BIOL 180 AT
Introductory Biology
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: H
Responses: 16/24 (67% high)

Taught by: John Parks, Lea Savolainen, Matt George
Instructor Evaluated: Matt George-TA

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:

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
4.2	4.4

(0=lowest; 5=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	Adjusted Median
The lab section as a whole was:	16	31%	38%	25%	6%			4.0	4.2
The content of the lab section was:	16	25%	38%	25%		12%		3.8	4.0
The lab instructor's contribution to the course was:	16	44%	50%	6%				4.4	4.6
The lab instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	16	56%	38%	6%				4.6	4.8

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Relative to other college courses you have taken:	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	16	12%	12%	12%	44%	19%			4.2
The intellectual challenge presented was:	16	31%	12%	31%	12%	12%			5.3
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	16	25%	31%	25%	12%	6%			5.7
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	16	25%	44%	19%	6%	6%			5.9
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	16	38%	12%	25%	25%				5.5

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: 4.5 (N=16)

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
19%	31%		6%	6%	12%	6%	6%	6%		6%	

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

Class median: 3.0 (N=16)

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
31%	25%	6%	19%	6%		6%		6%			

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.1 (N=16)

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)	F (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
6%	31%	12%	25%	6%	12%			6%						

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

(N=16)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
56%	19%	6%		12%	6%

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Explanations by the lab instructor were:	16	44%	50%	6%				4.4	11
Lab instructor's preparedness for lab sessions was:	16	69%	31%					4.8	4
Quality of questions or problems raised by the lab instructor was:	16	62%	38%					4.7	1
Lab instructor's enthusiasm was:	16	38%	44%	6%	12%			4.2	18
Student confidence in lab instructor's knowledge was:	16	56%	44%					4.6	12
Lab instructor's ability to solve unexpected problems was:	16	56%	38%	6%				4.6	6
Answers to student questions were:	16	56%	44%					4.6	5
Interest level of lab sessions was:	16	38%	44%	19%				4.2	8
Communication and enforcement of safety procedures were:	16	56%	31%	6%	6%			4.6	9
Lab instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	16	50%	44%	6%				4.5	7
Availability of extra help when needed was:	16	62%	38%					4.7	2
Use of lab section time was:	16	44%	38%	6%	6%	6%		4.3	10
Lab instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	16	38%	50%	12%				4.2	16
Amount you learned in the lab sections was:	16	38%	44%		19%			4.2	13
Relevance and usefulness of lab section content were:	16	38%	38%	6%	12%	6%		4.2	17
Coordination between lectures and lab activities was:	16	31%	44%	12%	6%	6%		4.1	15
Reasonableness of assigned work for lab section was:	16	56%	31%	12%				4.6	3
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	16	44%	38%	19%				4.3	14

BIOL 180 AT
Introductory Biology
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: H
Responses: 16/24 (67% high)

Taught by: John Parks, Lea Savolainen, Matt George
Instructor Evaluated: Matt George-TA

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. It was intellectually stimulating! It connected well with class and elaborated on many things that I was confused on.
2. yes we have to come up idea by discussion
3. Matt George is the best TA I've ever had. He helped stretch my thinking more than the labs. The labs were so simple that I feel like it wasn't worth going to.
4. The lab section did not really benefit me in learning the course material
5. Yes, labs were interesting
6. Yes, Matt was great at motivating us to think deeper than the question asked
7. Yes! Labs helped me understand statistical analysis so much better! It was great being able to apply the skills we talked about in lab to an actual lab experiment, it really helped me understand how to analyze and interpret data!
8. It was alright! I feel that the labs were very straightforward to start with, and it was only the last few labs involving presentations that allowed us to really stretch our thinking and formulate our own thoughts.
9. Yes I learned a lot about the world around me that I had not previously learned.
10. Yes, it was good review for exams
11. Yes
12. Matt was great and always willing to answer questions and explain, so yes it definitely was stimulating!

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The graphs and charts that Matt drew were very helpful. He also guided our experiment ideas without outright giving us answers. It was very helpful.
2. instructor would review what we learn in lecture
4. Hands on aspects, explanations by the TA
5. example problems
6. I loved the lab sections because Matt was great at explaining topics from class
7. Connecting with my peers and being able to ask Matt questions
8. Easy to follow instructions.
9. Practice problems and lab section.
10. Being able to ask questions to a TA was helpful.
11. Lectures
12. Explanations and help when asking a question, as Matt always guided you to the answer but didn't flat out tell you what it was so you could really learn it and come to it on your own.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. Sometimes his help was a little bit confusing, but it was because he wanted us to figure out the answer instead of giving it outright to us.
2. pre lab
3. Most labs felt like a waste of time and I felt like I didn't learn anything from the experiments.
4. I wish the labs were more explicitly connected to the lecture content and was mentioned how it was related to them in the beginning of lab
5. nothing
6. Nothing
7. none really
8. I feel that it wasn't as helpful to the class as it could've been. The content is definitely relevant, but I didn't learn more than what I already knew about the topics tested in the exams.
9. Wanted time during lecture.
10. All the review on excel every class was repetitive
11. Labs were not very beneficial
12. N/A

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Show more enthusiasm, he seemed very chill
2. explain more about the lab. not just have us to do pre lab.
3. More conceptually challenging labs.
4. I wish some time was allocated for prepping for tests
5. nothing
6. Nothing, it was great!
7. The prelabs and descriptions aren't very helpful but good thing Matt knew what he was talking about
8. Make it more of intellectually stimulating? None of this stuff is against Matt though he was chill this is more like the course itself.
9. Better professor.
10. Nothing
11. Matt was a great TA but I found the labs to be pretty pointless
12. Great job!

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.