%			3.4	1	1
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	13		54%	46%				3.6	1	1
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	13		38%	62%				3.3	1	1
Contribution of assignments to understanding course content was:	13	8%	23%	69%				3.2	1	1
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	13	8%	31%	46%	15%			3.2	0	0
Instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	13		23%	46%	31%			2.9	0	0
Answers to student questions were:	13		38%	38%	23%			3.2	0	1
Availability of extra help when needed was:	13	8%	23%	46%	23%			3.1	0	0
Use of class time was:	13		31%	54%	8%	8%		3.1	1	1
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	13	23%	38%	38%				3.8	1	1
Amount you learned in the course was:	13		54%	46%				3.6	1	2
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	13	15%	31%	38%	15%			3.4	1	1
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	13	8%	15%	46%	23%	8%		2.9	0	0
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	13	8%	46%	38%	8%			3.6	1	2
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	13	8%	31%	46%	15%			3.2	1	1

CSS 133 A
Computer Programming For Engineers II
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: D
Responses: 13/15 (87% very high)

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 made me think in a different way.
2. It was Professor Pisan's assignments constantly had me on my toes.
3. This class was difficult in terms of learning a new language of coding, previously knowing C and then just tossing it out the window to learn C++ was difficult.
4. Yes, all the topics were interesting and were challenging.
5. Yes, the course content was challenging and forced me to think in a different way. Homework assignments often required a lot of planning and critical thinking.
6. I think the one thing this class needed was to expand a little more on the applications of say, linked lists or other concepts.
7. This class was very challenging for me, and stimulating at the same time. The knowledge I gained from this course is helping me become a well-rounded engineer. Professor Pisan has been incredibly generous with his time in explaining concepts that I will most certainly use in my career as an engineer.
8. Thinking like a programmer was very helpful for problem-solving and professional growth
9. Yes, it took concepts from C and applied them to c++
10. Yes
12. Yes, the class was different from the C course, but I liked this course much more than the previous course.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. lab session
2. The hw assignments were invaluable as they helped cement what we learned in class
3. Going to lab and doing homework assignments.
4. Direct practice and seeing the code.
5. Homework assignments, presentation projects, and exam review worksheets.
6. Being able to freely ask questions during lecture and get a solid response
7. While the lectures were great, I feel that the assigned projects allowed me to apply the knowledge I gained from the lectures.
8. Lab portion and hands-on work
9. labs and HW
10. The labs and homework contributed to learning
12. Assignments and Labs

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. students teaching the material
2. There was one other student whose terrible attitude towards Professor Pisan was not only rude disrespectful but also extremely distracting to the class as a whole
3. Getting stuck on homework and sometimes spending along time working on it.
4. Going off-topic for things that were only slightly relevant to a topic we were currently learning.
5. Sometimes the homework instructions were ambiguous and required further clarification from the instructor.
7. None.
8. Changing class dynamic and structure, but its a new class and we are trying to find a grove
9. paper midterms
10. The colleague presentations took away from instruction time and a large portion of the presentations were not fully usable. I would rather have had instructor presentation during that time.
12. Nothing

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. the tests were extremely difficult.
2. When this course started I hated the idea of taking a coding test on paper but now that the course is almost over I actually prefer them. Really I wouldn't change a whole lot with this course
3. Incorporating what we do in engineering into the class and providing more practice. I feel like we are just coding random stuff and I don't see the application.
4. Maybe make the homework instructions a little bit more clear.
6. Maybe just some improvement in blending the topics together rather than learning each topic individually. I don't feel as if they built off of each other as much as they should.
7. None. Keep up the great work Professor Pisan.
8. More hands on coding in class like lab
9. N/A
10. programming the test made more sense than a written exam where we had to memorize functions in libraries or fit them on a notecard.
11. sometimes things on the board is a little hard to see
12. More hands on coding in class

INSTRUCTOR-ADDED OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

What advice would you give to a student taking this course that will help them succeed?

1. know some programming before taking the course
2. Work hard and learn material as it is presented you don't want to be playing catch up
3. Study everything that you have done homework, lectures, and labs. And don't get behind on a topic because the class keeps moving and building on previous topics.
4. Brush up on your about coding and syntax to make it a bit more easier to understand at first.
5. Read the text ahead of time and plan out code before programming it. Review chapter highlights for midterms as they have a lot of information and explanations that may not have been covered in class.
6. Use the resources posted on the website, they are extremely helpful, and attend labs.
7. Practice, practice, practice. Ask for help when you get stuck!
8. Treat C++ like a new language and try your best to stay with the class
9. stay on top of the work
10. start the assignments early.
11. do the practice exam
12. Read over the lecture notes and start assignments as early as possible

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.