IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

B EE 271 AA
Digital Circuits And Systems
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Nicole Hamilton
Instructor Evaluated: Nicole Hamilton-Lecturer

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: H
Responses: 8/10 (80% very 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:

	Median	College Decile
	4.7	**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: 5.6
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	DECILE RANK Inst	DECILE RANK College
The lab section as a whole was:	8	50%	38%	12%				4.5	6	7
The content of the lab section was:	8	50%	50%					4.5	7	7
The lab instructor's contribution to the course was:	8	75%	25%					4.8	8	8
The lab instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	8	75%	25%					4.8	8	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	DECILE RANK Inst	DECILE RANK College
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	8	12%	12%	25%	38%	12%			4.5	1	3
The intellectual challenge presented was:	8	38%	25%	25%	12%				6.0	7	6
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	8	25%	38%	25%	12%				5.8	5	5
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	8	50%	25%	12%	12%				6.5	9	8
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	8	38%	38%	12%	12%				6.2	7	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: 8.5   (N=8)**

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
		12%	38%		25%		12%				12%

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?   **Class median: 8.5   (N=8)**

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
	12%	25%		25%	12%		12%				12%

What grade do you expect in this course?   **Class median: 3.3   (N=8)**

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)	E (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
38%	25%	25%	12%											

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as: **(N=8)**

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
100%					

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	DECILE RANK Inst	College
Explanations by the lab instructor were:	8	88%	12%					4.9	9	9
Lab instructor's preparedness for lab sessions was:	8	75%	25%					4.8	8	9
Quality of questions or problems raised by the lab instructor was:	8	50%	50%					4.5	6	7
Lab instructor's enthusiasm was:	8	88%	12%					4.9	8	8
Student confidence in lab instructor's knowledge was:	8	88%	12%					4.9	9	8
Lab instructor's ability to solve unexpected problems was:	8	62%	38%					4.7	8	9
Answers to student questions were:	8	62%	25%	12%				4.7	7	7
Interest level of lab sessions was:	8	75%	12%	12%				4.8	8	9
Communication and enforcement of safety procedures were:	8	62%	38%					4.7	7	9
Lab instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	8	62%	38%					4.7	8	9
Availability of extra help when needed was:	8	88%	12%					4.9	9	9
Use of lab section time was:	8	75%	25%					4.8	9	8
Lab instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	8	88%	12%					4.9	9	8
Amount you learned in the lab sections was:	8	62%	38%					4.7	8	8
Relevance and usefulness of lab section content were:	8	50%	38%	12%				4.5	6	6
Coordination between lectures and lab activities was:	8	38%	38%	25%				4.2	6	8
Reasonableness of assigned work for lab section was:	8	38%	38%	12%	12%			4.2	4	5
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	8	50%	50%					4.5	6	6

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

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

B EE 271 AA
Digital Circuits And Systems
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Nicole Hamilton
Instructor Evaluated: Nicole Hamilton-Lecturer

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: H
Responses: 8/10 (80% very high)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

2. This class was very intellectually stimulating, thanks to Nicole Hamilton. I took this course with Rania Hussein last year and Rania did a horrible job of teaching the course. Nicole Hamilton did a fantastic job. Rania Hussein is not fit to teach this 271 course and did not even know her lecture slides. Nicole Hamilton had very good lecture slides and knew how to teach. Rania Hussein never gave us time to think about the questions and just gave us answers without explaining anything. Nicole Hamilton gave us time to think and explained how each problem was done and why it worked. Rania Hussein was always on her smartphone instead of teaching the class or the labs. One time during lab Rania Hussein dropped her smartphone infront of me and she said "oh, fuck." I felt offended by hearing Rania Hussein cuss infront of me. Nicole Hamilton spoke with respect and was always polite in the way she talked to students, she never said a bad word like Rania Hussein did.

3. yes

4. Yes, it was pretty challenging

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The lab assignments were key to leaning the consents presented by the class. However I feel that lab 1 could be replaced by a more complex Verilog lab after lab 4

2. Having Nicole Hamilton as a teacher who cares about the students and loves to teach is the aspect that contributed most to my learning. Rania Hussein was disrespectful to the students. Rania Hussein did not care about the students or teaching the students. Rania Hussein did not care about our success. The way that Nicole Hamilton taught the class showed us she wanted us to learn the material and wanted us to succeed. Nicole Hamilton even came to the labs on Tuesdays, Thursdays, Fridays, and Saturdays, not just the Mondays and Wednesdays she was scheduled for. Nicole coming to the labs almost every day was very helpful to my lab partner and I. We ended up learning beyond the labs. Rania Hussein was usually late to the labs and she I am not sure why Rania Hussein was late to the labs when she did not teach a class before the labs. Nicole Hamilton was always on time to the labs and lectures.

3. the instructor's extra effort

4. Nicole, the challenging nature of the lab

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

2. None. Nicole Hamilton did a great job and the other students in the class and labs were great too. Nicole Hamilton kept the class and labs interested in her lectures. Nicole Hamilton came to class and the labs every Monday and Wednesday for the lectures. Rania Hussein would cancel class multiple times and every time Rania Hussein would cancel class, she would have some excuse. Some of her "excuses" were "friend pasted away", "doctor's appointment" or "out of town." Rania Hussein detracted me from my learning by skipping and canceling class many times last year in 271. Nicole Hamilton did a fantastic job of always coming to class and Nicole never canceled class which helped me learn from her lectures.

4. Nothing

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

2. If UW Bothell really cares about us students, they would let Nicole Hamilton teach this 271 class instead of Rania Hussein. That is the biggest improvement UW Bothell can make. If Nicole Hamilton taught her full time, I would take all of my a classes with Nicole and none with Rania. When I was taking 271 last year in winter 2015, I would has Rania Hussein to explain a problem in her lectures and she would tell me to come to her office hours for extra help. Rania Hussein's office hours were Thursday 1:00 - 3:00 pm and she guaranteed to be there. When I went to her office she would not office the door. She would just tell me to ask her for help in class. And in class she would tell me to come to her office hours. Rania lied and contradicted what she said. Nicole Hamilton always took the time to answer all of our questions before, during ,and after class. Nicole Hamilton was always available to help us during her office hours. Rania Hussein told me my grade would be okay and that I would pass after the quarter ended but she ended up failing me for some reason even after I re-took her only two tests and did extremely better the second time. She did not change my test grades even though she promised me she would change them. The next quarter when I confronted her about the tests grades not being changed, she told me she forgot and did not give me credit. She told me to re-take the class again. UW Bothell is extremely lucky to have Nicole Hamilton around and extremely unlucky to have Rania Hussein around.

4. None

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.