

ESRM 351 A
Wildlife Research Techniques
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: X
Responses: 13/16 (81% very high)

Taught by: Danny Kosiba, Laura Prugh
Instructor Evaluated: Laura Prugh-Assoc Prof

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
4.8	4.9
(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: 4.4
(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:	13	77%	15%	8%				4.8	4.9
The course content was:	13	77%	15%	8%				4.8	4.8
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	13	85%	15%					4.9	4.9
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	13	69%	23%	8%				4.8	4.8

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Relative to other college courses you have taken:									
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	13		23%	23%	38%	15%			4.4
The intellectual challenge presented was:	13	8%	38%	15%	23%	15%			5.2
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	13	8%	46%	15%	31%				5.6
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	13	8%	15%	38%	38%				4.8
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	13	31%	23%	23%	23%				5.7

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: 9.0 Hours per credit: 1.8 (N=13)

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
	15%	15%	8%	15%	8%	38%					

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

Class median: 6.5 Hours per credit: 1.3 (N=13)

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
8%	15%	23%	8%	31%	15%						

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.4 (N=13)

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
8%	38%	23%	15%	8%				8%						

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

(N=13)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
85%			15%		

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

How frequently was each of the following a true description of this course?	N	Always		(5)	About Half		(2)	Never (1)	Median	Relative Rank
		(7)	(6)		(4)	(3)				
The instructor gave very clear explanations.	13	54%	38%		8%				6.6	5
The instructor successfully rephrased explanations to clear up confusion.	13	69%	23%		8%				6.8	3
Class sessions were interesting and engaging.	13	54%	23%	15%	8%				6.6	4
Class sessions were well organized.	13	69%	23%		8%				6.8	2
Student participation was encouraged.	13	54%	38%	8%					6.6	11
Students were aware of what was expected of them.	13	54%	23%	8%	15%				6.6	7
Extra help was readily available.	13	62%	23%	8%	8%				6.7	9
Assigned readings and other out-of-class work were valuable.	13	69%	23%		8%				6.8	1
Grades were assigned fairly.	13	62%	23%	8%	8%				6.7	10
Meaningful feedback on tests and other work was provided.	13	62%	23%	8%	8%				6.7	6
Evaluation of student performance was related to important course goals.	13	62%	31%		8%				6.7	8

Relative to other college courses you have taken, how would you describe your progress in this course with regards to:	N	Great		(5)	Average		(2)	None (1)	Median	Relative Rank
		(7)	(6)		(4)	(3)				
Learning the conceptual and factual knowledge of this course.	13	38%	38%	15%	8%				6.2	7
Developing an appreciation for the field in which this course resides.	13	85%	8%			8%			6.9	1
Understanding written material in this field.	13	54%	31%	15%					6.6	2
Developing an ability to express yourself in writing or orally in this field.	13	54%	23%	23%					6.6	3
Understanding and solving problems in this field.	13	46%	46%	8%					6.4	6
Applying the course material to real world issues or other disciplines.	13	62%	31%	8%					6.7	4
General intellectual development.	13	54%	31%	8%		8%			6.6	5

ESRM 351 A
Wildlife Research Techniques
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: X
Responses: 13/16 (81% very high)

Taught by: Danny Kosiba, Laura Prugh
Instructor Evaluated: Laura Prugh-Assoc Prof

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

2. This class was really amazing, it taught me about all different types of research methods that I might not have known about before. I wasn't sure about my minor before taking this class, but it really helped me realize my love for wildlife research.
3. This class was intellectually stimulating and was just the right amount of rigorous in-class work and challenging but fun field work.
4. It was intellectually stimulating. I learned a lot about animals.
5. Yes! It was a super fun class!
7. This class really stretched my thinking by having hands on learning activities where we could practice the skills being taught.
8. Assignments and trips were very stimulating and engaging.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The field trips and hands on learning
2. The lectures were very interesting, as well as the lab sections. The field trips were really awesome and I'm so glad we got to go on those trips!
3. Attending lectures, field trips and labs were the highest contributor, in addition to doing lots of outside-of-class work for our term project--the study guides for exams and lecture slides were the biggest contributor for prepping for exams.
4. The lectures and assignments
5. The field trips.
6. Field trips! Field experience was so fun and truly helpful!
7. The labs and field trips really helped me learn a ton in this class. They were also incredibly fun!
8. Hands on experience

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

2. N/A
3. Nothing really detracted from my learning at all--the course was at a good pace, had a reasonable amount of work that was fun to do, and Prof. Prugh was a great lecturer and teacher, especially in the field with hands-on learning.
4. Nothing
5. None.
7. I can't say there was anything that really detracted from my learning but it did feel a bit overwhelming to have a big project and paper due very close to when we had a big final.
8. Long lectures

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

2. None - this has been my favorite class in my time at UW so far!
3. I felt a bit confused on the Grinnellian-style journal entries and what they should look like, and I also felt that this skill is something I would've wanted to practice more in the class because it would be useful for a future career in environmental sciences.
4. None
5. None, it was so fun!
7. I would suggest making sure that the canvas page is up to date. On more than 1 occasion an assignment was locked when it shouldn't be, access to viewing a document wasn't granted until later etc. Having the canvas page working as should really helps the students

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.