

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: D
Responses: 14/17 (82% 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 3.6 (0=lowest; 5=highest)	College Decile 2 (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: 5.9 (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	College
The course as a whole was:	13	46%		38%		8%	8%	3.4	1	2
The course content was:	14	43%	14%	29%		14%		4.0	4	4
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	14	43%	7%	21%	14%	14%		3.5	1	1
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	14	36%	14%	14%	14%	14%	7%	3.5	2	2

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:	14	21%	14%	21%	29%		7%	7%	4.8	2	3
The intellectual challenge presented was:	14	36%	43%	14%	7%				6.2	8	7
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	14	50%	21%	21%	7%				6.5	9	8
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	14	50%	21%	14%	7%	7%			6.5	8	8
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	14	43%	29%	7%	14%	7%			6.2	7	7

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: 10.3 Hours per credit: 2.1 (N=14)

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
	7%		7%	21%	36%		7%				21%

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=14)

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
	7%	21%	7%	21%	14%	7%	7%				14%

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.5 (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
31%	23%	8%	15%		8%	8%			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%	15%			38%	

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:	14	36%	21%	29%	7%		7%	3.8	3	3
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	14	36%	21%	14%	21%		7%	3.8	2	3
Explanations by instructor were:	14	36%	7%	29%	14%	7%	7%	3.2	1	1
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	14	29%	29%	21%		21%		3.8	2	2
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	14	36%	29%	21%		7%	7%	4.0	3	3
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	14	36%	21%	29%		7%	7%	3.8	2	2
Contribution of assignments to understanding course content was:	14	36%	29%	29%		7%		4.0	4	4
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	14	43%	29%	7%	14%		7%	4.2	2	3
Instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	14	43%	21%	7%	14%		14%	4.2	4	4
Answers to student questions were:	14	43%	14%	7%	14%	14%	7%	4.0	3	4
Availability of extra help when needed was:	13	46%	15%	15%	15%		8%	4.2	3	4
Use of class time was:	13	38%	23%	8%	23%	8%		4.0	4	4
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	14	36%	14%	21%	14%	14%		3.5	1	1
Amount you learned in the course was:	14	36%	21%	14%	14%	7%	7%	3.8	2	3
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	14	36%	14%	36%	7%	7%		3.5	1	1
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	14	43%	14%	7%	7%	14%	14%	4.0	3	4
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	14	43%	7%	21%	21%		7%	3.5	1	2
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	14	36%	21%	21%	7%	7%	7%	3.8	2	2

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: D
Responses: 14/17 (82% 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. It's useful i guess. But a lot of employers want engineers to learn SQL - which may have been more useful. The teaching for this class is awful. So most of what I learned came from the internet and youtube. But because it's a course requirement, I have to pay for this class.
2. The concepts and material learned in this class was challenging, which made think harder about how to develop a solution to solve it.
3. I stretched my thinking while teaching c and c++ on, what I would consider, a higher level. My understanding of programming in general exponentially increased thanks to this class and I have come to love it very much.
4. This class most definitely expanded my thinking and understanding of coding and C++ language in general. With the introduction of so many topics and possibilities the class became more interesting and definitely more challenging.
5. out of the box thinking concepts
6. Yes. The material in this course was very difficult and often counterintuitive. Thinking about problems differently in order to arrive at a solution was emphasized.
7. Yes it did, coding just required a completely different way of thinking
8. Fairly stimulating. I have a good background in coding so I was at an advantage.
9. very challenging
10. assignments were challenging
11. Somewhat true.
12. Yes, the topics were novel, the assignments were interesting, and there was plenty of room to explore the topic through them and put in extra work if so inclined.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Introduction to each subject - which I then followed up with supplemental learning. I can't complain about this class because I found out that the professor accused complaining students of cheating, and it's his word against theirs.
2. I learned the material outside of class more than I did in class. I wasn't really hooked or learning anything from the lectures itself. In my opinion, some of the things that were in discussed wasn't as useful to me outside of class. And sometimes the lectures would go off track rather than using that time to discuss the assignments for the week.
3. The labs and the bigger assignments
4. The lab sections and the in class lectures. They helped us apply the concepts to the code and helped us understand better.
5. learning computers and how they work
6. Assignments and labs. In class exercises and lecture should be rethought as exercises were often on topics that were introduced in the same lecture and could be seen as unfair toward students who take longer to grasp material.
7. the labs were the best part
8. Assignments, excercises
9. Understand algorithms
11. Practical lab exercises.
12. The professor knows both the material and how to teach, the assignments were instrumental for learning the material, and the labs served as a good way to reinforce the lecture. A very well structured class.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. The teaching is atrocious. I can't wait for this class to be over. I need to take these 2 classes and have been stressed since September because I have to pass these classes to get the degree and all I have to rely upon is myself.
2. The in class assignments hadn't really provided me with anything. and the first couple weeks spent learning C wasn't too useful, since we covered the most basic concept of it.
3. nothing.
4. The in class assignment and some hw assignments. Expecting students to glean at lectures slides for one lecture and remembering everything to utilize for the closed book in class exercise was ridiculous. And for some assignments were too complicated and long to be cracked. All these assignments did was frustrate me rather than help me learn.

5. vague instructions on assignments, even though they were vague for the aspect of freedom. would of been nice to know i had that freedom mentioned in the instructions
6. Lecture was sometimes helpful but at other times it felt like the examples discussed in class were too simple and could incorporate more topics in one example.
7. some assignments were way to hard in regards to just understanding how to start. Time would have been better spent applying content and not trying to understand how to apply
8. I hardly retain the information that is lectured. Class should be more interactive where we use the IDEs more often and test code to see how it works rather than imagine it as the instructor describes.
9. Winter storm
10. The instructor gave confusing in-class exercises and seemed rushed when teaching us important content.
11. The tests and in-class assignments poorly conducted. Exams and in-class quizzes must be done in front of a computer. Explanations that "people would cheat" as to why this is not possible is absolutely unacceptable. Pace of lectures too fast at times. Switch from Slack to Discord was a bad move as we all were just getting used to the Slack environment. Lecture slides were always posted AFTER lecture so it was impossible to keep up with what was going on when students were falling behind.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Get a new teacher. I have spoken to a number of my peers and no one experiences as much stress as with these classes. Despite all the complaints by students last year, the teaching hasn't improved, and the teacher hasn't been changed.
2. Rather than just focusing on the lecture, spend a little bit more time talking about the assignment every week. The homework assignments especially toward the end of the quarter, were a little vague. I think somethings I would be interested in knowing is more structure, such as what makes code good. Like what are bad practices to avoid in each of the topics we covered and like real life scenarios.
3. This is the second class in the series and almost everything that was a problem last quarter was improved this quarter! I absolutely loved it.
4. The grading has to be done from a delicate point of view. This class is a 100's class and it's the second programming class. Not everyone has yet mastered all the code. Point deduction can be a little less harsh. Moreover, having assignments due the day before an exam no matter how much time was given is a little too much stress and work load to handle. In general the teacher needs to look at students from their level but not from a professional programmers level.
5. fun group activities and homework
6. Either focus more on C and the linux terminal or skip it completely. Devoting two weeks to the material makes it feel rushed and somewhat separate from the rest of the course.
7. Don't grade so heavily on exams. Getting a zero on problems you clearly worked hard on is a bit out of hand....in my opinion. More practice exams that are applicable to content
8. Less lecturing, more testing code. Also, this class is sometimes way too challenging for students who come in with no coding background. Id strongly believe if this was my first coding class Id struggle immensely. This is an intro 100 level class, felt like a 300 level class. I see some class mates working their butt off and barely passing because its their first time coding.
9. Organize contents more sequential
10. The instructor should improve his lectures and make his examples clearer, especially when writing on the whiteboard. He should also consider reorganizing the course content since it seems out of order and confusing.
11. Exams should be done in front of computers. Lecture slides must be posted AHEAD of time. Consider moving to a flipped classroom and narrating slide sets.
12. Tell the grader not to take points off assignments for things not on the grading rubric.

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.