STAT 394 A, Joint with MATH 394 A
Probability I
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: Y
Responses: 17/39 (44% moderate)

Taught by: Aaron Osgood-Zimmerman
Instructor Evaluated: Aaron Osgood-Zimmerman-Other

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
3.9	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: 5.7

(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 remote learning course as a whole was:	17	24%	35%	29%	6%	6%		3.8	3.9
The course content was:	17	24%	41%	29%	6%			3.9	4.0
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	17	41%	29%	24%	6%			4.2	4.4
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	17	29%	29%	29%	12%			3.8	4.0

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:	17	18%	18%	6%	41%	6%	6%	6%	4.3
The intellectual challenge presented was:	17	29%	47%	24%					6.1
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	17	24%	53%	24%					6.0
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	17	29%	41%	24%	6%				6.0
Relative to similar courses taught in person, your participation in this course was:	17	12%	47%	6%	29%			6%	5.7
Relative to similar courses taught in person, your success in this course was:	17	6%	24%	29%	24%	12%		6%	4.8

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: 12.1 Hours per credit: 4 (N=17)

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
		6%	12%	12%	12%	29%	12%	6%			12%

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

Class median: 10.5 Hours per credit: 3.5 (N=17)

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%	6%	18%	18%	29%	6%				6%

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.4 (N=17)

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
24%	24%	29%	24%											

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

(N=17)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
24%	6%	18%	47%		6%

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
The effectiveness of this remote course in facilitating my learning was:	17	24%	24%	29%	18%	6%		3.4	7
Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was:	17	35%	35%	18%	12%			4.1	3
Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was:	16	31%	38%	25%	6%			4.0	5
Clarity of course objectives was:	17	29%	35%	24%	12%			3.9	4
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	17	47%	18%	24%	12%			4.3	1
Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding course content was:	16	19%	25%	38%	6%	12%		3.3	11
Usefulness of written assignments in understanding course content was:	17	24%	35%	29%	12%			3.8	9
Usefulness of online resources in understanding course content was:	16	31%	31%	25%	12%			3.9	6
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	17	35%	41%	12%	6%	6%		4.1	2
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	17	29%	29%	29%	6%		6%	3.8	8
Organization of materials online was:	17	35%	18%	35%	12%			3.7	10

STAT 394 A, Joint with MATH 394 A
Probability I
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: Y
Responses: 17/39 (44% moderate)

Taught by: Aaron Osgood-Zimmerman
Instructor Evaluated: Aaron Osgood-Zimmerman-Other

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Homework was challenging, but feasible.

2. Yes, it was a lot of difficult concepts.

4. Yes.

6. This class was intellectually stimulating since it applied statistics to problems we often see, and provided a venue for using calculus in unique settings.

7. Yes, I learned how to incorporate beginner stats and calculus concepts into higher level statistics topics. Provided problems placed heavy emphasis on fully grasping the concepts.

9. This class is absolutely stimulating.

10. Yes, I have never taken a probability class before, and it was very unique.

11. The course content was intellectually stimulating and helped me think about probability in a different way. With so many different ways to make arrangements and distributions, it is interesting to see how the probability changes.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Lectures and in class polls

2. Recorded lectures.

4. Interesting lecture

5. Having class materials available online for reviewing alone

6. The ability to join office hours to ask clarifications about the HW helped most for learning. However, I'd wish if a dedicated chunk of time could be spend learning about the instructor's story, skills, and mindset towards statistics. without rush to finish.

7. Homework problems were challenging.

9. The lecture notes and the homework questions are very helpful while learning the material.

10. The homework assignments.

11. The availability of help was immense. With this being an accelerated course, there were still plenty of opportunities to ask questions in class, office hours, and online. The course content was structured fairly well and topics built upon each other. The homework had extra practice and a couple of coding problems (that helped jog my memory of coding) which was nice that Aaron offered that. Aaron was super passionate about teaching and helped us understand the content well. Even though at times, he seemed unsure of himself and the topics he was trying to teach, through his struggles we could see that the difficulty of probability never goes away and should be looked at from multiple angles.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. None

2. Unclear answers

3. For the assignment, there is some mixed problem that different than the problem talked on the class. So is much harder to do it.

4. Time difference

6. The fact that homework assignments were so long, yet we were given such limited time was demoralizing often. The lack of specified reading, extra practice problems in early part of the quarter, and suddenly being asked hard questions in homework was a challenge.

7. The difficulty of problems and topics in class felt uneven most of the time

8. The takling pace of this course is too fast and the reading material seems not much related to the PPT that talked in class.

9. NA

10. It would have been a lot easier to learn if it was not online and it was a little longer, instead of 4-5 weeks.

11. The homework lacked clarity in specific parts and it made it difficult to connect to course content.

What suggestions do you have for improving this class generally?

2. Decrease the amount of hw

4. The class is pretty good.

6. If offered remotely, I suggest this course be taught such that it takes the entire quarter and not rushed into 4 weeks. The material was difficult for a student with no statistics background to pick up quickly, and given that students in the class had already learnt the material beforehand, it was not a conducive environment for growth + learning.

8. Hopefully, we could have more pre-study course calendar which help us to study ahead. Also, we could have more pratice problems that help us learn the materials better.

9. No. Everything is great.

11. None

If this course were offered remotely again, what suggestions do you have to improve the student experience?

4. The class is pretty good.

5. Prerecorded lecture videos so that class time can be spent more on practice problems.

6. I would like to second the suggestions made above once again. To improve student experience in offered remotely again, I would suggest for classes to be 1 hour long but spread out over the course of the week as M, T, W, Th, F splits instead of 2 hour chunks 3 days a week where so much information is dumped that it is so hard to keep up.

9. NA

11. None

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.