B EE 332 AA
Devices And Circuits II
Course type: Face-to-Face

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: H
Responses: 19/24 (79% 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
3.8
(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: 5.2
(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:	19	26%	37%	26%		5%	5%	3.9	2	
The content of the lab section was:	19	37%	26%	21%	11%		5%	4.0	3	
The lab instructor's contribution to the course was:	19	37%	16%	32%	5%		11%	3.7	1	
The lab instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	19	32%	16%	26%	11%	5%	11%	3.4	1	

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:	19	16%	26%	21%	26%	5%		5%	5.1	4	
The intellectual challenge presented was:	19	37%	16%	21%	21%			5%	5.7	4	
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	19	37%	21%	21%	16%			5%	5.9	6	
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	19	42%	21%	21%	11%			5%	6.1	8	
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	19	47%	21%	5%	21%			5%	6.4	8	

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: 7.9 (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
	6%	11%	28%	28%	11%		11%			6%	

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

Class median: 5.4 (N=19)

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
5%	11%	37%	11%	5%	5%	11%	11%				5%

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.4 (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)	E (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
6%	33%	33%	17%		11%									

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

(N=19)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
89%			5%	5%	

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	DECILE RANK Inst	DECILE RANK College
Explanations by the lab instructor were:	19	32%	11%	26%	16%	11%	5%	3.2	0	
Lab instructor's preparedness for lab sessions was:	19	42%	11%	21%	16%	5%	5%	3.8	1	
Quality of questions or problems raised by the lab instructor was:	19	32%	21%	21%	16%	5%	5%	3.6	1	
Lab instructor's enthusiasm was:	19	32%	21%	21%	16%	5%	5%	3.6	0	
Student confidence in lab instructor's knowledge was:	19	42%	11%	32%	5%	5%	5%	3.8	0	
Lab instructor's ability to solve unexpected problems was:	19	42%	11%	21%	16%	5%	5%	3.8	2	
Answers to student questions were:	19	37%		32%	16%	11%	5%	3.1	0	
Interest level of lab sessions was:	19	42%	16%	21%	11%	5%	5%	4.0	4	
Communication and enforcement of safety procedures were:	19	37%	21%	21%	11%	5%	5%	3.9	1	
Lab instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	19	37%	11%	26%	5%	5%	16%	3.4	1	
Availability of extra help when needed was:	19	26%	16%	32%	16%	5%	5%	3.2	0	
Use of lab section time was:	19	42%	5%	37%	5%	5%	5%	3.4	1	
Lab instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	19	42%	11%	16%	16%	5%	11%	3.8	1	
Amount you learned in the lab sections was:	19	32%	16%	21%	21%	5%	5%	3.4	1	
Relevance and usefulness of lab section content were:	19	32%	32%	16%	5%	5%	11%	3.9	2	
Coordination between lectures and lab activities was:	19	32%	16%	16%	21%	11%	5%	3.3	2	
Reasonableness of assigned work for lab section was:	19	32%	26%	16%	16%	5%	5%	3.8	2	
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	18	22%	28%	28%	11%	6%	6%	3.5	1	

B EE 332 AA
Devices And Circuits II
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: H
Responses: 19/24 (79% very high)

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. yes, this course is very important for other courses and capstone projects. and i have really spent a lot of time and exert a lot of effort to grasp the required knowledge.

2. Yes, it was

5. It stretched my thinking learning how to put each lab together for the final project.

6. yes

7. Multi-Stage amplifiers are very difficult to understand so this was definitely intellectually stimulating.

8. The lab material was challenging.

9. The content and structure of this lab was excellent. I felt like I learned a lot more about BJT circuits in the lab than I did in the lecture.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. the design project was interesting and the PowerPoint slides of the instructor was helpful to understand the lab instructions

2. new knowledge of using The multism

3. The reworded lab handout made it much easier to understand what the requirements were for the labs.

5. The slideshows before doing labs helped when the professor would show us her work and we were able to compare our measurements.

6. not sure

7. Hands on work.

8. the final project was great material

9. The introductory presentations for each lab were very helpful, and the fact that Nicole re-wrote later labs helped a lot.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. the grading of the instructor was a little bit frustrating. to be honest she is hard grader.

2. two week for one lab is not enought

4. The lab professor uses profanity, comes to lab smelling like marijuana, talks about other professors in a negative way to students and in ear shot of other students, has an "I don't care attitude." This professor is very unprofessional, and gives this program a bad image.

5. Students in the lab room that were not in the class.

6. none

7. Taking 2 other lab courses.

8. NA

9. Poorly written lab instructions. Fortunately Nicole fixed this issue with later labs.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. I believe the quality of the lab content is good enough, however, students spent their time and money,at the end of the day their grades really matters. so, the instructor should be fair grader.

2. More lecture on lab

5. N/A

6. none

7. Procedures that have us play with various resistors in the amplifier circuits so we can see what effects clipping levels for various circuits.

8. NA

9. It would be helpful if the instructor talked slower when answering questions about the labs. The explanations offered for each lab were helpful, but at times I had difficulty keeping up with what was being said. Also, I think it would be helpful if the instructor spent more time listening to the student's question before offering an explanation. If the student has reached a wrong conclusion, the student should be able to explain their thought process to the instructor, so that the instructor can fully understand why the student is confused.

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.