

Instructional Assessment System

CHEM 1111 105
Chemistry
School of Natural Sci. & Math.
University of Texas at Dallas
H

Sandhya Gavva
Lecturer
Autumn 2007

DEPARTMENT COPY

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

E=Excellent; VG=Very Good; G=Good; F=Fair; P=Poor; VP=Very Poor

Respondents	PERCENTAGES ¹						MEDIAN	DECILE RANK	
	E (5)	VG (4)	G (3)	F (2)	P (1)	VP (0)		Institution	College
1. The lab section as a whole was:	29	14	14	66	7		3.2	1•	1•
2. The content of the lab section was:	28	4	29	61	7		3.2	1•	1•
3. The lab instructor's contribution to the course was:	26	15	8	38	35	4	2.8	0	0
4. The lab instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subj. matter was:	27	15	15	30	37	4	2.8	0	1•
COMBINED ITEMS 1-4	110	12	16	49	21	2	3.1	0	1•
5. Explanations by the lab instructor were:	27	19	15	26	33	4	2.9	0	1•
6. Lab instructor's preparedness for lab sessions was:	27	7	52	26	15		3.7	3•••	2••
7. Quality of questions or problems raised by the lab instructor was:	27	4	26	37	30	4	3.0	0	0
8. Lab instructor's enthusiasm was:	28	18	29	32	14	7	3.4	1•	1•
9. Student confidence in lab instructor's knowledge was:	27	19	30	33	11	7	3.4	2••	1•
10. Lab instructor's ability to solve unexpected problems was:	27	11	22	48	11	7	3.2	1•	0
11. Answers to student questions were:	28	11	18	36	29	4	2.9	0	0
12. Interest level of lab sessions was:	29	14	7	41	28	10	2.8	1•	1•
13. Communication and enforcement of safety procedures were:	29	21	34	34	3	7	3.7	3•••	2••
14. Lab instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	27	7	19	44	26	4	3.0	1•	0
15. Availability of extra help when needed was:	29	10	14	38	24	10	2.8	0	0
16. Use of lab section time was:	29	14	34	24	24	3	3.4	1•	2••
17. Lab instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	28	11	21	36	32		3.0	0	0
18. Amount you learned in the lab sections was:	29	3	31	28	34	3	2.9	0	1•
19. Relevance and usefulness of lab section content were:	29	7	28	41	21	3	3.1	1•	1•
20. Coordination between lectures and lab activities was:	29	21	17	31	21	10	3.1	2••	1•
21. Reasonableness of assigned work for lab section was:	29	21	24	41	10	3	3.4	1•	2••
22. Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	29	10	34	28	24	3	3.3	1•	1•

Relative to other college courses you have taken:

Respondents	Much Higher						Average						Much Lower						MEDIAN	DECILE RANK							
	(7)	(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(7)	(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(7)	(6)	(5)	(4)		(3)	(2)	(1)	Institution	College			
23. Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	29	28	34	14	21	3																			5.9	7••••••	8••••••
24. The intellectual challenge presented was:	29	7	14	28	31	10	3	7																	4.4	1•	1•
25. The amount of effort you put into this course was:	29	3	14	24	41	7	10																		4.3	0	0
26. The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	28	4	11	25	32	14	11	4																	4.2	0	0
27. Your involvement in course (assignments, attendance, etc.) was:	28	14	18	7	46	14																			4.3	0	0

28. On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course?	29. From the total average hours spent, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?	30. What grade do you expect in this course?	31. In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as:
<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>
38 Under 2	38 Under 2	72 A (3.9-4.0)	69 In your major
28 2-3	52 2-3	17 A- (3.5-3.8)	A distribution requirement
28 4-5	7 4-5	7 B+ (3.2-3.4)	3 An elective
3 6-7	3 6-7	7 B (2.9-3.1)	3 In your minor
3 8-9	10-11	B- (2.5-2.8)	24 A program requirement
10-11	12-13	C+ (2.2-2.4)	Other
12-13	14-15	C (1.9-2.1)	
14-15	16-17	C- (1.5-2.1)	
16-17	18-19	D+ (1.2-1.4)	
18-19	20-21	D (0.9-1.1)	
20-21	22 or more	D- (0.7-0.8)	
22 or more		E (0.0)	
Respondents: 29	Respondents: 29	3 Pass	Challenge and Engagement Index
Class median: 2.4	Class median: 2.0	Credit	CEI = 0 (decile rank)
Hours per credit: 2.38	Hours per credit: 1.97	No Credit	
		Respondents: 29	
		Class median: 3.9	