

LING 450 A, Joint with LING 450 B, LING 550 A, LING 550 B, LING 550 C
 Introduction To Linguistic Phonetics
 Course type: Hybrid

Taught by: Yuan Chai
Instructor Evaluated: Yuan Chai-Lect Inst

Evaluation Delivery: Online
 Evaluation Form: A
 Responses: 18/35 (51% high)

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	4.8
(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: 4.6
(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:	18	72%	22%	6%				4.8	4.7
The course content was:	18	67%	28%	6%				4.8	4.7
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	18	72%	22%	6%				4.8	4.7
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	18	89%	11%					4.9	4.9

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Relative to other college courses you have taken:	N	Much Higher (7)		Average (4)		Much Lower (1)		Median
		(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)		
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	18	11%	33%	17%	22%	17%		5.2
The intellectual challenge presented was:	18	17%	22%	33%	28%			5.2
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	18	6%	17%	56%	11%	11%		5.0
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	18	11%	11%	44%	22%	11%		4.9
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	18	11%	33%	11%	44%			5.0

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: 6.4 Hours per credit: 1.3 (N=18)

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%	39%	11%	6%	11%						

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

Class median: 5.0 Hours per credit: 1 (N=18)

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
17%	44%	11%	17%	11%	11%						

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.7 (N=18)

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
44%	28%	28%												

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

(N=18)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
61%	6%	11%	22%		

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Course organization was:	18	72%	22%	6%				4.8	2
Clarity of instructor's voice was:	18	67%	28%	6%				4.8	18
Explanations by instructor were:	18	67%	22%	11%				4.8	12
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	18	72%	22%		6%			4.8	10
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	18	83%	17%					4.9	4
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	18	72%	22%	6%				4.8	9
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	18	83%	11%	6%				4.9	15
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	18	89%	11%					4.9	11
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	17	82%	12%	6%				4.9	14
Answers to student questions were:	18	83%	17%					4.9	5
Availability of extra help when needed was:	18	78%	22%					4.9	8
Use of class time was:	18	61%	28%	11%				4.7	16
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	18	89%	6%	6%				4.9	6
Amount you learned in the course was:	18	78%	22%					4.9	1
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	18	78%	17%	6%				4.9	7
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	18	61%	39%					4.7	17
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	18	83%	11%	6%				4.9	3
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	18	72%	17%	11%				4.8	13

LING 450 A, Joint with LING 450 B, LING 550 A, LING 550 B, LING 550 C
 Introduction To Linguistic Phonetics
 Course type: Hybrid

Taught by: Yuan Chai
Instructor Evaluated: Yuan Chai-Lect Inst

Evaluation Delivery: Online
 Evaluation Form: A
 Responses: 18/35 (51% high)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. The variety of assignments pushed students to engage with the course content in different ways. Incorporating student languages into the study was an additionally helpful way to connect with topics studied.
2. Yes.
3. This class changed how I thought about speech. I found myself wondering about the transcriptions of random words, explaining to my non-linguist friends what I was working on with enthusiasm, and working on extra-credit assignments not because I needed to but because I thought it was fun.
4. Yes, I enjoyed learning about interesting topics in phonetics, and I enjoyed developing my skills in phonetics such as transcription, sound recognition, and sound production.
5. Yes, I found the days where we used relevant technology very stimulating. Mostly thinking about recording with praat and the electroglossograph.
6. Yes, it stretched my thinking because Professor Chai, used class time to give in-depth descriptions of phonetics but also introduced topics of phonology, to give us an idea of what we will be studying in phonology.
7. Yes, I appreciated the deeper dive into each topic than was perhaps "necessary" for just acquiring the information taught in the course. I think the articulatory knowledge in particular was most interesting.
8. Yes, because we learned about many concepts that would blow most peoples minds
10. It was convoluted at first but interesting and I grew to enjoy it.
11. The practical application at the end of class was both challenging, and helped to highlight key concepts. If I ran into any roadblocks, I was able to get feedback right away. The labs were also challenging, and fun. The homework assignments were a great way to stay focused on the current week materials outside of class.
12. Yes! We covered such a wide variety of topics in phonetics, but Yuan made sure we got into sufficient detail in each one. The attention paid to air stream mechanisms and tones was especially great.
13. The content was very interesting. Definitely teaches you how to think about things in a lot of new ways
14. Yes, I learned a lot about this area of linguistics.
15. Yes, it involved learning new subjects and delving further into them every class and had a lot of practice opportunities.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Flexibility of the instructor. The ability to attend in person or virtually was helpful.
3. I came into Yuan's office hours every week. Getting my questions answered with her one-on-one was really helpful and I got to see how much she cared about our learning. Before every lecture, we played a transcription from spectrogram "game" that resembled wordle which made practicing this skill interactive, relevant, and fun.
4. The professor was very helpful at answering interesting questions from her field experience in phonetics, and raised a lot of useful questions to help us think about the content more precisely, such as what speech sounds are possible.
5. In person worksheets.
6. Prof. Chai's examples and descriptions contributed to the most to my learning and understanding of phonetics.
7. The labs and transcription exercises, as well as the lectures themselves were helpful to apply what I was learning. The professor was also easily reachable through email and responded promptly and answered all questions asked in class, even if she had to research them.
8. The demonstrations and examples
9. I really enjoyed the professor's use of audio examples, charts, and other illustrations. I also really enjoyed how she used various students' recordings as examples to teach.
10. The professor's great organization and time management really helped with covering the course content effectively.
11. I feel like I learned the most from the lectures, and then applying them at the end of each class. Although it was also helpful to review the book after class, as well as engage in the homework assignments.
12. The lectures were very helpful! Yuan explained concepts very clearly and used good examples to support whatever we were learning that week. Also, doing the Gramle every day as a class was so fun that I didn't realize how much it improved my ability to read spectrograms until the course was over.
13. Lectures were the most helpful
14. I liked doing gramle as a class every day, it honestly helped a lot with my ability to read spectrograms.
15. Practice in class and through unlimited homework chances.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

3. There wasn't much in this class that detracted from my learning. The course load was a lot at times, but everything was relevant to my learning.
 5. I love gramle but it makes me feel like phonetics is bullshit because we can all agree on what something should be and then its either graphed wrong or transcribed wrong. Could be optional and the 30 minutes at the end and not the 30 minutes at the start.
 6. N/A
 7. I'm not sure whether the quizzes were exactly necessary because they were mostly repeats of the homework.
 8. Nothing
11. I feel like the book could be bit hard to follow at times. Especially when we had somewhat different terms applied in place of what either the book, or linguistic materials like the IPA chart used a set of terms that seemed to be concrete on their own respect. For example, using upper and lower instead of "close" and "open" on the vowel portion of the IPA chart. Although this is not unusual for a linguistic class, as my syntax class also applied different terms in place of terms used in the book. It's still somewhat of a hurdle to memorize term equivalents, and feels a bit clunky.
 12. I think the penalties were a little bit overly harsh. In some cases it was better to turn in incomplete work rather than late work.
 13. The building is kind of noisy. Also having multiple assignments due the same days (which is also the lecture day) is sometimes hard to manage.
 14. I think that the course material could have maybe been organized in a better way, because it seemed like towards the end of the course we were losing steam a little. Maybe instead of spending one lecture on one topic, there could be multiple lectures dedicated to the hard topics?

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. It might be better to replace some homework's with more labs. The labs were among the best ways to apply the knowledge learned in class.
 2. Although it's generally good practice not to be slow during the instruction and illustration (because it saves time, it's easy for students to lose concentration when the class flow is too slow, and students will usually raise questions if they missed any information), perhaps, at least for the software illustration, it's a good idea for the instructor to confirm whether the students have stood by before each step and slow down a little bit during the illustrations.
 3. I have no suggestions for improving this class.
 4. Some of the lectures felt like review from LING 200, such as the phonology lecture. Going a little beyond intro content in these lectures would make the class more interesting!
 5. Don't tell students the mystery language is hard to do quickly. It is not. Personally I would have benefitted from a midway transcription check but I understand how this prepares you for phonetician work with less oversight.
 6. I thought the way Prof. Chai was very good, and didn't need improving.
 7. Some of the instructions for the project weren't super clear, but overall the class is good.
 8. Nothing, it is perfect
11. Please keep doing the practical applications at the end of class. I also like how the homework is set up. :)
 12. With so many different homeworks, quizzes, transcriptions, labs, the final project, and the final exam, some of the work started to feel a little bit redundant, and sometimes it was hard to tell what was the most important. I think reducing the scale of the final project might be helpful.
 13. Spread the assignments out over more days.
 14. I have heard from students that have taken this course in the past that previously that there used to be an option to either take the final or do the mystery language project. I would have preferred if that was an option this time as well, instead of having to do both.
 15. Possibly making the IPA extra credit quiz offered midway through the course. I think having it all memorized improved my ability by tenfold and would be useful to encourage students to do so earlier in the quarter.

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.