

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT

Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle College of Arts and Sciences

Biology Term: Spring 2018

BIOL 200 AG Evaluation Delivery: Online Evaluation Form: H Introductory Biology

Course type: Face-to-Face Responses: 8/23 (35% moderate)

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 Adjusted Median Combined Median 4.0 4.1 (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: 4.9

(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:	8	25%	50%	25%				4.0	4.0
The content of the lab section was:	8	25%	38%	38%				3.8	3.9
The lab instructor's contribution to the course was:	8	25%	50%	25%				4.0	4.0
The lab instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	8	38%	50%	12%				4.2	4.3

STUDEN	NT ENGAG	EMENT														
Polotivo	to other c	ollogo og	NIFOOD VOI	ı haya tak	on:			Much Highe	r	(E)	Average	(0)	(0)	Much Lower		
		•			e		N		(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Median	
•	xpect your	J						3	12%	50%		12%			4.8	
The intelle	ectual chal	lenge pre	sented was	3:			3	3 12%		25%	12%				5.8	
The amo	unt of effor	t you put	into this co	urse was:			8	3 12%	12%	50%	25%				5.0	
The amo	unt of effor	t to succe	ed in this o	ourse was	::		3	3 12%	25%	50%	12%				5.2	
Your invo	olvement in	course (doing assig	nments, at	tending cla	asses, etc.)) {	3	38%	38%	25%				5.2	
including	age, how m attending o	classes, c	loing readir	ıgs, review		nis course, writing							C	Class me	edian: 9.	5 (N=8)
Under 2	2-3		4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	1:	2-13	14-15		16-17	18	-19	20-	21 2:	2 or more
		:	25%		25%	38%			12%							
	total avera in advancir	0	,	w many do	you consi	ider were							C	Class me	edian: 8.	2 (N=8)
Under 2	2-3		4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	1	2-13	14-15		16-17	18	-19	20-	21 2:	2 or more
12%	12%	0		12%	38%	12%	1	2%								
What gra	de do you	expect in	this course	e?									C	Class me	edian: 3.	5 (N=8)
A (3.9-4.0) 12%	A- (3.5-3.8) 38%	B+ (3.2-3.4) 12%	B (2.9-3.1) 12%	B- (2.5-2.8) 12%	C+ (2.2-2.4)	C (1.9-2.1) 12%	C- (1.5-1.8)	D+ (1.2-1.4	D (0.9-1	.1) (D- (0.7-0.8)	F (0.0)	F	Pass	Credit	No Credit
In regard	to your ac	ademic p	rogram, is	this course	best desc	cribed as:			_			_			_	(N=8)
A core/distribution In your major requirement			An elective			In your minor			A program requirement			nt Other				

75%

25%



COURSE SUMMARY REPORT Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle College of Arts and Sciences Biology

Biology Term: Spring 2018

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

			Verv				Verv		
	N	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Explanations by the lab instructor were:	8	38%	50%	12%				4.2	3
Lab instructor's preparedness for lab sessions was:	8	25%	50%	25%				4.0	12
Quality of questions or problems raised by the lab instructor was:	8	25%	38%	38%				3.8	8
Lab instructor's enthusiasm was:	8	25%		75%				3.2	18
Student confidence in lab instructor's knowledge was:	8	25%	50%	25%				4.0	15
Lab instructor's ability to solve unexpected problems was:	8	25%	50%	25%				4.0	9
Answers to student questions were:	8	38%	38%	25%				4.2	4
Interest level of lab sessions was:	8	25%	12%	62%				3.3	13
Communication and enforcement of safety procedures were:	8	38%	25%	38%				4.0	16
Lab instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	8	25%	25%	38%	12%			3.5	17
Availability of extra help when needed was:	8	25%	38%	25%	12%			3.8	11
Use of lab section time was:	8	25%	25%	38%	12%			3.5	14
Lab instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	8	25%	50%	25%				4.0	7
Amount you learned in the lab sections was:	8	25%	38%	38%				3.8	6
Relevance and usefulness of lab section content were:	8	38%	38%	25%				4.2	5
Coordination between lectures and lab activities was:	8	50%	12%	38%				4.5	1
Reasonableness of assigned work for lab section was:	8	50%	25%	25%				4.5	2
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	8	25%	38%	38%				3.8	10



COURSE SUMMARY REPORT

Student Comments

University of Washington, Seattle College of Arts and Sciences Biology

Term: Spring 2018

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: H

Responses: 8/23 (35% moderate)

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

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. Many of the labs were extremely engaging, and the opporutnity to see the UW collection of preserved fetuses was incredible.
- 2. Yes, I thought that the labs were interesting, especially compared to labs in BIOL 180.
- 3. The class was very useful to reinforce the material we were lecturing during lecture. Lab provided a way for students to practice the skills we were learning about in lectures that week.
- 4. It was fine when we were discussing topics but never really stretched current knowledge
- 5. Yes, the class was intellectually stimulating. It required a synthesis of concepts, reasoning, and problem solving skills.
- 6. Some of the questions to the lab discussion made me think really hard

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

- 1. The activities that walked us through the content we were learning, such as Glycolysis, the Krebs Cycle, etc.
- 2. The review of topics discussed in lecture at the beginning of labs was helpful for my notes and reviewing for exams.
- 3. The diagrams drawn on the whiteboards were often very helpful and illustrative when discussing what is happening on the molecular level.
- 4. the mini lectures
- 5. Readings.
- 6. The explanations by the TA

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

- 1. At times some of the lab material did not directly correlate to what we were discussing in lecture.
- 3. What detracted the most from the class was when there were miscommunications about the procedures, but those were rare.
- 4. the actual experiments
- 5. N/A
- 6. Following lab procedures

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

- 3. Consistently writing which assignments/ worksheets must be turned in at the end of lab on the whiteboard would be helpful.
- 4. I do not think the labs were nearly as useful as a quiz section would have been.
- 5. N/A
- 6. Maybe explain why certain steps are so important

© 2011–2018 IASystem, University of Washington Survey no: 193789

Printed: 12/13/18

Page 3 of 4



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. 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).

© 2011–2018 IASystem, University of Washington Survey no: 193789

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.