

INFO 360 B
Design Thinking
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: K
Responses: 16/35 (46% moderate)

Taught by: Abdullah Ali, Andy Ko
Instructor Evaluated: Andy Ko-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
4.8	4.4
(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: 4.4
(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:	16	69%	19%	6%	6%			4.8	4.3
The course content was:	16	69%	19%	6%	6%			4.8	4.4
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	16	81%	19%					4.9	4.5
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	16	88%	12%					4.9	4.5

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Relative to other college courses you have taken:	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	Average (5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	15	47%	33%	7%	13%				6.4
The intellectual challenge presented was:	15	20%	13%	20%	33%	13%			4.7
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	15	20%	27%	20%	20%	13%			5.3
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	15	20%	20%	27%	20%	7%	7%		5.1
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	15	33%	27%	7%	27%	7%			5.9

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: 7.3 Hours per credit: 1.5 (N=13)

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
		8%	46%	31%	8%		8%				

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

Class median: 6.5 Hours per credit: 1.3 (N=13)

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
	15%	8%	54%	8%	15%						

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.9 (N=13)

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
69%	31%													

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

(N=13)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
92%				8%	

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

How frequently was each of the following true of this course?	N	Always (7)	(6)	(5)	About Half (4)	(3)	(2)	Never (1)	Median	Relative Rank
The course was integrated with the rest of the curriculum.	15	60%	33%	7%					6.7	7
The instructor created an atmosphere of engagement.	15	80%	13%		7%				6.9	3
The instructor stimulated me to acquire new skills and approaches.	15	73%	27%						6.8	5
The instructor encouraged me to think independently.	15	73%	13%	13%					6.8	4
The course was structured to facilitate learning.	15	80%	13%			7%			6.9	2
Feedback by instructor during design/artistic process was valuable.	15	73%	13%	7%		7%			6.8	6
Feedback from peers was valuable.	15	60%	27%	7%			7%		6.7	1
Feedback from visitors/outside reviewers was valuable.	15	47%	27%	7%	7%	7%		7%	6.4	8

How well did this course help you to:	N	Very Much (7)	(6)	(5)	Moderate (4)	(3)	(2)	Not at All (1)	Median	Relative Rank
Develop your oral communication/presentation skills	15	40%	13%		27%	7%	13%		5.8	10
Develop your ability to express your ideas in artistic/graphic form	15	60%	20%	7%	7%		7%		6.7	7
Develop and use your creativity	15	73%	13%			7%	7%		6.8	5
Develop your ability to work in fluid or ambiguous situations	15	53%	33%		7%		7%		6.6	9
Develop your ability to provide peer critique	15	73%	13%	7%			7%		6.8	1
Develop your ability for self-critique	15	73%	13%	7%			7%		6.8	2
Practice design/artistic strategies and processes	15	67%	13%	7%	7%	7%			6.8	8
Integrate & apply new skills and knowledge in your products	15	73%	7%	7%	7%	7%			6.8	6
Apply the principles of past work of others and examples	15	67%	20%	7%		7%			6.8	3
Work effectively in teams to complete projects	15	67%	27%			7%			6.8	4

INFO 360 B
Design Thinking
Course type: Face-to-Face
Taught by: Abdullah Ali, Andy Ko
Instructor Evaluated: Andy Ko-Other

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: K
Responses: 16/35 (46% moderate)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS**Was this class intellectually stimulating? Did it stretch your thinking? Why or why not?**

2. This class was intellectually stimulating. I was able to work on critiquing and designing skills without being afraid of being criticized.
3. The class was intellectually stimulating. There wasn't enough time to really stretch my thinking.
4. Yes, the content of the class was very interesting and was presented in a way that was engaging.
5. Yes. Because there is no right answer. I have to evaluate everyone's answer with no quantitative scale to measure everyone's design solution.
6. Yes. This class because of its interactive activities helped me understand the perspective of others.
7. Yes and no, a lot of it seemed like principles from Info 200, but there were a lot of specific principles that we didn't go over that I liked learning about
8. Sort of, I already knew some most of the concepts since I had taken a design course before
9. For me, design methods always seem common-sensical so in terms of intellectual challenge it was very basic.
10. Yes this class was very intellectually stimulating and stretched my thinking every day. The material that was provided was very well written, and Andy was always providing clear explanation and feedback for any questions we had regarding the content. He would always relate our material to real life work for us to see how it's important, and it was not overwhelming or dreading material. The course was designed and structured very well, and everything was graded fairly as well.
11. I loved this class, the activities and readings really supplemented the course as a whole. I don't necessarily think it overly expanded my design skills but did lay a foundation for me to grow from on my own time.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The reading quizzes really helped me learn.
2. Comfortable and safe group atmosphere contributed most to my learning. I felt comfortable sharing my ideas and design with my classmates.
3. The reading contributed to most of my learning.
4. The readings were interesting and I really enjoyed reading them. The course content was fun to learn about and I enjoyed learning this material.
5. Critique and apply design thinking everywhere in everyday life and learning.
6. Class activities
7. Lecture, also talking with classmates during class
8. Practicing and talking about concepts in design
10. The in-class activities were very fun and were always related to the readings that we had to prepare before going to class. It helped us practice the skills and see how they can apply in the real world. The quizzes were also very helpful because it pushed me to do the reading which were a huge contribution to my learning, and before the quiz, Andy always opened the floor for questions about the reading which I always enjoyed because he explained material very well.
11. Andy was a great professor and overall mentor/critique giver/ listener. Abdulla was also a great TA that was very inviting and easy to talk to.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. The extra reading summaries felt a little long to write about, and sometimes didn't always help me learn the material
2. None
4. N/A
6. N/A
7. N/A
8. none
9. Most of the readings seemed like busy work (which I don't particularly appreciate). There must be a better way to communicate some of the ideas without making us read 4 articles per week for 6 weeks.
10. None
11. The extreme heat in the classroom.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

2. None! This class is great

3. I had a hard time on the midterm because of the time constraint. I had to learn to write with my other hand before class started and writing 20 short answer questions in 45 minutes was very difficult. Time constraints on answering short answer questions (quizzes and midterm) doesn't mean the student knows the material any better.
4. I felt the final project was a little rushed and the topic we had to choose from was too narrow. I do wish we were able to choose our own topic.
5. Make student take design as a serious topic.
6. N/A
7. N/A
8. none
9. Rework the necessity of readings
10. None
11. Fix the A/C in the classroom.

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.