

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: W24  
Responses: 4/21 (19% low)

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 |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 3.8                   | 4.1                      |
| (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: 4.3</b><br>(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:   | 4 | 25%           |               | 50%      | 25%      |          |               | 3.0    | 3.3             |
| The course content was:  | 4 | 25%           | 25%           | 50%      |          |          |               | 3.5    | 3.7             |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was:                   | 4 | 50%           | 25%           | 25%      |          |          |               | 4.5    | 4.7             |
| The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was: | 4 | 50%           | 25%           | 25%      |          |          |               | 4.5    | 4.8             |

### 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:                               | 4 |                 |     | 25% | 50%         | 25% |     |                | 4.0    |
| The intellectual challenge presented was:                                    | 4 |                 |     | 50% | 50%         |     |     |                | 4.5    |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was:                           | 4 |                 |     | 50% | 50%         |     |     |                | 4.5    |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:                          | 4 |                 |     | 75% | 25%         |     |     |                | 4.8    |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 4 |                 | 25% |     | 75%         |     |     |                | 4.2    |

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: 4.2 (N=4)**

| 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 |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
|         | 25% | 75% |     |     |       |       |       |       |       |       |            |

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

**Class median: 2.8 (N=4)**

| 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 |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
|         | 75% | 25% |     |     |       |       |       |       |       |       |            |

What grade do you expect in this course?

**Class median: 3.4 (N=4)**

| 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 |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|---------|------|--------|-----------|
|             | 25%          | 75%          |             |              |              |             |              |              |             |              |         |      |        |           |

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

**(N=4)**

| In your major | A core/distribution requirement | An elective | In your minor | A program requirement | Other |
|---------------|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------------|-------|
| 75%           |                                 |             |               | 25%                   |       |

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

|   | N | Excellent<br>(5) | Very<br>Good<br>(4) | Good<br>(3) | Fair<br>(2) | Poor<br>(1) | Very<br>Poor<br>(0) | Median | Relative<br>Rank |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|--------|------------------|
| The Teaching Assistant's (TA) effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was: | 4 | 25%              | 25%                 | 50%         |             |             |                     | 3.5    |                  |
| The TA gave very clear explanations:  | 4 | 25%              | 25%                 | 50%         |             |             |                     | 3.5    |                  |
| Student's confidence in TA's knowledge was:                                     | 4 | 75%              | 25%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.8    |                  |
| The TA was accessible when I had questions or concerns about this class:        | 4 |                  | 50%                 | 50%         |             |             |                     | 3.5    |                  |
| The TA provided meaningful feedback on assignments:                             | 4 | 50%              | 25%                 | 25%         |             |             |                     | 4.5    |                  |
| The TA assigned grades fairly:  | 4 |                  | 75%                 | 25%         |             |             |                     | 3.8    |                  |
| The timeliness of communications with your TA was:                              | 4 |                  | 75%                 |             | 25%         |             |                     | 3.8    |                  |
| Lab sessions were interesting and engaging:                                     | 4 |                  | 25%                 | 75%         |             |             |                     | 3.2    |                  |
| Lab sessions were well organized:   | 4 |                  | 50%                 | 50%         |             |             |                     | 3.5    |                  |

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: W24  
Responses: 4/21 (19% low)

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

### STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. I enjoyed Mike as a TA and would love to have him as a TA again. He brought more philosophy to the course and I felt like he did a good job of enhancing the course content and giving it his own spin.
2. Mike clearly demonstrated his effectiveness in teaching the course. His expertise and guidance when discussing various topics was made clear- he would often contribute additional insights or extra materials to supplement the curriculum.
3. Make section more about covering the material discussed in class and discussing those concepts more thoroughly rather than inundating us with new readings and information.

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

1. The discussions that were required were not always touched on after they were due. I felt like further discussion would've been great.
2. No aspects of the TA detracted from my learning.
3. Section time felt too short and rushed even though I learned more out of it than I did in lecture.

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

1. I felt that Mike was able to take really complex concepts and explain them in simpler terms. Additionally, he did a great job of giving examples of concepts based in reality. Sometimes a student wouldn't explain their assigned reading very well but I could still keep along due to Mike's additional explanations. I thought he did a great job of asking challenging questions and facilitating dialogue.
2. Mike has an uncanny ability to steer a group of people in new directions, ensuring that any discussions /never/ ran stale. His confidence in the material and passion for student engagement was palpable, I would love another chance to attend a section with him again.
3. The smaller group in section made it much easier to work through material through discussion rather than lecture.

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.