Instructional Assessment System

MATH 2420 501
Mathematical Sciences
School of Natural Sci. & Math.
University of Texas at Dallas
ELEC

Janos Turi
Professor
Autumn 2006

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	DECILE RANK College
1. The course as a whole was:	25	4	8	48	16	20	4	2.7	0	0
2. The course content was:	25	4	16	56	20	4		3.0	0	0
3. The instructor's contribution to the course was:	25	4	8	48	20	16	4	2.7	0	0
4 The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subj. matter was:	25	4		52	16	20	8	2.6	0	0
COMBINED ITEMS 1-4	100	4	8	51	18	15	4	2.8	0	0
5. Course organization was:	25	12	20	44	12	8	4	3.1	1 •	1 •
6. Sequential presentation of concepts was:	25	16	24	32	16	12		3.2	0	1 •
7. Explanations by instructor were:	25	4	8	44	16	20	8	2.6	0	0
8. Instr's ability to present alternative explan. when needed was:	25	4	4	48	20	16	8	2.6	0	0
9. Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	25	4	12	40	28	4	12	2.7	0	0
10. Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:	25	4	8	32	20	24	12	2.2	0	0
11. Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	25	32	20	36	12			3.6	0	1 •
12. Instructor's enthusiasm was:	25	8	16	40	28	4	4	2.9	0	0
13. Clarity of course objectives was:	25	8	16	36	20	12	8	2.8	0	0
14 Interest level of class sessions was:	25	4		36	36	16	8	2.2	0	0
15. Availability of extra help when needed was:	25	12	28	32	16	12		3.2	1 •	1 •
16. Use of class time was:	25	8	32	40	12	4	4	3.3	1 •	1 •
17. Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	25	12	32	28	16	4	8	3.3	1 •	1 •
18. Amount you learned in the course was:	25	4	28	36	20	8	4	3.0	1 •	1 •
19. Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	25	4	20	52	16	8		3.0	0	1 •
20. Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, etc.) were:	25	8	16	40	8	16	12	2 9	0	1 •
21. Reasonableness of assigned work was:	24	8	21	33	12	25		2.9	0	0
22. Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was	25	12	28	24	20	12	4	3.1	0	0

Relative to other college courses you have taken:	Respondents	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	Much Lower (2)	(1)	MEDIAN	DECILE RANK Institution	DECILE RANK College
23. Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	25		16	16	24	8	12	24	3.8	0	0
24. The intellectual challenge presented was:	25	24	44	16	12	4			5 9	7 •••••••	7 •••••••
25. The amount of effort you put into this course was:	25	16	40	16	24	4			5.7	6 ••••••	6 ••••••
26 The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	25	32	36	20	12				6.0	8 ••••••••	7 •••••••
27. Your involvement in course (assignments, attendance, etc.) was:	25	20	32	24	20	4			5.6	4 ••••	5 •••••

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

Percent	
	Under 2
12	2-3
28	4-5
36	6-7
4	8-9
	10-11
12	12-13
	14-15
8	16-17
	18-19
	20-21
	22 or more

Respondents: 25
Class median: 6.1
Hours per credit: 1.51

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

Percent	
8	Under 2
32	2-3
12	4-5
28	6-7
12	8-9
4	10-11
	12-13
4	14-15
	16-17
	18-19
	20-21
	22 or more

Respondents: 25
Class median: 5.2
Hours per credit: 1.29

30. What grade do you expect in this course?

Percent		
4	A	(3.9-4.0)
12	A-	(3 5-3.8)
8	B+	(3 2-3.4)
20	B	(2.9-3.1)
16	B-	(2.5-2.8)
12	C+	(2.2-2.4)
8	C	(1.9-2.1)
20	C-	(1.5-2.1)
	D+	(1.2-1.4)
	D	(0.9-1.1)
	D-	(0.7-0 8)
	E	(0.0)
	Pass	
	Credit	
	No Credit	

Respondents: 25
Class median: 2.7

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

Percent	
88	In your major
	A distribution requirement
	An elective
8	In your minor
4	A program requirement
	Other

Challenge and Engagement Index

CEI = 7 ••••••• (decile rank)

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

© 2006, University of Washington-OEA

Batch TD 521-000716

AU06:02317
SURVEY ID

Respondents: **25**
Enrollment **37**
Classes: **1**

B
Form Type

Mailbox.
ChairCopy? **No**
printed 1/26/2007