IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

PUBPOL 526 BB
Program Evaluation
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Vedavati Patwardhan
Instructor Evaluated: Vedavati Patwardhan-TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A1
Responses: 28/35 (80% very high)

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:

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
4.2	**4.3**
(0=lowest; 5=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: 4.2
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The course as a whole was:	29	34%	41%	10%	10%	3%		4.1	4.3
The course content was:	29	41%	34%	10%	10%	3%		4.2	4.4
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	29	48%	28%	14%	10%			4.4	4.5
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	28	39%	39%	11%	11%			4.2	4.3

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Relative to other college courses you have taken:	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	28	11%	36%	14%	39%				5.2
The intellectual challenge presented was:	28	11%	18%	25%	39%	4%	4%		4.6
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	28	11%	25%	14%	39%	11%			4.5
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	28	7%	29%	25%	32%	7%			4.9
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	28	18%	25%	7%	46%	4%			4.5

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: 2.9 (N=27)**

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
30%	30%	11%	22%	4%							4%

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?   **Class median: 2.5 (N=27)**

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
37%	26%	15%	19%							4%	

What grade do you expect in this course?   **Class median: 3.6 (N=27)**

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)	F (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
15%	63%	19%										4%		

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as: **(N=28)**

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
11%	64%			25%	

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Course organization was:	28	46%	29%	14%	11%			4.4	3
Clarity of instructor's voice was:	28	50%	29%	14%	7%			4.5	10
Explanations by instructor were:	28	43%	21%	29%	7%			4.2	11
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	27	41%	22%	22%	15%			4.1	13
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	28	50%	21%	21%	7%			4.5	5
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	28	36%	32%	25%	4%	4%		4.1	16
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	27	44%	37%	7%	7%	4%		4.3	14
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	28	50%	32%	11%	7%			4.5	9
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	27	59%	26%	11%	4%			4.7	4
Answers to student questions were:	28	32%	39%	18%	11%			4.0	17
Availability of extra help when needed was:	28	50%	21%	25%	4%			4.5	7
Use of class time was:	28	36%	29%	25%	7%	4%		4.0	12
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	28	50%	32%	14%	4%			4.5	8
Amount you learned in the course was:	28	32%	32%	14%	14%	4%	4%	3.9	15
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	28	32%	39%	18%	7%		4%	4.0	18
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	28	46%	32%	14%	7%			4.4	6
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	28	54%	25%	18%	4%			4.6	1
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	28	54%	29%	14%	4%			4.6	2
How comfortable were students expressing opinions in class?	28	64%	21%	7%	4%		4%	4.7	
To what degree were multiple perspectives represented in class discussions and reading assignments?	28	43%	32%	18%	4%		4%	4.3	
How effectively were diversity issues brought into the course (e.g. race, gender, sexual orientation, disability, political ideology, socio-economic class)?	28	39%	32%	25%	4%			4.2	

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

PUBPOL 526 BB
Program Evaluation
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Vedavati Patwardhan
Instructor Evaluated: Vedavati Patwardhan-TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A1
Responses: 28/35 (80% very high)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Was this class intellectually stimulating? Did it stretch your thinking? Why or why not?

1. I found this class really helpful and stimulating.

2. Yes. This class stretched my thinking in that we were asked to think about programs and policies using an evaluation lens, which I have never used before.

3. It varied significantly from class to class. Some sections felt valuable, and I think those were based on analyzing examples. The quality of examples varied a bit though.

4. The practical exercises were interesting ways to apply concepts learned in class.

5. This class served as a time to re-explain concepts and add new examples. Some off the items can be very repetitive and time could be spent doing other activities to push us a bit further

6. Yes, I loved being able to dive into specific topics we had discussed in lecture, to talk through examples (i.e. programs in other communities) and apply tools to those examples, and the opportunity to learn about other students' projects and share information about our own projects; it enabled me to think about the program in new ways (being able to share and hear from others).

7. I feel as of time spent in quiz section was mostly revisiting basic definitions that I had noted in lecture, it didnt further stimulate much.

8. Great supplement to the lectures, and pertinent exercises. Veda is the bests TA!

9. Veda did a great job facilitating this section and making us come up with our own answers to questions often through group discussions.

11. Quiz section was a good refresher but felt a little like overkill. I feel we could have used the quiz section to learn more rather than just review.

12. The examples used to demonstrate class concepts and further breakdown and explanation of concepts was helpful.

13. yes

14. Definitely - Veda did an excellent job preparing content that complemented the main class well - by either providing a new perspective on a topic or delving into a topic that was not discussed in-depth in the main course (e.g., meta analysis and program harms).

15. This class wasn't the most intellectually stimulating, but Veda always brought in really good examples to continue whatever topic we discussed in class that week, so it was always interesting.

17. Not particularly. Getting to talk with classmates about aspects of the project I found myself pigeonholed into was somewhat interesting, if only because of the diversity of programs around the world, but as far as quiz sections go this one was pretty boring.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Veda provided great examples in class and good opportunities for group discussion. She is really approachable and supportive.

2. The practical, hands-on use of evaluation skills and methods with real-life examples was very beneficial.

3. Analyzing examples, discussing our evals with other people.

4. Case studies

5. The best aspects of this quiz section were the explanation of concepts when asked for. They added to the knowledge base and picking out essential items

6. The whole course layout exactly as it was was meaningful, from the dialogue to the examples to the TA's knowledge and so on.

7. Collaboration and visiting with other groups.

8. Discussion slides were very helpful.

9. The review of the lecture materials was very helpful, as was the group work we did usually about our projects.

10. The way the TA brought extra concepts to section (to complement those learned in class or dig deeper), interesting examples, and topics from her own research

11. When we got to work with other students.

12. Thank you for letting me participate in the closest thing to a deeper discussion where there was disagreement with other students - professors and other TAs like to not have difficult conversations, but the closest I've come to arguing with someone in class was with your QS. Thank you for that opportunity and for your review of all concepts.

13. I think the program evaluation project fostered my understanding of different program assessments.

14. Veda is an excellent lecturer - she prepares really great content, is organized and efficient, and asks great prompting questions. In addition, I appreciated the mix of lecture, small group discussion, and large group discussion - as well as the opportunity to apply course concepts to our projects during class (usually in small groups).

15. I really liked the real-world examples of policy/programs that Veda would bring in for us to discuss. Getting class time to work on our projects was also really helpful.

16. Small group discussions or with partners

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. In the beginning of the quarter, Veda did not seem confident in her knowledge of program evaluation and sometimes gave answers that contradicted class instruction. However, she improved as the quarter went on and that is a sign that she is willing to learn.

2. Nothing. Veda ran a very organized and purposeful quiz section.

3. Rehashing concepts from lecture, didn't feel like this was that needed.

4. Nothing

6. N/A

7. It didnt detract from my learning, just didnt much add to it.

8. Getting to class early.

11. Felt a little repetitive.

12. Sometimes filler words were distracting.

13. no

14. None

15. The comments about the class being quiet got annoying, but nothing else detracted from learning.

17. There was a mandatory sign-in sheet.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Can we make section optional?

2. If time allows, I would recommend Veda set aside additional time for workshopping evaluation plans with classmates.

3. More focus on examples, analyzing those to get practice applying the concepts used in lecture.

4. None

5. I would address more new concepts or add time to work through project questions, so that time and new ideas and concerns can be focused on making the end product better

6. N/A -- I thought the layout was perfect and stimulating.

7. Dive deeper into topics discussed in lecture, have us do real life practice (create interview questions, actually interview someone, etc). Reiteration of lecture material at surface level isn't very useful

8. Veda doesn't really have a say on this I think but less readings, there were too many to get done and digest.

11. Focus on new material or time to workshop our project.

12. Better time management with classes and more time to edit feedback from Memos.

13. I think overall its good

14. None

15. None. I appreciate how available Veda was to answer questions on our projects, including staying after class and scheduling appointments outside of office hours. Thank you, Veda!

17. Eliminate mandatory quiz sections.

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.