CS&SS 505 A, Joint with SOC 512 A
Review Of Mathematics For Social Scientists
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: Y
Responses: 7/22 (32% moderate)

Taught by: Aaron Osgood-Zimmerman
Instructor Evaluated: Aaron Osgood-Zimmerman-Predoc 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
4.0	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: 3.9

(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 remote learning course as a whole was:	7	14%	71%	14%				4.0	4.1
The course content was:	7	14%	71%	14%				4.0	4.1
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	7	14%	71%	14%				4.0	4.1
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	7	29%	57%	14%				4.1	4.2

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:	7	29%	14%		57%				4.4
The intellectual challenge presented was:	7	14%	29%		57%				4.4
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	7		14%		86%				4.1
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	7		14%		71%	14%			4.0
Relative to similar courses taught in person, your participation in this course was:	7		14%	14%	57%	14%			4.1
Relative to similar courses taught in person, your success in this course was:	7	14%	29%	14%	43%				5.0

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 Hours per credit: 4.5 (N=6)

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
	33%	33%	17%	17%							

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

Class median: 3.0 Hours per credit: 3 (N=6)

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
	67%	17%	17%								

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.3 (N=6)

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
17%		17%	17%									50%		

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

(N=6)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
	17%	67%			17%

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:	7	14%	71%	14%				4.0	1
Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was:	7	14%	71%	14%				4.0	10
Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was:	7	43%	29%	29%				4.2	4
Clarity of course objectives was:	7	43%	29%	29%				4.2	2
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	7	43%	29%	29%				4.2	3
Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding course content was:	7	14%	57%	14%	14%			3.9	9
Usefulness of written assignments in understanding course content was:	7	29%	43%	29%				4.0	7
Usefulness of online resources in understanding course content was:	7	29%	43%	29%				4.0	8
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	7	29%	43%	14%	14%			4.0	6
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	7	29%	29%	29%	14%			3.8	11
Organization of materials online was:	7	29%	57%	14%				4.1	5

CS&SS 505 A, Joint with SOC 512 A
Review Of Mathematics For Social Scientists
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: Y
Responses: 7/22 (32% moderate)

Taught by: Aaron Osgood-Zimmerman
Instructor Evaluated: Aaron Osgood-Zimmerman-Predoc TA

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Yes, this course was intellectually stimulating. It stretched my thinking in ways to conceptualize discrete and continuous distributions.

2. yes, great review to understand the underlying mechanisms

3. This class was intellectually stimulating and provided a ton of helpful material. It was well taught and did a good job of accomplishing its objectives.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The lecture slides and the recorded lecture were aspects that contributed most to my learning.

2. homework helps

3. Well taught lectures and homework assignments, plus availability of instructor over email/office hours. The instructor was great at teaching the material, some of the structure and content of the class could have been improved.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. Sometimes the lecture slides were incorrect and/or the information that was presented was distracting when presented incorrectly then corrected.

2. ok the biggest motivation to fill out this review is - that one lecture where the instructor's apple pencil was low on power and the notification keeps poping out was the most annoying online lecture in my memory, ever. it is so annoying so please in the future if that ever happens again just stop and record a second video for the remaining part. It gives me so much anxiety.

3. The structuring of the order of events in the class was not intuitive, and didn't motivate my engagement as well as it could have been. For example, having people present on how to do a problem for an assignment that has already been turned in with an answer key provided didn't really work well for me, because I had already looked at what I did wrong and also knew my grade was already done so I didn't really feel compelled to listen to the presentations. I also felt like some of the homework assignments were too long, too complicated based on what had been included in the lecture, or both. It is one thing to provide a question that is slightly challenging but still can be figured out based on the lecture, but it is another to make the problem extra complex and necessitate knowledge that was not in the lecture (the latter is when it not longer is helpful, but is instead frustrating).

What suggestions do you have for improving this class generally?

1. One suggestion would be to create your own lecture slides so you know the information that is being presented.

2. charge your apple pencil when recording courses

3. Restructure the order of events to enhance motivation for engagement (e.g., make assignments due after the help has been provided in class), revisit the homework assignments and consider shortening them and removing or adjusting extremely difficult questions.

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

1. One suggestion to improve the student experience would be to organize groups/partners so that students can reach out to one another to review and discuss lectures and homework problems.

2. charge your apple pencil when recording courses

3. Continue the asynchronous lectures, consider my recommendations above.

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.