COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of North Texas
College of Science
Mathematics
Term: Spring 2023

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

MATH 5420 1
Complex Analysis
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Kirill Lazebnik
Instructor Evaluated: Kirill Lazebnik-Assist Prof

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A
Responses: 6/6 (100% 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:

Median
4.5
(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: 5.8
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median
The course as a whole was:	6	33%	50%	17%				4.2
The course content was:	6	50%	50%					4.5
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	6	67%	17%	17%				4.8
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	6	50%	33%	17%				4.5

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%		50%	17%			4.2
The intellectual challenge presented was:	6	17%	83%						6.1
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	6	17%	50%	17%	17%				5.8
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	6	17%	67%		17%				6.0
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	6	17%	33%	17%	33%				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: 2.8   (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
			33%	33%			17%			17%	

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?   **Class median: 8.5   Hours per credit: 2.8   (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
			33%	33%			17%			17%	

What grade do you expect in this course?   **Class median: 3.3   (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
17%	33%		33%	17%										

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as: **(N=6)**

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
17%	50%	17%		17%	

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of North Texas
College of Science
Mathematics
Term: Spring 2023

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median
Course organization was:	6	50%	33%	17%				4.5
Clarity of instructor's voice was:	6	83%			17%			4.9
Explanations by instructor were:	6	50%	50%					4.5
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	6	67%	33%					4.8
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	6	67%	17%	17%				4.8
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	6	100%						5.0
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	6	100%						5.0
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	6	50%	17%	33%				4.5
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	6	83%			17%			4.9
Answers to student questions were:	6	67%	17%	17%				4.8
Availability of extra help when needed was:	6	67%		17%	17%			4.8
Use of class time was:	6	83%	17%					4.9
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	6	67%	17%		17%			4.8
Amount you learned in the course was:	6	67%	17%	17%				4.8
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	6	67%	33%					4.8
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	6	50%		50%				4.0
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	6	50%	50%					4.5
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	6	83%	17%					4.9

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

MATH 5420 1
Complex Analysis
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Kirill Lazebnik
Instructor Evaluated: Kirill Lazebnik-Assist Prof

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A
Responses: 6/6 (100% very high)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

3. Yes.

6. This class has multiple different math subjects in the background so it forced you to recall a lot of info.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. I thought the lectures were well done and the homework problems themselves were useful

2. It was very helpful that we covered basically everything on the qual syllabus. In my experience, this is unusual, but much appreciated. It was helpful to see pictures and plenty of examples for everything. Your boardwork was very good and easy to follow. I like how you presented theorems and proofs in a slightly different way from the book, and how you expounded on things the book left to the reader.

3. Dr. Lazebnik is an excellent teacher and knows his subject extremely well.

4. The instructor's interest in the subject and their ability to succinctly present the main ideas behind theorems using a visual approach whenever possible and connecting everything with the main 'story' was more engaging and helpful than the usual approach of only writing out theorems and proofs on the board.

6. Being in class and doing homework with peers.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. the homework not being graded was not beneficial. I would've much rather had mandatory graded homeworks. This would've given the students a higher incentive to complete the homeworks, and would've given the instructor more examples of where students were struggling. The professor's office hours were hard for me to attend with my schedule this semester, and so this extra source of feedback and help would've helped a lot.

3. There were too many exams.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. the lectures during test day were really confusing to me. In my opinion they didn't serve a purpose to the class and just detracted from the test. Most of the time the pre-test lectures were just reviewing material, and it wasn't material that was going to show up on the test, and so it only distracted me from the stuff I was about to be tested on. The tests are also not easy in this class, and so the extra time to take them would've been appreciated. I also think the disparity between tests information was off this semester. It seems really hard to generate good questions for the topics covered in this course that can be answered during a normal class period, but each test I really had no idea what types of questions to expect or prepare for. I think a course like this would benefit a lot more with longer take-home tests than in-person tests.

2. I think 3 midterms was maybe one too many. It seemed like every 3 weeks we had another exam, and when taking more than one core, that is hard to manage successfully. I also think the exams could have been the whole 80 minutes. I think it would have been helpful to see some conformal mapping problems as examples or maybe as assigned homework since they're so prevalent on the quals. Lastly, I think if office hours are at 5 or later, it would be helpful to offer them on zoom too.

3. I think there should be less exams in the class.

5. When we ended classes with exams, I found it difficult to concentrate on new material during the lecture, but starting classes with exams would probably also have problems. I don't think there's a correct answer, but in other cores I've taken and as I've heard from other students, cores usually don't get to everything on the qualifying exam syllabus. In another class, I preferred missing material on the syllabus during the school year in favor of spending more time on each other section as opposed to seeing everything but spending less time with each section, although this is just a personal opinion. The class is fine as is though. Most of the difficulties felt like they came from the fact that I might've needed the background from the introductory complex class that there wouldn't be time for. I think other people in this class might feel the similarly about their complex background as well as their topology background. Thanks for teaching us.

6. Strike a balance between written work and exams.

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.