IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

LAW E 553 A, Joint with LAW E 553 B, LAW E 553 C, LAW E 553 D, LAW E 553 E
Technology Law And Public Policy
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Inyoung Cheong
Instructor Evaluated: Inyoung Cheong-Grad TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: C
Responses: 13/22 (59% high)

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
4.3	**4.0**
(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: 4.6
(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:	13	46%	23%	31%				4.3	4.0
The course content was:	13	54%	31%	15%				4.6	4.3
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	13	46%	23%	31%				4.3	4.0
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	13	31%	31%	23%	15%			3.9	3.5

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:	13	23%	38%	15%	15%	8%			5.8
The intellectual challenge presented was:	13	15%	38%	15%	31%				5.6
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	13	23%	15%	23%	31%	8%			5.0
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	13	15%	23%	31%	23%	8%			5.1
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	13	38%	15%	31%	15%				5.8

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: 4.5 Hours per credit: 2.2 (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%	31%	23%	23%	15%							

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?   **Class median: 4.3 Hours per credit: 2.2 (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%	23%	46%	8%	8%							8%

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
54%	38%	8%												

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
15%	8%	62%	8%	8%	

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Course organization was:	13	31%	31%	38%				3.9	16
Instructor's preparation for class was:	13	54%	31%	15%				4.6	9
Instructor as a discussion leader was:	13	31%	15%	46%	8%			3.4	18
Instructor's contribution to discussion was:	13	54%	8%	31%	8%			4.6	12
Conduciveness of class atmosphere to student learning was:	13	38%	23%	31%	8%			4.0	17
Quality of questions or problems raised was:	13	46%	38%	15%				4.4	15
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	13	54%	31%	8%	8%			4.6	10
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	13	69%	23%	8%				4.8	4
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	13	77%	8%	15%				4.8	1
Instructor's openness to student views was:	12	67%	25%	8%				4.8	5
Interest level of class sessions was:	13	54%	31%	15%				4.6	2
Use of class time was:	13	38%	46%	8%	8%			4.2	13
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	13	69%	23%	8%				4.8	3
Amount you learned in the course was:	13	38%	38%	23%				4.2	14
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	13	46%	31%	23%				4.4	11
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	13	46%	38%	15%				4.4	7
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	13	46%	38%	15%				4.4	8
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	13	54%	31%	15%				4.6	6

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

University of Washington, Seattle
School of Law
Term: Winter 2023

LAW E 553 A, Joint with LAW E 553 B, LAW E 553 C, LAW E 553 D, LAW E 553 E
Technology Law And Public Policy
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: C
Responses: 13/22 (59% high)

Taught by: Inyoung Cheong
Instructor Evaluated: Inyoung Cheong-Grad TA

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. The professor knows how to engage students by bringing contemporary news and ideas. She always asks interesting questions, which keeps me looking for more information. In addition, her suggestions on my paper were very helpful. She was the only professor who sent me papers specifically for my paper, and I really appreciate it.

2. Yes, absolutely. I like all those discussions around the hot topics of AI industry and their legal implications and public policy controversies.

3. I enjoyed the variety of perspectives and the nuanced solutions to complex problems presented by the material. I really liked the paper on legal adversarialism.

4. Yes, it was overall a great class. Professor found a way to incorporate all the student's interests into the syllabus

5. Yes this class was great! I did not want it to end.

6. Professor Cheong did a good job of creating an engaging class after having been asked to teach it at the very last minute. Not easy!

7. I really enjoyed variety of subject matter we covered and the willingness of the instructor to pivot class material to current events. Tech policy isn't covered in a ton of other law school classes so it was really great to get a chance to cover it more.

8. The class was intellectually stimulating because the material was very interesting and new, and students had a lot of opinions to contribute to discussion. The professor was very knowledgable and gave us interesting topics to think about and asked good questions.

9. This was easily the best class towards talking the most relevant issues of technology facing society today

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. It is a small classroom with a lot of discussions. Her teaching approach is excellent, and her reading material is rich.

2. Many insights from the AI industry broaden my understanding and inspire my deep thinking - the world is officially stepping into a new era of AI.

3. The discussion and presenters.

4. The class discussions

5. The reading materials, class presenters, etc.

6. The guest speakers were very interesting and provided a lot of valuable insight and perspective.

7. The variety of guest speakers was clearly well-thought out and most of them were fascinating. I also really like the free-flowing discussion.

8. Inyoung's presentations and discussions in class. Guest lecturers also made the class more interesting.

9. learning how peoples perspectives are different when it comes to topics of big theory of tech law was really fascinating to witness

10. I enjoyed the discussions, and I especially enjoyed hearing from interdisciplinary scholars. Most of the guest lecturers were fantastic!

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. Sometimes it's hard for me to focus on online guests, but I appreciate Ms. Cheong's effort in bringing special guests to our class.

2. None.

3. Not much

4. Nothing

5. The syllabus changed a few times: For one week I read materials that ended up not being discussed/used.

7. Some of the discussions could have been moderated a bit better - there were certainly students in the class that tended to monopolize the discussion and I think that could have been handled a bit better.

8. Some students had a lot more technical knowledge than others, so discussion was a little lopsided.

9. none

10. At some points, the discussion would go on tangents and it seemed we didn't cover all topics in as much depth as we could.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. I don't really have any suggestions, but I would like to emphasize that having Ms. Cheong as a professor was a great experience in many ways. First, she is an amazing professional, and I have learned much from her. Second, as a Brazilian and Japanese woman, I feel represented by having a non-American female professor at UW. We need more of this on our Law School Campus.

2. Perfect for me.

3. This is stupid, but if there are less than 20 people in the class, why not sit in a circle? It's a conversation

4. Continue having this professor teach this class.

5. Recommend sticking to the original syllabus as much as possible.

6. My suggestion is for the Law School administration: Professors for our classes should be settled on much earlier than a week before the quarter begins (as happened with this class). To do otherwise is unfair to both teachers and students.

7. Class as a whole could have used a bit more structure, but as I understand Inyoung was tapped to teach it on relatively short notice. I think all things considered she did a great job and given the opportunity to prepare a little more the class could be even better.

8. A little more control over discussion, but overall it was a great class! thank you Inyoung!

9. None Inyoung was a badass and she defo deserves the opportunity to keep teaching at UW Law - shes a bright prospect that UW Law to give her more the opportunity to teach at the school shes really amazing

10. I think the classes could have been more structured.

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.