COURSE SUMMARY REPORT

Numeric Responses

Univ. of Washington, Seattle Information School Term: Winter 2016

INFO 310 A, Joint with INFO 310 B $\,$

Information Assurance And Cybersecurity

Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: James Farricker, Kristina Savelesky Instructor Evaluated: Kristina Savelesky-Other

Evaluation Delivery: Online Evaluation Form: X1

Responses: 10/34 (29%)

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 Combined Median Median 4.4 3.9

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: 4.1

(0=lowest; 5=highest)

(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 course as a whole was:	10	40%	40%	20%				4.2	3.7
The course content was:	10	30%	40%	30%				4.0	3.5
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	10	60%	40%					4.7	4.2
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	10	50%	50%					4.5	4.0

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Relative to	o other c	ollege co	urses yo	u have tak	en:		N	- 1	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Mediar	n
Do you exp	pect your	grade in	this cours	e to be:				9	56%	11%	33%					6.6	
The intelled	ctual chal	lenge pres	sented wa	s:				9	11%	22%	11%	44%		11%		4.4	
The amour	nt of effor	t you put i	nto this co	urse was:			!	9	11%	33%	11%	22%		22%		5.0	
The amour	nt of effor	t to succe	ed in this	course was	s:		!	9	11%	22%	11%	33%		22%		4.3	
Your involvwas:	ement in	course (d	loing assi	gnments, at	tending cla	asses, etc.)	9	22%	22%	11%	33%	11%			5.0	
On averagincluding at papers and Under 2	ttending o	classes, d er course	oing readi	ngs, review				12-1:	3	14-15	Cla	16-17		2 Hou 8-19	rs per c		.4 (N=9)
Olider 2	2-3		22%	33%	11%	22%	-	12-1		14-13		10-17	-	1%	20-2	21 2	ZZ OI IIIOTE
From the to valuable in				w many do	you cons	ider were					Cla	ıss med	ian: 6.	5 Hou	rs per c	redit: 1	.3 (N=9)
Under 2	2-3 22%		4-5 22%	6-7 11%	8-9 22%	1 0- 11 11%	-	12-13	3	14-15		16-17	-	8-19 1%	20-2	21 2	22 or more
What grade	e do you	expect in	this cours	e?										С	lass me	edian: 3	3.9 (N=9)
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)	E (0.0)	P	ass	Credit	No Credit

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

(N=9)

	A core/distribution				
In your major	requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
78%		22%			

56%

44%

Numeric Responses

Univ. of Washington, Seattle Information School Term: Winter 2016

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

How frequently was each of the following a true description of this		Always			About Half			Never		Relative
course?	N	(7)	(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Median	Rank
The instructor gave very clear explanations.	9	67%	33%						6.8	2
The instructor successfully rephrased explanations to clear up confusion.	9	56%	44%						6.6	9
Class sessions were interesting and engaging.	9	78%	11%	11%					6.9	1
Class sessions were well organized.	9	56%	22%	22%					6.6	6
Student participation was encouraged.	9	56%	33%	11%					6.6	11
Students were aware of what was expected of them.	9	44%	44%	11%					6.4	10
Extra help was readily available.	9	67%	22%	11%					6.8	8
Assigned readings and other out-of-class work were valuable.	9	56%	11%	11%	11%		11%		6.6	3
Grades were assigned fairly.	9	67%	33%						6.8	7
Meaningful feedback on tests and other work was provided.	9	67%	33%						6.8	4
Evaluation of student performance was related to important course goals.	9	67%	22%	11%					6.8	5

Relative to other college courses you have taken, how would you describe your progress in this course with regards to:	N	Great (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	None (1)	Median	Relative Rank
Learning the conceptual and factual knowledge of this course.	9	44%	22%	22%	11%				6.2	4
Developing an appreciation for the field in which this course resides.	9	67%	22%		11%				6.8	1
Understanding written material in this field.	9	33%	44%	11%	11%				6.1	6
Developing an ability to express yourself in writing or orally in this field.	9	33%	56%		11%				6.2	5
Understanding and solving problems in this field.	9	44%	22%	11%	22%				6.2	2
Applying the course material to real world issues or other disciplines.	9	44%	22%	11%	22%				6.2	7
General intellectual development.	9	44%	33%		22%				6.3	3

© 2014, IASystem, University of Washington Survey no: 157335

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT

Student Comments

Univ. of Washington, Seattle Information School Term: Winter 2016

INFO 310 A, Joint with INFO 310 B

Information Assurance And Cybersecurity

Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: James Farricker, Kristina Savelesky Instructor Evaluated: Kristina Savelesky-Other

Evaluation Delivery: Online Evaluation Form: X1

Responses: 10/34 (29%)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

- 2. Yes. The labs Kristina conducted were genuinely entertaining or useful. They each taught a skill that most didn't know prior to the lab.
- 3. Kristina's lectures were always intellectually stimulating. We learned some really fascinating skills and how these skills are applied in practice.
- 4. The class was intellectually stimulating but it would be better if we got some technical skills as well.
- 5. I spend a lot of time studying cybersecurity already, and so I enjoyed the course... but I didn't necessarily learn a whole lot. However, the things that I did learn were super interesting and useful to know.
- 6. I loved this class. All of the topics were cool and practical.
- 7. Yes, I learned many new things I haven't known before.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

- 1. You are gorgeous.
- 2. Labs were hands on and technical compared to the general curriculum.
- 3. Kristina's recommendations on what to read outside of class really enhanced my learning experience beyond the scope of the classroom.
- 4. The labs contributed the most because they allowed me to apply class concepts to something in real-life.
- 5. Labs, hands on stuff. A lot of this stuff is great to talk about but it really "clicks" when you get hands on and do it.
- 6. Everything. The readings fit with the lectures which fit with the labs which fit with the assessments. It was like clockwork. Kristina was a stellar TA. She was always active on the Facebook group posting interesting links to topics outside of this class and even responded to the class' atmosphere by posting extra links to concepts that the class seemed to be struggling with at the time, always offered extra help (even an hour right before the final!) and clarified requirements promptly (fortunately, they were largely easy to understand). I know she mentioned that she didn't like talking too much during class but I think the class would have loved to hear about her expertise and perspectives a little more. This is the only class I took this quarter that I'm actually sad is over because I wanted to be in it longer.
- 7. I enjoyed the labs.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

- 2. The book is out dated and a good portion of the information is not relevant.
- 3. Sometimes we moved through labs a little too quickly or some material was presented at a fairly detailed level and was hard to grasp upon introduction.
- 4. I think the book detracted from the learning since it was dry and really didn't contribute much other than definitions.
- 5. N/A
- 6. N/A.
- 7. Some of the lectures could have been more organized.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

- 2. Update the book to a more current one. Provide more technical information, and trying to stray away from the policies and mechanism aspect of the class.
- 3. Please share your work experience in the future!
- 4. The course would be better if it were more technical especially in the second half of the class.
- 5. More hands on, dive further into the technical parts. Once again, it's nice to talk about what a VPN is and how it protects people, but discuss how they work, the different types of VPN's, and the advantages/disadvantages of each variant, demo connecting to one and show how you get a new IP address on a tunneling interface. VPN's are just an example; most of things in this course are like this. We did do some great hands on stuff, like the lab on firewalls, or the sql injection lab. I would love to see more of this stuff done, instead of talking about policies/mechanisms for 8/10 weeks.
- 6. Maybe include worksheets and other types of short homework?
- 7. Organize the lectures a little more.

Did the technology used in the course help or hinder your learning? Please Explain.

- 2. It helped. The technology gave us a technical insight that was lacking in other areas.
- 3. The technology used in the course helped my learning by showing us some real world applications of the concepts that we talked about in lecture.

© 2014, IASystem, University of Washington Survey no: 157335

Printed: 11/17/16

Page 3 of 4

- 4. The technology helped because I could see the concepts taught in class applied in something hands-on.
- 5. definitely helped. It's very important that we used tech in this class since it is the cornerstone of this class. Learning how to use a cisco router a bit, and how sql can be injected into a database is eye opening and allows for better learning/understanding of the concepts when they are all hand-wavey.
- 6. Definitely helped. The various labs cemented my understanding of the concepts discussed in class (like Wireshark and the ACLs).
- 7. Technology is necessary in a cybersecurity and information assurance class.

© 2014, IASystem, University of Washington Survey no: 157335