

# Engineering Spring 2018 Course Evaluation Report for SP2018.E35.ESE.531.01 - Nano and Micro Photonics (Lan Yang)

Project Title: WashU Spring 2018 Course Evaluations

Project Audience: **9**Responses Received: **7**Response Ratio: **7 7.78%** 

#### **Report Comments**

Welcome to WashU Course Evaluations. Below you will find response data from the specified course/instructor pairing. In the case of multi-instructor courses, separate reports are available. We appreciate your dedication to our learning community at Washington University.

If you have questions, please contact evals@wustl.edu

Please Note: In order to protect student anonymity, reports are not generated for sections with fewer than 4 respondents.

Creation Date: Mon, Jul 02, 2018



#### **Course Administration**

Was a course syllabus or a course information sheet distributed or available online?

Options	Count	Percentage
Yes	6	85.71%
No	1	14.29%

Did the syllabus explain the content and administration of the course (e.g., office hours, grading)?


Options	Count	Percentage
Yes	6	85.71%
No	1	14.29%


Early in the semester, did your professor explain the expectations for academic integrity?

Options	Count	Percentage
Yes	6	85.71%
No	1	14.29%

### **Rating Scale Responses**


		Score			
Question	Mean	Median	Response Count	Standard Deviation	
In retrospect, the syllabus was an accurate reflection of how the course was actually taught.	6.14	7.00	7	1.57	
The course matched the course catalog description.	6.00	6.50	6	1.55	






### **Instructor Evaluation**


## Overall rating for teaching quality of Lan Yang.





#### Rating Scale Responses for Lan Yang


		Score			
Question	Mean	Median	Response Count	Standard Deviation	
The instructor made the course interesting.	5.67	7.00	6	2.42	
The instructor was enthusiastic about the course.	6.00	7.00	6	2.45	
The material was covered at a reasonable pace.	6.00	7.00	6	2.00	
The instructor was available to answer questions (through office hours, email, etc.).	5.33	7.00	6	2.58	
The instructor was well-organized and prepared for class.	5.17	7.00	6	2.86	
The instructor explained the course material so that you could understand it.	6.00	7.00	6	2.45	






# **Course Materials and Assignments**

## Overall rating of course content.






## **Rating Scale Responses**

		Score			
Question	Mean	Median	Response Count	Standard Deviation	
Textbooks/readings complemented the lectures.	6.17	6.50	6	0.98	
Textbooks/readings were useful.	6.33	6.50	6	0.82	
Assigned homeworks were helpful and relevant to the course.	6.50	7.00	6	0.84	
There was reasonable time to complete assignments.	6.83	7.00	6	0.41	
Assignments were returned within a reasonable period of time.	5.00	7.00	6	3.10	
Comments on graded work were helpful.	5.80	7.00	5	2.68	
Labs were an effective supplement to the course.	5.80	7.00	5	2.68	
The course material drew upon real world applications.	6.60	7.00	5	0.89	








## **Exams and Grade**

## Expected grade for this course.

Options	Count	Percentage
A	5	83.33%
В	1	16.67%
С	0	0.00%
D	0	0.00%
F	0	0.00%
P	0	0.00%

## **Rating Scale Responses**

		Score			
Question	Mean	Median	Response Count	Standard Deviation	
Exams reflected material taught.	7.00	7.00	6	0.00	
Adequate time was given to complete exams.	7.00	7.00	6	0.00	
Your grades to this point accurately reflect your understanding of the material.	6.60	7.00	5	0.55	
The grading system was consistent and equitable.	6.80	7.00	5	0.45	





### **Overall**

About how many hours per week did you spend on this course outside of class?

Options	Count	Percentage
0	1	16.67%
1-3	1	16.67%
4-6	2	33.33%
7-9	2	33.33%
10-12	0	0.00%
13-15	0	0.00%
Over 15	0	0.00%

## What percentage of the lectures did you attend?

Options	Count	Percentage
0%	0	0.00%
10%	0	0.00%
20%	0	0.00%
30%	0	0.00%
40%	0	0.00%
50%	0	0.00%
60%	0	0.00%
70%	0	0.00%
80%	0	0.00%
90%	0	0.00%
100%	6	100.00%

## Would you recommend this course to others?

