IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

Univ. of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Spanish & Portuguese Studies
Term: Spring 2017

PORT 201 B
Intermediate Portuguese
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Paper
Evaluation Form: E
Responses: 6/6 (100%)

Taught by: Anderson Carvalho Sandes, Eduardo Silva
Instructor Evaluated: Anderson Carvalho Sandes-Lecturer

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
4.9	4.8

(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: 4.3
(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:	6	83%	17%					4.9	4.8
The course content was:	6	50%	50%					4.5	4.4
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	6	100%						5.0	4.9
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	6	83%	17%					4.9	4.8

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:	6	33%		17%	50%				4.5
The intellectual challenge presented was:	6		50%	17%	17%		17%		5.5
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	6			50%	33%	17%			4.5
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	6		33%	17%	33%		17%		4.5
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	6	17%	33%	50%					5.5

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: 8.5 Hours per credit: 1.7 (N=6)

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
		17%	17%	33%	17%			17%			

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

Class median: 8.2 Hours per credit: 1.6 (N=6)

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
	17%		17%	50%				17%			

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.6 (N=6)

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)	E (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
33%	33%	17%	17%											

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

(N=5)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
20%			20%	20%	40%

© 2014, IASystem, University of Washington

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Opportunity for practicing what was learned was:	6	100%						5.0	1
Sequential development of skills was:	6	50%	50%					4.5	14
Explanations of underlying rationales for new techniques or skills were:	6	50%	50%					4.5	17
Demonstrations of expected skills were:	5	100%						5.0	2
Instructor's confidence in students' ability was:	6	100%						5.0	8
Recognition of student progress by instructor was:	6	83%	17%					4.9	10
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	6	67%	33%					4.8	16
Freedom allowed students to develop own skills and ideas was:	6	100%						5.0	9
Instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	6	83%		17%				4.9	7
Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was:	6	67%	17%	17%				4.8	11
Availability of extra help when needed was:	6	100%						5.0	3
Use of class time was:	6	50%	33%	17%				4.5	15
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	6	100%						5.0	6
Amount you learned in the course was:	6	33%	67%					4.2	18
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	6	67%	33%					4.8	13
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	6	83%	17%					4.9	4
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	6	83%	17%					4.9	5
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	6	67%	33%					4.8	12

© 2014, IASystem, University of Washington