BIOL 200 AN
Introductory Biology
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: H
Responses: 11/18 (61% high)

Taught by: Elizabeth Warfield, 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
4.8	4.9

(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: 5.2

(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:	11	55%	45%					4.6	4.8
The content of the lab section was:	11	73%	27%					4.8	5.0
The lab instructor's contribution to the course was:	11	82%	9%	9%				4.9	5.1
The lab instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	11	64%	36%					4.7	4.9

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:	11	9%		18%	45%	27%			4.0
The intellectual challenge presented was:	11	9%	45%	18%	27%				5.6
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	11	36%	27%	9%	27%				6.0
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	11	36%	36%		27%				6.1
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	11	36%	18%	9%	27%	9%			5.8

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: 9.8 (N=11)

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
	9%	9%	9%	18%	27%	9%	9%	9%			

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

Class median: 7.0 (N=11)

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
	18%	18%	18%	27%	9%	9%					

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.4 (N=11)

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
9%	36%	18%	18%	9%	9%									

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

(N=11)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
73%		9%		9%	9%

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:	11	82%	18%					4.9	8
Lab instructor's preparedness for lab sessions was:	11	82%	18%					4.9	12
Quality of questions or problems raised by the lab instructor was:	11	82%	18%					4.9	7
Lab instructor's enthusiasm was:	11	82%	18%					4.9	14
Student confidence in lab instructor's knowledge was:	11	82%	18%					4.9	13
Lab instructor's ability to solve unexpected problems was:	11	64%	36%					4.7	17
Answers to student questions were:	11	64%	36%					4.7	15
Interest level of lab sessions was:	11	73%	27%					4.8	3
Communication and enforcement of safety procedures were:	11	64%	36%					4.7	18
Lab instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	11	82%	18%					4.9	10
Availability of extra help when needed was:	11	82%	18%					4.9	11
Use of lab section time was:	11	82%	18%					4.9	5
Lab instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	11	64%	36%					4.7	16
Amount you learned in the lab sections was:	11	91%	9%					5.0	1
Relevance and usefulness of lab section content were:	11	91%	9%					5.0	4
Coordination between lectures and lab activities was:	11	82%	18%					4.9	2
Reasonableness of assigned work for lab section was:	11	82%	18%					4.9	6
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	11	82%	18%					4.9	9

BIOL 200 AN
Introductory Biology
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: H
Responses: 11/18 (61% high)

Taught by: Elizabeth Warfield, 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. This class has looked at topics that were already covered in previous bio courses but looked deeper into it and basically made everything even more complicated and confusing. It was fun to torture my brain with continuous studying so it would finally understand what is going on inside a single cell.

2. This class required me to solve real life problems regarding health and biology based in the information learned in class.

3. Biology labs are wonderful: they present low stakes learning environments that allow students to explore complex biological concepts in hands on and engaging ways.

4. Yes, the tests were very hard and made us apply what you've learned

5. Yes

6. Yes, I love biology and the enthusiastic instructors made the class interesting

7. Yes! We learned so much in biology lab this quarter -- we got to learn about and view so many real life processes (fertilization, development, etc.), it was really cool!!

8. It really stimulates my thinking and gives me a lot of basic knowledge about molecular biology.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. I liked the explicit drawings on the boards and lab instructor's explanations of main concepts discussed during the lectures. I also found it very helpful that the lab instructor was "on the same level" as students at times, helping with every question, no matter how silly they might be.

2. The labs as a whole gave me a deeper and more complex understanding of the material learned in class.

3. Experiments that apply concepts learned in class build upon the information we as students already have and help us to synthesize the wide array of topics we need to know for tests and future classes.

4. Lecture and YouTube videos

5. pogils and answering questions

6. Lectures by Dr. Clemmons, POGILs, lab explanations (shoutout to the whiteboard artist, that helped me understand everything 10x better)

7. We did very interesting labs, and they related very well to our course material. Matt was very supportive and always answered our questions. (Also, the diagrams drawn on the whiteboards were amazing.)

8. Every day's lecture, polling questions, and reading quiz.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. The pressure to get good grades.

2. Nothing.

3. Turning in group lab reports encourage collaboration, but also allow social loafing of group members not in charge of writing. This problem can be avoided by encouraging each student to turn in individual lab reports.

4. Tests

5. Nothing

6. Reading quizzes having tons of "choose all correct answers" that lost me a lot of points lol

7. I was a little uncomfortable with the chicken embryo lab -- because of the thought that we developed a life and then snuffed it out for the purpose of learning about something we could have learned through video. It was still fascinating, but it disturbed me a bit. I didn't eat eggs for weeks after.

8. Sometimes the reading is too much.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

2. None.

3. Keep doing what you're doing!

4. Tests

5. Nothing

6. NA

7. Just one thing -- Matt told our class that the blood on a female's period comes from the secondary oocyte bursting out of the ovary. But I believe the blood comes from the shedding of the blood and tissue that built up in the uterus -- meant to support a possible baby.

8. It is really good now.

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.