

Instructional Assessment System

CHEM 2401 001
Chemistry
School of Natural Sci. & Math.
University of Texas at Dallas
A

Donovan Haines
Assistant Professor
Spring 2007

DEPARTMENT COPY

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

PERCENTAGES ¹

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 course as a whole was:	18	17	39	33	11		3.6	3 ...	3 ...
2. The course content was:	18	17	33	39	6	6	3.5	2 ..	3 ...
3. The instructor's contribution to the course was:	18	39	33	22	6		4.2	4	5
4. The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subj matter was:	18	39	11	39	6	6	3.5	2 ..	2 ..
COMBINED ITEMS 1-4	72	28	29	33	7	3	3.7	3 ...	3 ...
5. Course organization was:	18	22	17	39	17	6	3.2	1 •	1 •
6. Clarity of instructor's voice was:	18	61	17	22			4.7	6	7
7. Explanations by instructor were:	18	39	28	28	6		4.1	5	5
8. Instr's ability to present alternative explan. when needed was:	18	39	33	22	6		4.2	5	6
9. Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	18	33	28	22	17		3.9	3 ...	4
10. Quality of questions or problems raised by instructor was:	18	39	17	33		11	3.8	3 ...	4
11. Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	18	39	28	22	6	6	4.1	2 ..	2 ..
12. Instructor's enthusiasm was:	18	44	22	33			4.3	4	5
13. Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	18	39	33	22	6		4.2	3 ...	5
14. Answers to student questions were:	18	39	28	28	6		4.1	5	5
15. Availability of extra help when needed was:	18	33	33	28	6	6	4.0	5	5
16. Use of class time was:	18	33	22	33	6	6	3.8	3 ...	3 ...
17. Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	18	50	17	33			4.5	6	7
18. Amount you learned in the course was:	18	39	11	39	6	6	3.5	2 ..	3 ...
19. Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	18	33	22	33	6	6	3.8	3 ...	4
20. Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, etc.) were:	18	28	44	28			4.0	4	5
21. Reasonableness of assigned work was:	18	33	39	22	6		4.1	5	6
22. Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	18	28	22	44	6		3.5	2 ..	2 ..

Relative to other college courses you have taken:

Respondents	PERCENTAGES ¹						MEDIAN	DECILE RANK	
	Much Higher (7)	Average (6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	Much Lower (2) (1)		Institution	College
23. Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	17	6	6	24	53	12	4.2	1 •	1 •
24. The intellectual challenge presented was:	17	18	24	24	6	6	5.1	3 ...	3 ...
25. The amount of effort you put into this course was:	17	12	24	35	18	6	5.1	3 ...	4
26. The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	17	18	18	41	12	6	5.1	3 ...	3 ...
27. Your involvement in course (assignments, attendance, etc.) was:	17	24	47	24	6		4.9	1 •	2 ..

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>
Under 2	Under 2	11 A (3.9-4.0)	100 In your major
17 2-3	17 2-3	17 A- (3.5-3.8)	A distribution requirement
11 4-5	33 4-5	17 B+ (3.2-3.4)	An elective
17 6-7	17 6-7	33 B (2.9-3.1)	In your minor
22 8-9	11 8-9	6 B- (2.5-2.8)	A program requirement
6 10-11	11 10-11	6 C+ (2.2-2.4)	Other
11 12-13	6 12-13	6 C (1.9-2.1)	
17 14-15	6 14-15	C- (1.5-2.1)	
16-17	6 16-17	D+ (1.2-1.4)	
18-19	18-19	D (0.9-1.1)	
20-21	20-21	D- (0.7-0.8)	
22 or more	22 or more	E (0.0)	
Respondents: 18	Respondents: 18	6 Pass	Challenge and Engagement Index
Class median: 8.0	Class median: 5.5	Credit	CEI = 3 ... (decile rank)
Hours per credit: 2.00	Hours per credit: 1.38	No Credit	
		Respondents: 18	
		Class median: 3.1	

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