

INFO 450 AF  
Information Ethics And Policy  
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: W24  
Responses: 10/24 (42% moderate)

Taught by: Mike Katell  
Instructor Evaluated: Mike Katell-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	4.0
(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:

<b>CEI: 5.2</b> (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	30%	30%	40%				3.8	3.8
The course content was:	9	22%	33%	44%				3.7	3.7
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	10	40%	40%	10%	10%			4.2	4.3
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	10	40%	30%	20%	10%			4.2	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:	10	10%	20%	30%	40%				4.8
The intellectual challenge presented was:	10	10%	50%	40%					5.7
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	10	20%	30%	40%	10%				5.5
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	10	10%	40%	40%	10%				5.5
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	10	10%	40%	30%	20%				5.5

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: 9.0 (N=10)**

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
	10%		10%	40%	20%		20%				

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

**Class median: 7.5 (N=10)**

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
	10%	20%	20%	20%	20%	10%					

What grade do you expect in this course?

**Class median: 3.5 (N=10)**

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
30%	20%	40%		10%										

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

**(N=10)**

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
40%	10%		40%	10%	

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
The Teaching Assistant's (TA) effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	10	40%	50%		10%			4.3	
The TA gave very clear explanations:	10	50%	40%		10%			4.5	
Student's confidence in TA's knowledge was:	10	50%	30%	10%	10%			4.5	
The TA was accessible when I had questions or concerns about this class:	10	50%	30%	10%	10%			4.5	
The TA provided meaningful feedback on assignments:	10	60%	10%	20%			10%	4.7	
The TA assigned grades fairly:	10	60%	20%		10%		10%	4.7	
The timeliness of communications with your TA was:	10	60%	20%		20%			4.7	
Lab sessions were interesting and engaging:	10	30%	30%	10%	20%	10%		3.8	
Lab sessions were well organized:	10	50%		30%	10%	10%		4.0	

INFO 450 AF  
Information Ethics And Policy  
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: W24  
Responses: 10/24 (42% moderate)

Taught by: Mike Katell  
Instructor Evaluated: Mike Katell-TA

### STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

#### What suggestions or feedback do you have for the TA?

1. Mike explained course content from lecture very well, but I wish there was more room for discussion within section, as it's hard to truly have a constructive discussion in a large lecture. The debates were a great way to do that, but to have some less formal discussion afterwards (which was attempted) would be great. Discussions would give a good opportunity for students to contextualize concepts related to IP/other hard issues we talk about in class. Unfortunately a lot of this lack of discussion falls on the students lack of participation, but some guided discussion time would be great.
2. Spending more time of section to go over what was discussed in lecture with different examples to gain a better understanding.
4. Mike is an amazing TA that who can teach well and make a significant impact on his student. I'm lucky enough to have him as my TA.
5. The only suggestion I have is in regards to the debates in section. I think that the time spent discussing issues after the debates was really engaging, but the debates themselves did not contribute greatly to my learning. I think that it would be better to have open discussions in the class where everyone must come prepared to talk about a current issue instead of debates that not many people seem to pay attention to.

#### What aspects of the TA's role detracted from your learning?

1. None
2. Not necessarily the TA more the was sections was run. I feel I would have benefited if we spent more of section time reviewing topics discussed in lecture.
4. N/A
5. None, Mike was a really great teacher and is really knowledgeable.

#### What aspects of the TA's role contributed most to your learning?

1. Discussions on Canvas!! This is the only way that students participate (through graded discussions) so it was nice to read and respond to people's opinions that aren't shared in class. I don't know how to make these discussions as effective in person, but on Canvas I get a better idea of what everyone is thinking and am able to give more critical thought to topics covered in class.
2. feedback on papers and quiz questions
3. Good feedback on writing assignment.
4. He comes to the section well prepared and explain the material covered in a lecture in depth that was very helpful and he was also very helpful in his office hours.
5. Mike had really clear explanations of complex topics and he was able to relate those topics to current events. I think that talking about current events and social issues was the best part of lab.

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.<sup>1</sup> 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).

<sup>1</sup> 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.