

B EE 425 AB
Microprocessor System Design
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: H
Responses: 9/14 (64% high)

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 3.5 (0=lowest; 5=highest)	College Decile 2 (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: 5.5 (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	College
The lab section as a whole was:	9	11%	33%	56%				3.4	1	2
The content of the lab section was:	9	11%	33%	56%				3.4	1	1
The lab instructor's contribution to the course was:	9	22%	33%	44%				3.7	1	2
The lab instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	9	22%	33%	44%				3.7	2	2

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median	DECILE RANK	
										Inst	College
Relative to other college courses you have taken:											
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	9	11%	22%	11%	44%	11%			4.4	1	2
The intellectual challenge presented was:	9	22%	33%	22%	11%	11%			5.7	5	4
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	9	22%	44%	11%	22%				5.9	6	5
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	9	22%	56%		22%				6.0	7	6
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	9	11%	44%	11%	22%	11%			5.6	3	3

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: 5.3 (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
		56%	22%	22%							

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

Class median: 4.5 (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
	33%	33%	22%	11%							

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.4 (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)	E (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
22%	22%	22%	22%	11%										

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

(N=9)

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:	9	33%	22%	33%		11%		3.8	2	3
Lab instructor's preparedness for lab sessions was:	9	33%	22%	22%	22%			3.8	2	4
Quality of questions or problems raised by the lab instructor was:	9	33%	22%	33%	11%			3.8	2	2
Lab instructor's enthusiasm was:	9	44%	22%	22%		11%		4.2	2	3
Student confidence in lab instructor's knowledge was:	9	56%	11%	22%	11%			4.6	4	5
Lab instructor's ability to solve unexpected problems was:	9	44%	11%	33%	11%			4.0	4	5
Answers to student questions were:	9	33%	22%	33%	11%			3.8	2	2
Interest level of lab sessions was:	9	33%	11%	44%	11%			3.4	1	2
Communication and enforcement of safety procedures were:	9	33%		67%				3.2	0	1
Lab instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	9	44%		44%	11%			3.4	1	2
Availability of extra help when needed was:	9	44%		56%				3.4	1	1
Use of lab section time was:	9	44%	11%	33%		11%		4.0	4	4
Lab instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	9	56%		33%		11%		4.6	5	6
Amount you learned in the lab sections was:	9	44%		44%	11%			3.4	1	1
Relevance and usefulness of lab section content were:	9	44%		44%	11%			3.4	1	1
Coordination between lectures and lab activities was:	9	22%		33%	22%	22%		2.7	0	0
Reasonableness of assigned work for lab section was:	9	33%		44%	11%	11%		3.1	1	1
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	9	33%		44%	22%			3.1	0	1

B EE 425 AB
Microprocessor System Design
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: H
Responses: 9/14 (64% 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. I spent more time for the project
2. The design project was very intellectually stimulating. It was very challenging, and required significant effort and resilience to complete. The other two labs sort of felt like busy work. The concepts they covered was relevant to the course, but the amount of work required (especially on lab two) seemed unnecessary.
3. Nicole's labs were very interesting, yet simple. She did a good job of creating complex assignments and breaking them down into simple smaller sections that were manageable.
4. Yes, because it challenged us to solve real-world problems
5. Yes I think the Verilog labs were helpful for hands on experience with processor level programming and low level instructions.
6. Yes it was a great class

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. nothing
2. The introductory presentations given at the start of each lab.
3. Nicole's help during the labs was the most useful, as her ability to answer questions and steer the student in the correct direction is very good.
4. The instructor's assistance with our design problems. Without Nicole we would not have learned half as much useful information and skills
5. The two Verilog labs.
7. Thank you for exposing us to Verilog which will help us in the workplace for the future and allowing alternate labs and final project

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. nothing
2. At times, the requirements for the labs was not very clear. This was probably due to the fact that the instructor was using labs that she did not write.
3. Not knowing Verilog syntax made completing the code very difficult.
4. Lab problems weren't directly related to lecture material, but that is in part to the order in which lecture material was presented
5. Lack of Verilog programming experience.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. we need more instructions in the lab
2. On the design project, I felt like I wasn't very prepared for programming in Verilog. A lecture or two covering the basics of Verilog would have been very helpful.
3. Good suggestions of Verilog learning sources.
4. Teach students how to use the tools they need to use first! Nicole did a very good job of teaching us on the fly but there should be a more in-depth tutorial for Verilog and Quartus
5. Verilog instruction in lecture with more discussion of FPGA board. I think more Verilog in conjunction with Assembly would be helpful.
6. I would suggest Ms Hamilton to teach the EE425 lecture, and in fact many other lectures, rather than Rania Hussein. I think students can learn million times more from Ms Hamilton than most teachers since she knows what she's actually doing and is not lost during giving lecture. I did not learn anything in my EE425 class with Rania and I feel like UWB robbed us by having her teach that class and so not happy with it. I'm sure we would learn everything if Nicole was our instructor 😊

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.