

LING 453 A, Joint with LING 553 A
Experimental Phonetics
Course type: Hybrid

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A
Responses: 10/13 (77% very high)

Taught by: Yuan Chai

Instructor Evaluated: Yuan Chai-Lect Inst

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
4.8	4.7
(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: 4.8
(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	80%	20%					4.9	4.8
The course content was:	10	70%	30%					4.8	4.7
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	10	80%	20%					4.9	4.8
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	10	70%	10%	20%				4.8	4.7

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:	9		33%	22%	33%			11%	4.8	
The intellectual challenge presented was:	10		50%	40%	10%				5.5	
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	10		30%	40%	30%				5.0	
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	9			78%	22%				4.9	
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	9	11%	11%	33%	33%	11%			4.7	

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: 8.1 Hours per credit: 1.6 (N=9)

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
	11%		22%	56%		11%					

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

Class median: 6.0 Hours per credit: 1.2 (N=9)

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
	11%	33%	22%	33%							

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.9 (N=9)

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
56%	33%								11%					

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%	30%	10%		10%

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Course organization was:	10	40%	50%	10%				4.3	16
Clarity of instructor's voice was:	10	40%	40%	20%				4.2	18
Explanations by instructor were:	10	40%	40%	10%	10%			4.2	17
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	10	50%	40%	10%				4.5	14
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	10	70%	20%	10%				4.8	6
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	10	70%	30%					4.8	5
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	10	80%	20%					4.9	10
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	10	90%	10%					4.9	4
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	10	80%	10%	10%				4.9	9
Answers to student questions were:	10	60%	40%					4.7	12
Availability of extra help when needed was:	10	90%		10%				4.9	2
Use of class time was:	10	50%	40%	10%				4.5	13
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	10	90%	10%					4.9	3
Amount you learned in the course was:	10	60%	30%	10%				4.7	8
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	10	60%	30%	10%				4.7	11
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	9	89%	11%					4.9	1
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	10	70%	30%					4.8	7
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	10	50%	40%	10%				4.5	15

LING 453 A, Joint with LING 553 A
Experimental Phonetics
Course type: Hybrid

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A
Responses: 10/13 (77% very high)

Taught by: Yuan Chai

Instructor Evaluated: Yuan Chai-Lect Inst

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

2. This class was intellectually stimulating and provided a good balance of familiar and unfamiliar material.
4. This class allowed a lot of freedom in what sort of experiments we designed and how we conducted them, which was both a bit scary and very beneficial. I was able to not only follow my own interests but also receive frequent, detailed feedback on my proposals. As such, I was able to learn a lot about the research project and conduct my own experiment as well as possible.
5. This course definitely was intellectually stimulating. It tied together many concepts that I've learned in other linguistics courses, including phonetics, phonology, and language development.
6. Yes. It expanded on concepts taught in LING 450 in a way that expanded my knowledge and encouraged more critical and creative thinking.
7. Yuan was very engaging and actively provided productive feedback for class.
9. Practical experience with Praat and the core measurement of phonology are core to my intended research

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. interactive and hands-on projects that gradually built up skills well.
2. The group lab projects that encouraged us to utilize the phonetics laboratory gave us hands on experience.
4. The professor is one of the best I have ever had -- she is confident, knowledgeable, and genuinely interested in helping her students learn as much as possible. I felt comfortable coming to her for questions and was able to learn a lot more than I would have under another professor. I also appreciated the group work, and the time and support we were given made these projects relatively painless.
5. The reading assignments, lectures, and in-class activities. Learning how to use the phonology lab was very helpful. Yuan's enthusiasm and knowledge of the material are excellent.
6. Professor Yuan Chai's enthusiasm for the subject and our learning of it, as well as her availability/receptiveness for if you have questions or need extra help. Her explanations are clear and she classes were balanced between lectures and hands-on activities.
8. I think being able to do a lot of hands on learning with using new apps/software helped a lot with my learning. We got to conduct a few experiments and go through a simplified linguistic experiment process, which was very fun!
9. Lectures and exercises

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

2. Quizzes felt a bit unnecessary when put in tandem with lab assignments.
5. None.
9. Organization of the exercises over the various directories and categories; exercises, in-class project... I found it very rushed when we went through the quizzes in class.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

2. More time to work on in-class activity
3. Overall a very interesting and helpful course. Would be more interesting if we could reproduce more of the experiments in the papers
5. Some of the instructions for the in-class activities could have been clearer. I had to follow along closely with what the Yuan was demonstrating rather than being able to refer to the instructions. Sometimes I got lost because my attention was focused on replicating what had been demonstrated and I missed the next steps that were being demonstrated.
6. The first steps for the final project could maybe be assigned earlier on in the quarter, so that there's a bit longer of a timeline for completing it. They could also be more incremental (more assignments, but with fewer steps in each so that it's not a jump from a rough idea to a fully fleshed out proposal). However, overall, the pacing was alright.
9. A better organization of lab, exercise materials maybe by "week-day" directory

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.