

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT

Numeric Responses

Univ. of Washington, Bothell Engineering and Mathematics

Term: Spring 2016

Evaluation Delivery: Online Evaluation Form: A

Responses: 3/4 (75%)

B EE 495 C

Capstone Project In Electrical Engineering I

Course type: Face-to-Face Taught by: Nicole Hamilton

Instructor Evaluated: Nicole Hamilton-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:

4.1

College Decile

Median

(0=lowest; 5=highest)

(0=lowest; 9=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: 5.5 (1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median		LE RANK College
The course as a whole was:	3		67%	33%				3.8	2	3
The course content was:	3	33%	67%					4.2	5	6
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	3	33%	33%	33%				4.0	2	3
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	3	33%	67%					4.2	4	5

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

STUDEN	II ENGAG	EWIENI															
								Much Higher			Average			Much Lower		DEC	LE RANK
Relative	to other o	college co	urses you	ı have tak	en:		N .	(7)	(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Median		College
Do you e	xpect your	grade in	this course	to be:			3			67%	33%				4.8	2	4
The intelle	ectual chal	llenge pre	sented was	s:			3	67%		33%					6.8	9	8
The amou	e amount of effort you put into this course was:				3	33%	33%		33%				6.0	7	7		
The amou	e amount of effort to succeed in this course was:					3	33%	33%	33%					6.0	7	6	
Your invo		course (d	doing assig	ınments, at	tending cla	asses,	3	33%	33%		33%				6.0	6	6
including	attending of	classes, d		ngs, review		his course, writing					Class	media	an: 5.0	Hours	per cred	lit: 2.	5 (N=3)
Under 2	2-3		4-5 67%	6-7	8-9	10-11		1 2-13 33%		14-15	16	6-17	18-	19	20-21	22	or more
	total avera in advancir	0		w many do	you cons	ider were					Class	media	an: 5.0	Hours	per cred	lit: 2.	5 (N=3)
Under 2	2-3		4-5 67%	6-7 33%	8-9	10-11		12-13		14-15	16	6-17	18-	19	20-21	22	or more
What grad	de do you	expect in	this course	∍?										Cla	ss media	an: 3.	5 (N=3)
A (3.9-4.0)	A- (3.5-3.8) 67%	B+ (3.2-3.4) 33%	B (2.9-3.1)	B- (2.5-2.8)	C+ (2.2-2.4)	C (1.9-2.1)	C- (1.5-1.	_	D+ 2-1.4)	D (0.9-1.1	D- (0.7-		E (0.0)	Pas	s Cre	edit	No Credit
In regard	to your ac	ademic p	rogram, is	this course	best desc	cribed as:											(N=3)
A core/distribution In your major requirement 100%		An	elective		ln y	your m	ninor	Арі	rogram	ı require	ment		Other				



COURSE SUMMARY REPORT Numeric Responses

Univ. of Washington, Bothell Engineering and Mathematics Term: Spring 2016

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS										
	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median		LE RANK College
Course organization was:	3		67%		33%			3.8	3	3
Clarity of instructor's voice was:	3	33%	67%					4.2	3	3
Explanations by instructor were:	3	67%	33%					4.8	8	8
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	3	67%		33%				4.8	8	8
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	3	67%	33%					4.8	7	7
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	3	33%	33%	33%				4.0	3	4
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	3	33%	33%		33%			4.0	1	2
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	3	67%	33%					4.8	6	7
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	3	67%		33%				4.8	6	7
Answers to student questions were:	3	67%		33%				4.8	8	8
Availability of extra help when needed was:	3	33%	67%					4.2	4	4
Use of class time was:	3	67%			33%			4.8	8	8
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	3	67%	33%					4.8	7	7
Amount you learned in the course was:	3	33%	67%					4.2	5	5
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	3	33%	67%					4.2	4	5
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	3	67%			33%			4.8	8	8
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	3	33%	33%	33%				4.0	4	4
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	3	33%	33%		33%			4.0	3	4



COURSE SUMMARY REPORT

Student Comments

Univ. of Washington, Bothell Engineering and Mathematics Term: Spring 2016

Evaluation Delivery: Online Evaluation Form: A

Responses: 3/4 (75%)

B EE 495 C

Capstone Project In Electrical Engineering I Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Nicole Hamilton

Instructor Evaluated: Nicole Hamilton-Lecturer

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

- 1. Yes. So much stuff to learn
- 2. Nicole is great at posing examples and explaining concepts without giving away what we need to figure out.
- 3. yes, Verilog was never my strength.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

- 1. Helping us understand by going step by step
- 2. Nicole provided great explanations and information related to the project.
- 3. Your enthusiasm was motivational.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

- 1. It's complicated stuff
- 2. The class was a little disorganized, partly my fault for not motivating the other group members.
- 3. I felt like I was prepared for this project, but I would not drag the team down.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

- 1. Nothing
- 2. Stress the importance of organization.
- 3. Not necessary for this course, but have a Verilog course, like CSS 162 etc, as a core. We should have done more research on this project, or recommend a few references if you could.

© 2014, IASystem, University of Washington Survey no: 14137

Printed: 6/26/16

Page 3 of 3