

INFO 350 A  
Information Ethics And Policy  
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: X  
Responses: 41/150 (27% low)

Taught by: Mike Katell

Instructor Evaluated: Mike Katell-Predoc 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
4.1	4.5
(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: 4.4</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:	41	24%	27%	29%	17%	2%		3.5	4.0
The course content was:	41	27%	32%	24%	17%			3.8	4.1
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	41	51%	27%	17%	5%			4.5	4.9
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	41	49%	24%	20%	7%			4.5	4.9

### 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:	40	12%	22%	15%	30%	12%	5%	2%	4.5	
The intellectual challenge presented was:	40	15%	28%	15%	32%	5%	5%		5.0	
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	40	18%	18%	25%	28%	10%	2%		4.9	
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	40	15%	20%	30%	28%	5%	2%		5.0	
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	40	25%	22%	12%	30%	8%	2%		5.3	

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: 7.2 Hours per credit: 1.4 (N=38)**

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%	8%	39%	16%	16%	5%	8%				

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

**Class median: 5.3 Hours per credit: 1.1 (N=38)**

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
5%	24%	24%	11%	18%	8%	5%	5%				

What grade do you expect in this course?

**Class median: 3.5 (N=37)**

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
19%	32%	41%	5%			3%								

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

**(N=38)**

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
53%	16%		21%	11%	

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.	40	45%	32%	20%	2%				6.3	1
The instructor successfully rephrased explanations to clear up confusion.	38	45%	34%	18%	3%				6.3	3
Class sessions were interesting and engaging.	39	26%	28%	21%	10%	8%	5%	3%	5.6	8
Class sessions were well organized.	40	42%	40%	18%					6.3	2
Student participation was encouraged.	39	41%	28%	15%	13%	3%			6.2	7
Students were aware of what was expected of them.	39	38%	41%	15%		3%	3%		6.2	4
Extra help was readily available.	39	31%	31%	26%	8%	5%			5.9	9
Assigned readings and other out-of-class work were valuable.	40	30%	18%	22%	12%	8%	10%		5.4	11
Grades were assigned fairly.	39	31%	28%	23%	8%	8%	3%		5.8	10
Meaningful feedback on tests and other work was provided.	39	33%	33%	10%	13%		10%		6.0	5
Evaluation of student performance was related to important course goals.	39	36%	38%	10%	10%	5%			6.1	6

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.	40	38%	38%	18%	5%	2%			6.2	5
Developing an appreciation for the field in which this course resides.	40	48%	30%	8%	12%		2%		6.4	3
Understanding written material in this field.	40	38%	22%	18%	20%		2%		5.9	6
Developing an ability to express yourself in writing or orally in this field.	40	45%	22%	18%	12%	2%			6.3	2
Understanding and solving problems in this field.	39	33%	28%	26%	5%	5%	3%		5.9	7
Applying the course material to real world issues or other disciplines.	39	56%	28%	5%	8%	3%			6.6	1
General intellectual development.	39	46%	15%	21%	13%	5%			6.2	4

INFO 350 A  
Information Ethics And Policy  
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: X  
Responses: 41/150 (27% low)

Taught by: Mike Katell

**Instructor Evaluated: Mike Katell-Predoc TA**

### STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

2. Yes I liked how it was applicable to current situations and got me thinking about things I'd never really thought about before
4. The class was somewhat stimulating, we had to think a lot about how ethics applied to technology.
6. Mike's inclusion of 'In The News' as part of his lectures was very interesting, as it was nice to see real world applications of the topics we've discussed in class.
9. The critical essay was interesting to do since it was such a different way of thinking, which was mostly facilitated by the TAs and had nothing to do the lectures
10. It was, learning new ideas like ethics always makes you think!
11. I think the subject matter of the class is stimulating. But it wasn't presented in a very dynamic way most of the time. Often the material that would be assigned in readings was simply recapped in the lectures. I enjoyed a lot of the videos, especially the Curtis documentary.
12. I thought this class was wonderful in having me thinking from a new perspective in thinking about the justification of our actions in technology.
13. Yes, this class was intellectually stimulating, as it made you think critically about the tech industry at large.
14. The class was very dry and I felt that lecture time was not used valuably. Lectures were a regurgitation of readings, and readings were long and tedious. I felt that it was hard to understand how material was applicable to the current state of the tech industry because that content was never covered in class.
15. Probably one of my favorite classes at UW! I loved how engage Professor Katell was. This was an interesting topic and brought up a lot of interesting issues and topics.
16. Yes. It didn't stretch my thinking too much but I loved learning about the different ethical theories and how they apply to every day things.
17. I think the content was kind of repetitive when compared to other core classes.
18. Yes, some of the topics were review from other courses though.
19. Yes, because it made me view the technology work field differently. After taking the course I realized when going into the field there will be current problems and new problems that I will need to consider as I work for companies.
21. Yes, ideas on ethics, philosophy, and IP were really interesting.
22. Yes, very much so! The topics and examples sparked discourse about ethics that I had not fully considered before.

#### What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. relating class content to current events/news
2. The class presentations and current events videos
4. I liked the examples of ethical dilemmas and real world situations, they engaged us more than any theory or videos could.
5. Assigned readings
6. I thought the textbook was very interesting to read and easy to understand, compared to a lot of textbooks for other classes. Lecture was structured to coincide with the reading material.
9. The critical essay and logical fallacies
10. The topic discussions and just the open classroom being able to talk!
11. Reading the textbook, other assigned readings, videos, discussion posts.
12. The final paper actually made me think of everything in total. The paper in structure plays perfect to be an accumulation of what we learned
13. Class discussions
15. Talking about the issues in the news. Related the topics and our studies to the real world and daily events.
16. I loved the daily inclusion of ethical mess ups by corporations.
18. The lectures were fairly interesting and kept me engaged. The presentation katherine gave was really great.
19. I think the lectures contributed a lot to my learning.
21. The material itself was simple but could be applied to our fields really easily.
22. Lectures were helpful, the readings and the book were actually quite useful! Discussion prompts in lecture were a good way to participate.

#### What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. some classes were not super interactive, luckily I found the course content very interesting so I felt engaged, but I could see how some people wouldn't be.

4. I thought that the incessant bashing of Facebook was unnecessary, Mike seemed to hate Facebook so much that all of examples included them but I thought that it was too much. I get it that Facebook has done some questionable stuff in the past, but acting like every Facebook story is the end of the world got old real quick.
7. Lectures would consistently include 30 minutes or so of the instructor presenting his personal views as fact, which I found to be incredibly detrimental to forming my own educated opinions on the presented subjects. For example, literally every lecture mentioned Facebook with a strong negative connotation as if the company is a massive cyberterrorism organization out to destroy world. Of course they have committed unethical acts (and potentially more often than other major corporations), but students were not invited to have their own opinions on the subject matter. For example, the instructor had a slide titled "oh Facebook", and presented information about how they "make it so easy" to dislike them and report on their unethical decisions. While anti-Facebook views were the primary ones pushed in class, there were also other opinions given on a consistent basis and passed off as fact, oftentimes without support. Particularly in a class about developing informed opinions (this is what I would consider the most valuable aspect of the class), I would recommend trying as hard as possible to word questions, lectures, slides, etc in ways that are as unbiased as possible. Even if the opinion is a commonly held opinion, it should be presented objectively with all sides described.
8. TA is very not available. Quiz session does not help a lot.
9. The lectures were long and I didn't really understand the point of the homework in relation to the lectures
10. Lecture's were sometimes very dry
11. Section, parts of the lectures, grading of the first essay.
12. Some of the readings were a bit weird to understand
13. Readings did not seem to teach me much that wasn't covered in lecture.
15. My assignments were not graded in a timely matter and often took several weeks to receive a grade back.
16. I found that the labs weren't too particularly helpful and a bit repetitive.
18. I found the papers to be very poorly structured and thought they were more of a chore than something that contributed to my learning. It would have been much more interesting to have more of a chance to develop your own argument instead of spending so much time beating around someone else's. The directions for the critique felt pretty ambiguous and it was hard navigate the themes for the different sections without contradicting yourself or feeling repetitive.
19. Nothing really.
20. The final essay. Did not feel like we were prepared at all for it. Felt like there was a disconnect between lectures/sections and the final essay.
21. The content was sometimes a little dry and required just basic reading of the slides.
22. Nothing

#### What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. I think there could've been more interactive homework assignments, actually. The reading did not take that long before every class. For example, when we studied IP, an interesting homework assignment would be to look up some patents and see what kinds of things have been recently patented, or answer questions about the process or structure. Maybe even draw up a fake patent. I feel like this would be a real-world applicable homework assignment that would help us more in our careers than just reading about IP. as fas as class interaction, maybe more pollev's
3. I liked when we did Ethics in the News, I wish we had more lectures about things that are actually happening now/things that were important in the news versus just theories and previous court cases
4. If the class isn't engaging enough to have people come every day, then make the class better, don't add participation credits. We are students in college, we can handle learning on our own; adding participation credits just punishes students that need to leave for things in their personal lives.
5. It would be nice for explanations on why quiz questions were correct to be posted online, as there is no Panopto and no way for students to revisit the explanations behind quiz questions. Additionally, the information ethics in the news segments always took up a significant portion of class, and I feel that these sections could have been condensed so that we had more time to spend on the course material itself.
6. I thought the poll.ev questions were an easy way to get the class involved in discussion, so maybe utilize it more. I would also suggest having more peer review opportunities for our final papers.
7. I would scale back the quizzes more and provide more feedback. They were obnoxiously hard without any way to really prepare for them. Moreover, they did not provide any feedback on them (and they took a really long time to grade), so we had no idea of what we missed or how to improve for the future. Also, I would work on having more consistent sections. Some sections assigned work while others did not, and I found this to be very unfair. Also, the grade distributions of essays was very inconsistent across sections from what I could tell looking at Canvas statistics.
9. Make the transition from homework to lectures cohesive More practice and information in how to critique a philosophical paper
10. Improve some lecture, maybe not make it pure European content/ look at ethics from a different point of view
11. In this class you are fighting an uphill battle: making a more liberal arts oriented subject interesting to Info, CS, and other STEM majors. Basically I feel like the class failed on this front. Ethics and philosophy can have a reputation for being boring, inaccessible, and pointless. It is hard, but it is part of what could make this class great is really challenging STEM students. I felt like many aspects of this class did not respect the intelligence of those taking it, and students can tell when a class is the type of class they can put on the back burner.
12. I would suggest that argument building should have more emphasis, I think the hardest part for the final is to initially find the argument in premises as personally, this was the first argumentative essay I've written in a while, so it's reasonable that being thrown into the mix to find these premises and arguments can be daunting. Especially since it felt like a side thing to do in section.
13. I felt like some of the issues brought up as "this is morally bad" were fairly cut and dry: most people agree said action was morally bad. More morally ambiguous concepts should have been discussed as a class, such as self-driving cars, military AI, etc.
14. Assign more modern, engaging readings. Make better use of class time. Have a more lenient absence/makeup policy: your students are human beings who won't know they're going to be sick 48 hours in advance. They're also intelligent human beings who have jobs they need to work to support themselves or interviews they need to attend to further their career. Your absence/makeup policy is not understanding of students at all.
15. Provide the study guides earlier for the quizzes. Publish the slides prior so students can take notes directly on the paper. Also if the presentations could have a white background that would help students save ink when they print the slides.

16. Less emphasis on the final essay grade wise. Maybe include smaller papers instead of one of big paper? Idk don't trust me on this.
17. Make the lectures more engaging
18. A slightly more objective rubric for the paper could be helpful. I also felt like instructions for the peer review were not clearly listed on the assignment.
19. I don't have much to suggest, because I thought the class would good as is.
20. I would highly suggest recording lectures on Panopto and splitting up parts of the essays into 4 different parts. Not grouping parts 1&2, and 3&4 together. This will allow for more feedback and pacing for students so it's not left until the last minute. Did not see much of a connection between the essay and class lectures. Would prefer if the essay was talked about more in lectures and things to incorporate from the lecture into our essays.
21. More in class participation beyond mandatory response questions would have made it more lively. It felt like we were being lectured at for 2 hours sometimes when the content should be discussed more.
22. I would suggest taking out the tech imaginary lecture and film that Ms. Cross did/showed, since it was very confusing and didn't seem particularly relevant in terms of the course. (Nothing against Ms. Cross — she was the best TA I've had in my time at UW)

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.