

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT

Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Bothell Engineering and Mathematics

Term: Summer 2016

Evaluation Delivery: Online Evaluation Form: H

Responses: 5/13 (38% moderate)

B EE 271 AA

Digital Circuits And Systems Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Nicole Hamilton

Instructor Evaluated: Nicole Hamilton-Lecturer

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:

Median College Decile 4.8 (0=lowest; 5=highest) (0=lowest; 9=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: 6.3 (1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median		LE RANK College
The lab section as a whole was:	5	80%	20%					4.9	9	9
The content of the lab section was:	5	80%		20%				4.9	9	9
The lab instructor's contribution to the course was:	5	80%	20%					4.9	8	8
The lab instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	5	60%	20%	20%				4.7	6	7

CTUDENT ENGAGENE

STUDEN	IT ENGAG	EMENT															
Relative	to other c	ollege co	ureae vau	ı have takı	an:			Much Higher (7)	(6)	(E)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median		LE RANK College
	xpect your	•	•		JII.		5	20%	(6) 40%	(5) 20%	20%	(3)	(2)	(1)	5.8	7	8
,	'	Ü					5	40%	40%	20%	2070				6.2	8	7
		challenge presented was: effort you put into this course was:					5	80%	20%	2070					6.9	9	9
		, ,		ourse was.			5	60%	40%						6.7	9	8
				nments, at	-		5	60%	40%						6.7	9	8
etc.) was		course (o	oling assig	mmems, at	terialing cia	15565,	5	00%	40%						0.7	9	0
including	0 ,	classes, de	oing readin	ıgs, review		nis course, writing								Clas	s mediar	n: 11.((N=5)
Under 2	•		4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11		12-13		14-15	16	-17	18-	-19	20-21	22	or more
					20%	40%		20%			20)%					
	total avera	0		w many do	you consi	ider were								Clas	s mediar	n: 11.0	(N=5)
Under 2	2-3		4-5	6-7	8-9 20%	1 0-11 40%		12-13 40%		14-15	16	-17	18-19 20		20-21	22 or more	
What grad	de do you	expect in t	his course	e?										Cla	ss media	ın: 3.6	6 (N=5)
A (3.9-4.0) 20%	A- (3.5-3.8) 60%	B+ (3.2-3.4) 20%	B (2.9-3.1)	B- (2.5-2.8)	C+ (2.2-2.4)	C (1.9-2.1)	C- (1.5-1		D+ 2-1.4)	D (0.9-1.	D- 1) (0.7-		E (0.0)	Pas	s Cre	edit	No Credit
In regard	to your ac	ademic pr	ogram, is t	this course	best desc	cribed as:								_			(N=5)
A core/distribution In your major requirement 60% 20%		An	elective		In your minor			A pr	A program requirement 20%				Other				



COURSE SUMMARY REPORT Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Bothell Engineering and Mathematics Term: Summer 2016

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS										
	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median		LE RANK College
Explanations by the lab instructor were:	5	60%	40%					4.7	7	7
Lab instructor's preparedness for lab sessions was:	5	60%		40%				4.7	6	9
Quality of questions or problems raised by the lab instructor was:	5	80%	20%					4.9	9	9
Lab instructor's enthusiasm was:	5	60%	20%	20%				4.7	4	5
Student confidence in lab instructor's knowledge was:	5	80%	20%					4.9	8	8
Lab instructor's ability to solve unexpected problems was:	5	80%		20%				4.9	9	9
Answers to student questions were:	5	80%	20%					4.9	9	8
Interest level of lab sessions was:	5	80%		20%				4.9	9	9
Communication and enforcement of safety procedures were:	5	60%	40%					4.7	7	9
Lab instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	5	40%	20%	40%				4.0	4	5
Availability of extra help when needed was:	5	60%	20%	20%				4.7	7	7
Use of lab section time was:	5	60%	20%	20%				4.7	7	7
Lab instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	5	80%	20%					4.9	8	8
Amount you learned in the lab sections was:	4	100%						5.0	9	9
Relevance and usefulness of lab section content were:	5	80%	20%					4.9	9	9
Coordination between lectures and lab activities was:	5	60%	20%	20%				4.7	8	9
Reasonableness of assigned work for lab section was:	5	80%	20%					4.9	9	9
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	5	60%	20%	20%				4.7	7	7



COURSE SUMMARY REPORT

Student Comments

University of Washington, Bothell Engineering and Mathematics Term: Summer 2016

Evaluation Delivery: Online Evaluation Form: H

Responses: 5/13 (38% moderate)

B EE 271 AA

Digital Circuits And Systems Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Nicole Hamilton

Instructor Evaluated: Nicole Hamilton-Lecturer

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

- 1. Coding is important
- 2. HELLA HARD ZOMG taught me so much actually
- 3. Yes because it is completely new materials that people did not know existed prior to this class
- 4. Lab was stimulating enough
- 5. This class was intellectually stimulating as the lab reinforced the lectures in class. It also showed the real-world implementations of the course material.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

- 1. Open lab times. They were nearly required.
- 2. dope lab subjects
- 3. The coding and writing of the specific codes.
- 4. Labs and Q&A
- 5. What contributed most to my learning was the hands on experience working with the breadboards and the fpga boards. By troubleshooting my code, I was able to fully understand each component in verilog, as well as common error codes and solutions.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

- 1. Complexity of labs and delay on lecture material slowed down the ability to proceed towards the end of the quarter.
- 2. nothing i spent a long time on each lab
- 3. Not having enough examples
- 4. Not enough time.
- 5. Although I was able to develop a deeper understanding of Verilog throughout the quarter, it would have been nice to have a lab session dedicated to the basics of verilog. I found myself conceptually understanding the process, but not being able to translate that right away into verilog.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

- 2. nada
- 3. HAVE MORE EXAMPLES
- 4. Not much, keep up the great work! Please teach BEE425 Lectures and Labs with the same enthusiasm as BEE271
- 5. -Spend one lab session dedicated to understanding verilog

© 2011–2021 IASystem, University of Washington Survey no: 14608

Printed: 10/17/21

Page 3 of 4



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. 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.