

IMT 570 A
Analytic Methods For Information Professionals
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: X1
Responses: 23/34 (68% high)

Taught by: Abhinav Garg, Mike Katell, Richard Sturman
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
3.6	3.7
(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: 4.9 (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:	23	4%	43%	22%	17%	13%		3.4	3.6
The course content was:	23	4%	39%	22%	30%		4%	3.2	3.4
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	23	22%	39%	17%	13%	4%	4%	3.8	3.9
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	23	17%	39%	17%	17%	4%	4%	3.7	3.8

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:	20	20%	15%	25%	35%		5%		4.9
The intellectual challenge presented was:	20	20%	20%	30%	15%	10%	5%		5.2
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	20	30%	25%	25%	20%				5.7
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	20	25%	25%	30%	15%	5%			5.5
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	20	40%	15%	20%	25%				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: 7.5 Hours per credit: 1.9 (N=20)

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
		20%	30%	30%	10%	5%		5%			

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

Class median: 4.5 Hours per credit: 1.1 (N=20)

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%	20%	30%	10%	20%	5%						

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.6 (N=19)

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
16%	74%	11%												

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

(N=19)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
5%	26%	11%	5%	53%	

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

How frequently was each of the following a true description of this course?	N	Always (7)	(6)	(5)	About Half (4)	(3)	(2)	Never (1)	Median	Relative Rank
The instructor gave very clear explanations.	22	32%	23%	27%	9%	9%			5.7	4
The instructor successfully rephrased explanations to clear up confusion.	22	45%	23%	18%	5%	9%			6.3	3
Class sessions were interesting and engaging.	21	29%	19%	14%	14%	19%	5%		5.3	8
Class sessions were well organized.	21	29%	19%	19%	5%	19%	10%		5.4	9
Student participation was encouraged.	21	38%	24%	14%	5%	14%	5%		6.0	7
Students were aware of what was expected of them.	21	24%	14%	33%	14%	10%		5%	5.1	11
Extra help was readily available.	20	35%	30%	20%	5%	10%			6.0	6
Assigned readings and other out-of-class work were valuable.	21	33%	14%	24%	10%	14%		5%	5.4	10
Grades were assigned fairly.	21	52%	19%	14%	10%	5%			6.5	2
Meaningful feedback on tests and other work was provided.	21	52%	19%	19%	5%	5%			6.5	1
Evaluation of student performance was related to important course goals.	21	43%	14%	24%	14%	5%			6.0	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.	20	15%	25%	25%	20%	10%	5%		5.1	4
Developing an appreciation for the field in which this course resides.	20	20%	15%	35%	15%	10%	5%		5.1	6
Understanding written material in this field.	20	15%	20%	30%	25%	5%	5%		5.0	5
Developing an ability to express yourself in writing or orally in this field.	20	20%	20%	25%	25%	5%	5%		5.1	3
Understanding and solving problems in this field.	20	25%	15%	35%	15%	5%		5%	5.2	2
Applying the course material to real world issues or other disciplines.	20	20%	10%	35%	25%		5%	5%	4.9	7
General intellectual development.	20	15%	30%	20%	20%	10%	5%		5.2	1

IMT 570 A
Analytic Methods For Information Professionals
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: X1
Responses: 23/34 (68% high)

Taught by: Abhinav Garg, Mike Katell, Richard Sturman
Instructor Evaluated: Mike Katell-TA

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

2. Yes it was definitely stimulating. Made us think very differently when we were presenting things on the spot.
4. Yes! I really liked the class activities; It was great that the class always had a group activity to understand how to practically apply the content we went over in the theory section. I learned quite a lot from the group activities, and listening to different groups present really brought perspectives out.
5. The class is very useful and helps stretch my thinking in terms of the research methods. Very helpful content
6. Yes
7. It did stretch my thinking in some ways, but there was a lot of room for improvement. For instance, the qualitative and quantitative methods could have been elaborated and more hands-on examples could have been analyzed. The level of the readings and the in-class exercises did not match at all. I would come to class thinking we would study X, but we would only do some random activity which hardly had any semblance to the readings
8. It did stretch my thinking in a way, as it exposed me to the problems associated with Dementia. However, watching a documentary series on Dementia would have had the same effect. I had very high expectations of this course in the beginning, as I was expecting it to expose me to different quantitative and qualitative methods of analysis. However, it was a major let down and the only thing that I got out of the course was a general understanding of Dementia. It did not sufficiently add to my existing knowledge of the analytical methods used in IM. Hence, all due respect, I feel that it did not help me learn any useful skills at the end.
9. To an extent
10. Yes. It was quite intellectual
11. It was not particularly, no. It gave me a slightly better understanding of some of the tools to use in business research, but since we couldn't really apply most of them, it felt fairly useless.
12. I enjoyed the process of researching a topic that was outside my comfort zone.
13. No, the research topic did not let us explore, a better topic could have been given
14. No.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

2. Quantitative analysis and research methods were something I had not learnt before
3. Mike was very helpful, prompt and thorough in providing feedback, and providing relevant examples and supplementary information in class.
4. Group activities. I also enjoyed the report writing submissions that went in sequence. Great insights into how to actually conduct research systematically.
5. some of the reading
6. The final project and discussions
7. Definitely the TAs comments of our assignments Somehow I feel that if Mike had been able to communicate the significance and expectations behind all that we were doing, we could have definitely done better.
8. The in-class exercises made me a better public speaker
9. Statistical analysis
10. Teaching me how to approach a problem and begin to plan my solution
11. Some of the readings were moderately interesting, and it was wonderfully fascinating when Mike talked about how what we were doing related to his PhD research. More of that would've been great.
12. Learning about the process of research and how it works was definitely interesting. It would certainly help in the future when I do research of some sort.
13. Research methods, possible ways to implement them in real-life scenarios
14. None

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. Group project
2. The focus on dementia which was not very related to our field of study.
4. I really liked the class; However the participation during the theory section wasn't great, and I think giving points to group activities and class participation would really help.
5. the limitations for us to conduct a real life research due to the sensitivity of the topic the lectures were relatively plain to me
6. nothing as such

7. A lot of pointless activities in class. Professor Richard hardly taught for 15-20 minutes, and it was just a cursory glance of the readings. Since the title of the course in Research Methods for Industry Professionals, I was expecting a much more industry-oriented perspective, but I never really got a flavor of that. Until mid-quarter, I was almost unclear as to what was expected of us.
8. Being force-fed Dementia as a topic, the entire course structured around the topic.
9. Lectures were broad and not in depth
10. Nothing
11. The entire way in which this course was structured really worked against it. It was very clear that it had been redesigned recently and it wasn't effective at all. You could still see the bones of the academic research class that had been there, and trying to interject business research didn't really work. In trying to do both, it did neither well. It was rare that we could actually go and apply the business concepts we were learning due to the scope limitations. I felt incredibly frustrated that we had to scope out a project and were then told that we couldn't actually accomplish any of it, so then it turned largely into a generic academic research project.
12. Every class had activities that got a little repetitive.
13. Professor was not engaging enough, he had industry experience, but didn't seem the right choice for this subject
14. The assignment instructions weren't well described and then the grading was very strict

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

4. Points for class activities; Also, quite often one person in the group does most of the work, and there ought to be a way to handle that, or have a system where every group member is graded according to their contributions.
5. maybe change a different topic so that we can play around more with the research methods by really practicing it?
6. Increase the number of assignments like bivariate analysis
7. More relevant and engaging in-class exercises. Something which will also contribute in adding skills to the student's portfolio. So many tools were mentioned as part of the class (Tableau, Spark, etc.), but we never really got around to being acquainted well with them
8. Please allow the students to choose their own topic. Please focus on a more quant-oriented approach, as this is what most students are interested in. Very few of us would have to conduct interviews and focus group discussions in our jobs, while most of us would need a good understanding of analyzing data quantitatively.
9. The lectures could have been more technical and the course content too. Some of the instructions for the assignments were not clear.
10. Include more forms of analysis- qualitative and quantitative
11. Either pick a better project for the entire class with an appropriate scope, or let people pick their own topics for their research. The Excel assignments also were not integrated well with the rest of the course material - they felt like something that was tangentially tied in that you were expected to pick up on your own. If I hadn't taken a stats class recently, they would have been a nightmare.
12. I think the activities that were conducted in the end of class should be reduced.
13. better projects, everyone must have an individual project idea, rather than giving out a topic where it is difficult to interview. Better utilization of time, lectures were left early as there was not enough matter.
14. please don't keep GATAs who do not understand our level of thinking

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

4. It was great. I really enjoyed this course.
6. yes helped
7. Not much was used except Powerpoint Presentations. Did not add to my learning in any way.
8. We did not use anything except word, powerpoint, and excel. It did not teach me anything that I did not already know.
9. It helped
10. It helped
11. The PowerPoints used in class were dreadful - they simply recapped the reading without really going into anything deeper or more interesting. There was then zero incentive to do the reading and class discussions were dead.
12. No such technologies were used.
13. No technology was used in this course
14. help

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.