Instructional Assessment System

MATH 2333 002
Mathematical Sciences
School of Natural Sci. & Math.
University of Texas at Dallas
DLEC

Randall Rausch
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] E (5)	VG (4)	G (3)	F (2)	P (1)	VP (0)	MEDIAN	DECILE RANK Institution	College
1. The course as a whole was:	26	4	15	54	23	4		2.9	0	0
2. The course content was:	27	4	11	59	19	7		2.9	0	0
3. The instructor's contribution to the course was:	27	11	19	44	19	7		3.0	0	1 •
4. The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subj. matter was:	27	4	19	37	37	4		2.8	0	1 •
COMBINED ITEMS 1-4	107	6	16	49	24	6		2.9	0	0
5. Course organization was:	27	4	26	33	30	7		2.9	0	0
6. Sequential presentation of concepts was:	27	11	26	30	26	7		3.1	0	1 •
7. Explanations by instructor were:	27	4	15	37	26	19		2.7	0	0
8. Instr's ability to present alternative explan. when needed was:	27	4	15	30	33	19		2.4	0	0
9. Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	27	15	19	33	15	19		3.0	0	1 •
10. Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:	27	4	19	37	30	11		2.8	0	1 •
11. Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	27	15	26	30	22	4	4	3.2	0	0
12. Instructor's enthusiasm was:	27	11	22	48	19			3.2	0	1 •
13. Clarity of course objectives was:	27	7	26	33	22	7	4	3.0	0	1 •
14. Interest level of class sessions was:	27	7	11	33	41	4	4	2.6	0	1 •
15. Availability of extra help when needed was:	27	15	19	37	26	4		3.1	0	1 •
16. Use of class time was:	27	15	30	33	15	7		3.3	1 •	1 •
17. Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	27	11	19	41	19	11		3.0	0	0
18. Amount you learned in the course was:	27	4	30	41	19	4	4	3.1	1 •	1 •
19. Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	27	7	15	30	30	7	11	2.6	0	0
20. Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, etc.) were:	27	19	22	33	22		4	3.2	1 •	1 •
21. Reasonableness of assigned work was:	27	26	30	26	19			3.7	3 •••	3 •••
22. Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	27	22	33	19	22	4		3.7	2 ••	3 •••

Relative to other college courses you have taken:

		Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)			
23. Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	26	8	38	19	27	4		4	5.3	5 •••••	6 ••••••
24. The intellectual challenge presented was:	26		42	31	23		4		5.3	4 ••••	3 •••
25. The amount of effort you put into this course was:	26	15	12	31	31	8	4		4.8	2 ••	2 ••
26 The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	26	12	27	27	15	12	8		5.1	3 •••	3 •••
27. Your involvement in course (assignments, attendance, etc.) was:	26	4	27	38	27	4			5.0	2 ••	2 ••

28. On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course?

Percent	
12	Under 2
12	2-3
29	4-5
21	6-7
8	8-9
4	10-11
8	12-13
	14-15
4	16-17
	18-19
	20-21
	22 or more

Respondents: 24
Class median: 5.2
Hours per credit:

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

Percent	
39	Under 2
17	2-3
22	4-5
9	6-7
	8-9
4	10-11
	12-13
4	14-15
4	16-17
	18-19
	20-21
	22 or more

Respondents: 23
Class median: 2.8
Hours per credit:

30. What grade do you expect in this course?

Percent	
31	A (3.9-4.0)
38	A- (3.5-3.8)
8	B+ (3.2-3.4)
12	B (2.9-3.1)
4	B- (2.5-2.8)
	C+ (2.2-2.4)
4	C (1.9-2.1)
	C- (1.5-2.1)
	D+ (1.2-1.4)
4	D (0.9-1.1)
	D- (0.7-0.8)
	E (0.0)
	Pass
	Credit
	No Credit

Respondents: 26
Class median: 3.6

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

Percent	
23	In your major
15	A distribution requirement
	An elective
4	In your minor
58	A program requirement
	Other

Challenge and Engagement Index

CEI = 2 •• (decile rank)

1. *Percentages are based on the number of students who rated each item*

© 2006, University of Washington-OEA

Batch TD 467-001505

AU07:01122
SURVEY ID

Respondents: 27
Enrollment: 53
Classes: 1

B
Form Type

Mailbox:
ChairCopy? No
printed: 1/16/2008