

MATH 1720 310
Calculus II
Course type: Face-to-Face
Taught by: Ignat Soroko
Instructor Evaluated: Ignat Soroko-Other

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A
Responses: 15/41 (37% moderate)

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
4.7
(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: 5.7
(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:	14	57%	14%	7%	21%			4.6
The course content was:	14	50%	21%	7%	21%			4.5
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	14	79%		14%	7%			4.9
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	14	64%	14%	7%	14%			4.7

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:	14	21%	14%	7%	29%	21%		7%	4.2
The intellectual challenge presented was:	14	50%	29%		7%	14%			6.5
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	14	50%	14%	14%	7%	14%			6.5
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	14	50%	21%		14%	14%			6.5
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	14	50%	29%	7%	7%	7%			6.5

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: 9.5 Hours per credit: 3.2 (N=14)

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
	7%	14%	21%	7%	14%	21%	7%	7%			

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

Class median: 7.5 Hours per credit: 2.5 (N=14)

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
	29%	14%	7%	21%	7%	14%	7%				

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.1 (N=14)

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
21%	21%	7%	7%		14%	21%		7%						

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

(N=14)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
79%	14%			7%	

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median
Course organization was:	14	64%	7%	21%	7%			4.7
Clarity of instructor's voice was:	14	57%	21%	7%	14%			4.6
Explanations by instructor were:	14	71%	7%		14%	7%		4.8
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	14	71%		14%	7%		7%	4.8
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	14	71%	7%	14%	7%			4.8
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	14	64%	7%	14%	14%			4.7
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	14	71%	7%	14%	7%			4.8
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	14	79%		14%	7%			4.9
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	14	64%	14%	7%	14%			4.7
Answers to student questions were:	14	50%	29%	7%	7%		7%	4.5
Availability of extra help when needed was:	14	79%		7%	14%			4.9
Use of class time was:	14	79%		7%	14%			4.9
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	14	64%	14%	7%	7%	7%		4.7
Amount you learned in the course was:	14	57%	21%	7%	14%			4.6
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	14	64%	14%	14%	7%			4.7
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	14	64%	7%	21%	7%			4.7
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	14	71%		14%	14%			4.8
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	14	57%	14%	21%	7%			4.6

MATH 1720 310
Calculus II
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A
Responses: 15/41 (37% moderate)

Taught by: Ignat Soroko
Instructor Evaluated: Ignat Soroko-Other

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Yes it absolutely did, instructor was extremely good. It did stretch my thinking because of both the difficulty of the content but also through the teaching by the professor.
2. Yes, was the perfect level of challenging.
3. Yes, subject material and teaching was good.
4. 1
5. Yes, this class is very difficult and stimulating, I try my hardest and get by but I know others put in more work.
6. Yes , the teacher was great . Good explanation
7. Yes it was, it was relatively difficult.
8. Hard class content.
9. Yes, but maybe too much
10. Very. Soroko was very enthusiastic and taught very well. Very lovable
11. yes
12. Yes, the class was intellectually stimulating due to the professor's ability
13. Yes, we touched many interesting topics.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The instructor's examples and explanations.
2. The teaching method.
3. The way the professor teaches, as well as the quizzes.
4. 1
5. The class itself was very helpful, 2.5 hr calculus lectures are not the most fun, however you can get a lot done.
6. Everything
7. having quizzes every week
8. Cengage
9. The notes being posted online
10. Homeworks/Prof
11. nothing
12. The professor's ability to make problems very simple for new concepts introduced and slowly accumulating the challenge of problems.
13. I believe there are generally two types of effective mathematics professors: The first type delves deeply into subjects, earnestly striving to enhance students' learning. Although this approach may be challenging for some to keep up with, it benefits those who can. The second type assesses students' strengths early on and tailors their teaching to accommodate everyone. If certain students seek more in-depth knowledge, these professors kindly invite them to discuss further after class, ensuring the rest of the group does not feel neglected. In my opinion, the latter approach tends to benefit more students, and Dr. Soroko exemplifies this method well and I benefited the most because of this aspect.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. The webassign homework is the worst part of the whole class.
2. Some of the students.
3. A challenged student was in the class and disrupted many times. The professor handles it well, but he was very distracting in class and even in quizzes.
4. 1
5. There was a specific student in the class that absolutely sucked and distracted everyone, not his fault he's a distraction, but it's also not fair to other students to have someone who randomly screeches in class. The class content and instruction itself was perfect, I just got subpar circumstances by chance.
6. None
7. the homework

8. Professors inability to answer questions.
9. Having a quiz during recitation time
10. Time (Not in his control)
11. quizzes and homeworks
13. None

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Stop using the webassign homework it's way too much work for not much payoff. Feels just not helpful and makes me not want to do it at all.
3. The challenged student had a thousand questions and definitely needed extra help and he yelled and hit things. He should be in a separate class to help himself and other students learn better.
4. 1
5. No specific suggestions, there should however be some different rules involving special needs in advanced courses, throwing a tantrum isn't acceptable in an advanced math class.
6. None
7. nothing because that's up to UNT not having universal homework for programs
8. Be nicer and actually answer people's questions without making them feel bad.
9. - more exams, doing an exam a unit vs doing an exam on 8-9 sections chapters of leaning -multiple choice questions -not having it so late or go so late, possible adding an extra day
10. NA
11. none
13. When we have a quiz scheduled, I find myself distracted, preparing for it and paying less attention to the lecture on that day. Perhaps holding the quiz at the beginning of class could resolve this issue. I understand there's a risk that latecomers might miss the quiz, but it could help focus our attention on the lecture. Additionally, if we could use a cheat sheet provided by the instructor, it would allow us to focus more on practical word problems from our exercises. I've noticed some intriguing problems in our textbook that could broaden our understanding of each topic.

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.