COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Spring 2022 (COVID)

LING 472 A, Joint with CSE 472 A
Introduction To Computational Linguistics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Sara Ng
Instructor Evaluated: Sara Ng-Predoc TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A
Responses: 8/33 (24% low)

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
4.6	**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: 4.1
(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:	9	44%	44%		11%			4.4	4.6
The course content was:	9	44%	56%					4.4	4.5
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	9	67%	22%	11%				4.8	4.9
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	9	56%	33%		11%			4.6	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:	8	12%		12%	62%			12%	4.1
The intellectual challenge presented was:	8	25%	12%	12%	25%	25%			4.5
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	8	25%		25%	38%	12%			4.5
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	8	25%	12%	12%	38%	12%			4.5
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	8	12%		12%	50%	25%			4.0

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: 6.8 Hours per credit: 1.4 (N=8)

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
		25%	38%	12%	25%						

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

Class median: 5.5 Hours per credit: 1.1 (N=8)

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
	12%	38%	25%	12%	12%						

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.6 (N=7)

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
29%	43%	29%												

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

(N=8)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
62%		25%			12%

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Spring 2022 (COVID)

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Course organization was:	8	62%	25%		12%			4.7	3
Clarity of instructor's voice was:	8	75%	25%					4.8	6
Explanations by instructor were:	8	62%	38%					4.7	4
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	8	50%	25%	25%				4.5	15
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	8	62%	25%	12%				4.7	7
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	8	75%	12%		12%			4.8	1
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	8	75%	12%			12%		4.8	8
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	8	62%	38%					4.7	14
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	8	62%	38%					4.7	11
Answers to student questions were:	8	50%	50%					4.5	17
Availability of extra help when needed was:	8	62%	38%					4.7	9
Use of class time was:	8	50%	38%	12%				4.5	12
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	8	62%	25%	12%				4.7	10
Amount you learned in the course was:	8	38%	25%	25%	12%			4.0	18
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	8	50%	25%	25%				4.5	16
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	8	50%	25%	12%		12%		4.5	13
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	8	62%	25%			12%		4.7	5
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	8	75%	12%		12%			4.8	2

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Spring 2022 (COVID)

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

LING 472 A, Joint with CSE 472 A
Introduction To Computational Linguistics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Sara Ng
Instructor Evaluated: Sara Ng-Predoc TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A
Responses: 8/33 (24% low)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Yes, a very different kind of CS class. Good to get away from just thinking about efficiency and breakthroughs and consider the social impacts of technology and ethical considerations.

2. Yes, it was really great learning about these different topics and what directions they are going in, and why they are important

3. Yes, I enjoyed getting a survey of the field

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The lectures! In-class discussion were lively and made me think about the content. Assignments got me to dig a little deeper and understand the inner workings or algorithms or ethical implications.

2. Instructor's enthusiasm and willingness to help students in and out of class, lecture recordings and slides

3. Sara was very enthusiastic and great at connecting with the students. I also enjoyed having a motivated partner for the final project.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. Hard to pay attention through the whole hour and a half of class, especially since it's in the evening. Class discussion and talking about real-world connections helped.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Summer 2020

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

LING 473 B, Joint with LING 473 C, LING 473 D
Basics For Computational Linguistics
Course type: Online

Taught by: Sara Ng
Instructor Evaluated: Sara Ng-Lecturer

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: Y
Responses: 26/33 (79% 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:

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
4.2	**4.3**
(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: 5.2
(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 remote learning course as a whole was:	26	42%	38%	19%				4.3	4.3
The course content was:	26	27%	31%	38%	4%			3.8	3.8
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	26	54%	35%	12%				4.6	4.6
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	26	42%	35%	23%				4.3	4.3

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:	26	8%	38%	23%	31%				5.3
The intellectual challenge presented was:	26	15%	38%	19%	23%	4%			5.6
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	26	19%	35%	23%	15%	8%			5.6
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	26	23%	31%	27%	15%	4%			5.6
Relative to similar courses taught in person, your participation in this course was:	26	12%	27%	15%	31%	15%			4.8
Relative to similar courses taught in person, your success in this course was:	26	4%	35%	15%	38%	8%			4.8

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: 13.5 Hours per credit: 4.5 (N=26)**

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
	4%	8%	4%	4%	23%	8%	19%		8%	4%	19%

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?   **Class median: 10.5 Hours per credit: 3.5 (N=26)**

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%	8%	8%	19%	15%	15%	12%	4%	4%		8%

What grade do you expect in this course?   **Class median: 3.7 (N=26)**

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
38%	35%	8%	15%		4%									

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as: **(N=26)**

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
15%	8%	4%		62%	12%

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Summer 2020

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
The effectiveness of this remote course in facilitating my learning was:	26	31%	46%	19%	4%			4.1	
Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was:	26	58%	31%	12%				4.6	3
Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was:	26	73%	12%	12%	4%			4.8	2
Clarity of course objectives was:	26	46%	31%	23%				4.4	5
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	26	65%	19%	12%	4%			4.7	1
Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding course content was:	26	35%	23%	31%	12%			3.8	9
Usefulness of written assignments in understanding course content was:	26	50%	35%	12%	4%			4.5	6
Usefulness of online resources in understanding course content was:	26	50%	31%	15%	4%			4.5	8
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	26	46%	35%	15%	4%			4.4	7
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	26	50%	15%	27%	8%			4.5	4
Organization of materials online was:	26	65%	15%	19%				4.7	

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Summer 2020

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

LING 473 B, Joint with LING 473 C, LING 473 D
Basics For Computational Linguistics
Course type: Online

Taught by: Sara Ng
Instructor Evaluated: Sara Ng-Lecturer

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: Y
Responses: 26/33 (79% very high)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. This class was mostly review of familiar topics, but the topics that were new were intellectually stimulating and provided a good introduction into those areas.

2. Yes

4. Yes. There was a steep learning curve. I had a hard time keeping up, but I felt this course was necessary preparation for the CLMS core courses. I'm sure the material learned here will prove useful later on.

5. This course was a refresher for many essential for the MS program. I thought it was a good reminder of important principles and how they apply in industry.

6. Yes, it was intellectually stimulating. It stretched my understanding of things I had studied before by introducing their specific application to computational linguistics.

9. This course introduced new concepts and methods. The assignments/projects really did stretch my thinking because they were fairly involved.

10. It did. I really enjoyed this aspect of the course. I've been out of college for a while so going back I was nervous about this yet am pleased with my efforts. A quarter schedule definitely requires more personal responsibility and effort than a semester. This is mostly a good thing.

11. The class was intellectually stimulating and had a lot of interesting concepts. However, I felt that the course overall covered too much and too challenging of material for an introductory course and ended up being overwhelming.

13. I came into the program with unbalanced background in the sense my knowledge on math/stats is either too old and faded away or just not as advanced as the program requires. This course has served the purpose of brushing up on that front well, however I wish I could have had more time to self-study so as to pick up the lectures faster. Some of the contents do expect the student to have some prerequisite knowledge in order to fully absorb the contents.

14. Yes, it does. Being developer its easy to think for simple problems easily but for complex specific field related problem, developer need to think critically by keeping the context in mind. I believe I some where achieve, or started doing that, through this course.

15. Yes, the concepts were intellectually stimulating

16. Yes, I learned a lot from this course

17. For topics that I'm not historically strong in, it was intellectually stimulating. For topics that I have come across multiple times, it was okay.

19. The class covered a lot of ground so it definitely stretched my thinking about certain topics, but also interacting with fellow students from so many different educational/professional backgrounds gave me a lot to think about in terms of what skills I should develop or improve.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The written assignments and the projects were effective.

2. All

3. The instructor is very diligent and helpful. She always replies and explains thing clearly. She keeps her promises.

4. The assignments/projects. I also had to do a lot of self-learning with terminal-related tasks, which was awful in the moment :) but ultimately helpful.

5. The professor was awesome! She really cared about us understanding the material and also made class fun. I felt like I was encouraged to participate. The class members also helped as there was a lot of discussion on Canvas and on Slack that helped me deal with any issues.

6. The assignments and break out sessions were most helpful as they allowed me to apply the concepts that were introduced in lecture.

8. The assignments.

9. The homework assignments and projects. Sara is an amazing instructor and she made all of the remote lectures very engaging which helped me learn.

10. The programming, the useful tidbits I didn't know about linguistics, the way the instructor challenged us, reviewing probability and statistics, having reading materials. Sara was also great at taking feedback and quickly adjusting the lectures and class if need be. Initially some of us felt there weren't enough examples on some material and the next lecture she had she absolutely delivered. I'm grateful for this. She admitted to being new to lecturing at the beginning and it is clear she has grown and adapted to the challenge. I hope she sees that too. I also thought Sara shined when she mixed in topics that she was passionate about relevant to the learning. It made the material more engaging. I also have to name the student's participation too. I usually felt they were all smarter than me so this had me working harder to meet that bar and contribute. Whether I equally gave back is another question that we don't have to answer 😊.

11. The critical review assignment really allowed me to familiarize myself with ACL formatting! The instructor Sara was incredibly kind and helpful.

13. the lectures, the assignments, the student group discussion, and the projects. I'd like to highlight the big contribution/influence the instructor has made to the learning. She has been extremely patient and encouraging, esp. when it comes to office hours and discussion boards, regardless of how stupid the question might be, she is always there to offer help, she shows sympathy to the difficulty students might have encountered.

14. The projects, where I did lots of NLP specific activities from ground, without using available libraries(such as NLTK). It improves my learning a lot. Moreover, the instructor, Sara, explained each and every problem in details. This helps me to understand the various scenario.

15. The homework, especially the critical paper review. It was my first time doing such an assignment and I enjoyed it. I appreciated that Sara was willing to have office hours with me outside of her normal office hour times. She was always looking for questions in the chat and always tried her best to respond to all of them. Having a break time was nice

16. The assignment push me improve my programming skill

17. I think the homework assignments were the most helpful. It is tough for me to sit and listen for almost 2 hours, but doing the assignments helped reinforce what the instructor was teaching us.

18. The course materials, assignments and projects were excellent and challenging. The instructor was super engaging and it was fun learning.

19. The lectures were very good and the coding projects were helpful in dusting off some of the cobwebs.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. I was unable to attend lectures "live," so I re-watched them as Zoom recordings. It was sometimes hard to follow when Sara would be interacting with people on the chat asking questions, this often disrupted the flow of lectures and was hard to follow.

3. Too many topics. I prefer to have a focus and go deeper in at least on topic.

4. For me personally, the course load was a bit high. This meant I had to make compromises. I sometimes had to spend less time learning things I found interesting in order to complete other tasks

5. For some things it would have been good to have another TA since Sara was pretty busy with the time required to teach the course.

8. The lectures sometimes felt like coverage of material rather than instruction.

9. It felt a little alienating to be remote -- I wasn't sure how to work with my classmates at first. Eventually, I found the CLMS slack channel and that helped immensely.

10. Tuesday/Thursday courses on a quarter schedule definitely threw me. Not sure any teacher could help me with that style of instruction; I felt I'd be better off if I were a full time student. If it were spread out to shorter lectures I would've fared better. This resulted in me forgetting many things where if I'd had more time I probably would've reviewed better than I could. I mostly just spend time reviewing by doing the coursework. Another thing is I'm a very visual learner and I didn't feel the slides were geared towards that style as much as they could be. Finally, if the class were (partially or fully) in person I think the students would've collaborated better. I wouldn't say this is the instructor's doing per se. Just knowing the data out there on this it's just a fact: students learn better this way. Unfortunately there is a virus that we don't have much control over so what can we do?

11. The course content felt too broad in relation to the assignments and projects. When tackling certain projects, I felt I was missing key and important information that was not covered in the lectures. There was a lot to know, and often I needed outside resources to get coursework done.

13. None, the learning experience has been rewarding, and the quality of education exceeds my expectation.

14. I don't think so anything detracted my learning.

17. Sometimes I felt that the flow was too fast - I wish we had spent more time on certain sections. However, what may have been difficult for me may not have been difficult for many other students, so I think it would be very difficult to cater to everyone's needs, especially since we are all coming from very different academic backgrounds.

What suggestions do you have for improving this class generally?

1. One or two TAs or more focused office hours/assignment help sessions would be beneficial. More support for providing guidance on some of the assignments and projects would have been helpful.

2. It's too much in too little time

4. I'm not sure. I felt like the class was rigorous, and time-consuming, but all of it may be necessary preparation for the CLMS program.

5. I think that having test cases for projects would improve the class a great deal. For example the last project we had a train file that was labeled, so we knew when our code was working as intended. I wish we had test cases to double check our code against for the other 4 projects, just to make sure we weren't too far off the mark.

7. The project assignments are very verbose and we need to check with the instructor for lot of clarity. I would recommend the project assignments to be more precise and shorter. This course was more focused on probability and coding projects. I was expecting to learn more around linguistics basic. However, only some topics on linguistics was covered. I would recommend this course to cover more on the linguistics side than on the probability and coding assignments.

8. I spent a lot of time doing things on the assignments that weren't part of learning or theory to be done in this class and think that scaffolding the more confusing parts of the assignments would help alleviate confusion generally. That said, this is a weed-out class, the assignments are clearly indented to be confusing/misleading.

9. I thought it was pretty effective as-is!

10. I think I covered this above. Having reading materials on all subjects in the course would've been more helpful but this is more to the remote vs in-person argument. Remotely I'd say this a requirement.

11. I think the syllabus could use a rework, with better flow from topic to topic. The course could be a little more focused and some of the projects simplified. I felt really rushed by the end of the course, especially with so many difficult assignments being due one after the other. Also: I think more detailed explanations into using Condor would be incredibly beneficial.

12. the only thing I can think of is just that I wish the final 3 assignments/projects had been spaced out more

14. we can have more math-programming linking for NLP context. Moreover, it would be great if we can get some real time business problems.

15. Use Piazza instead of Canvas discussion board?

16. I think the topic can be more specific, like four the first few lectures we focus on math, and for the following classes we focus on Linux/programming. This would be a better idea for to about the distribution of the course materials.

17. I think having more detailed slides, even if they are pedantic, could be helpful. Particularly for derivations and problem solutions. It may not be necessary to go over every detail in the lecture, but it would be very helpful when reviewing on our own.

19. I could have used a little more structure or guidance on the critical paper review. I spent a lot of time going down a rabbit hole and trying to understand all of the content, which was definitley not the best use of my time. I ended up 'finishing' the paper in terms of getting something down for all of the prompts but it wasn't a great paper. That said, it was a valuable learning experience!

If this course were offered remotely again, what suggestions do you have to improve the student experience?

1. Record the lectures in full ahead of time and provide more office hours/Q&A sessions

2. Less material

4. Not sure. I think a lot of the experience depended on the other students. I was lucky enough to be in a class full of motivated and interested students who engaged in and out of class. In other cases, this kind of engagement might need to be enforced by the instructor

5. I liked the breakout room sessions, more of those would be great!

6. Finding more opportunity to use break out sessions and interact directly with the material and other students in the class would be great.

8. Some of us students are vying for positions in the CLMS program next fall, we're all competing. It was refreshing when, during a particularly difficult assignment, we "showed our cards" so to speak, and it turned out we could help each other more working together than competing alone. That was magical. The course discussion boards facilitated this; however, the difficulty of the assignment made it happen.

9. Introduce the CLMS slack at the beginning of the quarter as a student resource.

10. Haha, I just said it above. I have to say I am grateful that the CLMS students were also remote (though I can't say they would agree). It helped in my remote learning. And talking about class participation before, it would've likely been even worse if the class were split this way. I know I would've been jealous of the in-person learners.

11. Thoroughly enjoyed the remote aspect of it!

14. I would appreciate if either the class shifted 1 hour from the usual time or there are more than one breaks given in the class. As at that time in India, its an early morning (5 AM). It is bit challenging to complete all the morning activities before the class. It would be helpful to have class without any disturbances.

15. Have the students do a worksheet along with the lecture that they have to turn in (scan?) for participation to make sure they're following along because it's easy to tune out in online lectures

16. I hope the instructor ask students to open their camera, in this way I can get to know more about my classmates and being more active in class.

17. I think that overall the remote experience is fine Maybe see instructions on how to join the Zoom call would be helpful (I was late to the first lecture because I embarrassingly didn't know how to join).

18. The instructor took great care in making the remote course just as effective and engaging for the class members. We learnt a good deal from fellow mates regarding resources and Q&A

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.

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Spring 2019

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

LING 472 AA, Joint with CSE 472 AA
Introduction To Computational Linguistics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 15/29 (52% high)

Taught by: Sara Ng
Instructor Evaluated: Sara Ng-TA

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
4.0	**4.1**

(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: 4.7
(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 quiz section as a whole was:	15	40%	13%	20%	20%	7%		3.8	3.9
The content of the quiz section was:	15	27%	20%	20%	20%	13%		3.3	3.4
The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was:	15	40%	33%	13%	7%	7%		4.2	4.3
The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	15	47%	27%	13%	7%	7%		4.4	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:	15	27%	13%	7%	47%			7%	4.4
The intellectual challenge presented was:	15	27%	13%	33%	20%	7%			5.2
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	15	20%	13%	33%	20%	7%	7%		5.0
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	15	33%	7%	33%	20%		7%		5.2
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	15	20%	7%	33%	27%		13%		4.8

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: 10.2 (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
21%		7%	7%	7%	21%	7%	14%		7%		7%

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

Class median: 7.5 (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
21%		14%	14%	7%	36%		7%				

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.6 (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
31%	38%	8%		8%	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
62%		31%	8%		

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Spring 2019

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Explanations by the QSI were:	15	60%	13%	13%	7%	7%		4.7	3
QSI's use of examples and illustrations was:	15	60%	13%	13%	7%	7%		4.7	5
Quality of questions or problems raised by QSI was:	15	53%	13%	13%	13%	7%		4.6	7
QSI's enthusiasm was:	15	67%	27%	7%				4.8	9
Student confidence in QSI's knowledge was:	15	60%	27%	13%				4.7	13
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	15	67%	33%					4.8	6
Answers to student questions were:	15	53%	20%	20%		7%		4.6	11
Interest level of quiz sections was:	15	40%	20%	13%	13%	13%		4.0	15
QSI's openness to student views was:	15	60%	33%	7%				4.7	8
QSI's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	15	53%	20%	20%		7%		4.6	10
Availability of extra help when needed was:	15	67%	13%	13%		7%		4.8	2
Use of quiz section time was:	15	47%	13%	13%	13%	13%		4.2	14
QSI's interest in whether students learned was:	15	53%	20%	13%	7%	7%		4.6	12
Amount you learned in the quiz sections was:	15	40%	7%	20%	13%	20%		3.3	17
Relevance and usefulness of quiz section content were:	15	40%	7%	20%	7%	27%		3.3	18
Coordination between lectures and quiz sections was:	15	47%		27%	7%	13%	7%	3.4	16
Reasonableness of assigned work for quiz section was:	15	67%	20%	7%	7%			4.8	1
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	15	60%	20%	7%	13%			4.7	4

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Spring 2019

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

LING 472 AA, Joint with CSE 472 AA
Introduction To Computational Linguistics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 15/29 (52% high)

Taught by: Sara Ng
Instructor Evaluated: Sara Ng-TA

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. The python pre-processing examples covered in lecture really helped me understand how to approach similar problems in the final project.

2. Sure, the assignments and readings were challenging

6. Yea, it did and Sara did a great job expanding our knowledge of the subject

9. Yes, quiz section helped a lot ; sometimes it helped connect lecture back together, and I think I liked the AWS thing at the end

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The in-class coding helped most.

2. TA's availability and the discussions in class

4. I liked that it was casual and low-pressure. Also, I appreciated the time we spent reviewing lecture material, preparing for the midterm, talking about homework, etc.

6. Sara's expertise

8. Sections are great

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. n/a

2. Wish the first couple of weeks were more relevant to the assignments

4. Some of the group programming activities we did were not helpful to me because I didn't have my computer and couldn't follow along or I tried following along and got lost or didn't know what terms meant but didn't want to slow down the process by asking questions that no one else seemed to have. I think the fact that there were such different levels of coding experience in the class made it hard for the entire class to benefit from the same section time.

6. the disjointed nature of the class, it seemed that homework assignments, classes and the final project were not the same

8. Homework spec can be a little confusing

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. n/a

2. Demos for assignments

3. It will be better if there is more programming.

4. Maybe some more time dedicated specifically to reviewing lecture material or, when applicable, practicing things we talked about in lecture.

5. Make it more directly related to lecture material and reading material

7. do reviews of the lecture material and tutorials on how to use the softwares (or at least the general technical structure of the softwares) to make the homework less grueling. The most useful quiz section was the jeopardy review. Quiz section class time would be better spent clarifying concepts from lecture and providing support material for the homeworks.

9. Lot of pauses in class

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.

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Autumn 2018

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

LING 570 A, Joint with LING 570 B, LING 570 C, LING 570 D
Shallow Processing Techniques For Natural Language Processing
Course type: Hybrid

Taught by: Fei Xia, Sara Ng
Instructor Evaluated: Sara Ng-TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 21/38 (55% 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:

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
4.1	**4.0**
(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: 5.6
(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:	21	33%	43%	19%		5%		4.1	4.0
The course content was:	21	33%	43%	14%	5%	5%		4.1	4.0
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	21	38%	38%	10%	10%	5%		4.2	4.1
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	21	38%	33%	14%	5%	10%		4.1	4.0

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:	20	25%	35%	15%	20%		5%		5.8
The intellectual challenge presented was:	20	30%	35%	5%	25%		5%		5.9
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	20	40%	25%	10%	25%				6.1
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	20	35%	35%		30%				6.1
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	20	30%	15%	25%	30%				5.3

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: 13.9 Hours per credit: 3.5 (N=20)

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
				10%	25%	10%	25%		10%	15%	5%

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

Class median: 10.5 Hours per credit: 2.6 (N=20)

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
5%	5%		10%	25%	10%	5%	15%	10%		10%	5%

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.9 (N=20)

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
55%	35%	5%	5%											

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

(N=20)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
35%	30%	10%		25%	

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Autumn 2018

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

Rate your instructor on each of the following:	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Established rapport	19	58%	32%	5%	5%			4.6	1
Student's confidence in Teaching Assistant's knowledge was:	19	63%	16%	21%				4.7	
Explanations by the Teaching Assistant were:	19	63%	16%	21%				4.7	
The Teaching Assistant's interest in whether students learned was:	19	58%	32%	5%	5%			4.6	
The Teaching Assistant's use of examples and illustrations was:	19	58%	21%	16%	5%			4.6	
Teaching Assistant's enthusiasm was:	19	63%	26%	11%				4.7	
The Teaching Assistant's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	19	58%	21%	21%				4.6	
Teaching Assistant's openness to student views was:	19	68%	26%	5%				4.8	
The Teaching Assistant's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	20	70%	20%		10%			4.8	
Availability of extra help when needed was:	19	74%	26%					4.8	
Answers to student questions were:	19	68%	26%	5%				4.8	
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	19	63%	26%	11%				4.7	
Amount you learned from the Teaching Assistant was:	19	53%	26%	16%	5%			4.5	
The Teaching Assistant as a whole was:	20	60%	30%	5%	5%			4.7	

LING 570 A, Joint with LING 570 B, LING 570 C, LING 570 D
Shallow Processing Techniques For Natural Language Processing
Course type: Hybrid

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 21/38 (55% high)

Taught by: Fei Xia, Sara Ng
Instructor Evaluated: Sara Ng-TA

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Sara ws always very friendly and funny

3. Implementing algorithms in assignments

4. Assignments

5. Working with Sara during office hours

6. The assignments were the most important. The lectures were very interesting, but I often found it hard to follow the details of all of the equations and concepts in lecture. The assignments were a great incentive to get me to go back over the lectures and readings in detail to really get the material to sink in.

9. I went to Sara's office hours regularly throughout the quarter and she was always very helpful. She was willing to go over explanations of details and help strategize solutions to our programming assignments. Her knowledge of the material is quite thorough and she often had suggestions I would not have thought of on my own. She responded quickly to communications, which I also appreciated.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. N/A

3. Assignments were extremely unclear and difficult to understand. Lectures were also disorganized and difficult to follow.

5. Sometimes lectures were dense and hard to follow

6. Nothing comes to mind. I thought everything in the class was valuable.

9. NA

Other comments?

1. N/A

2. Good responsiveness to questions about assignments & grades.

5. Sara is great! She made the course welcoming and fun, and helped me when I was confused. Her emails were lovely.

6. The TA was great! I was an online student, and it was very nice to have Sara active in the chat during class to make sure that all of our questions were seen and answered. Thanks for everything!

7. It might be better the valid grading may be done within 1 week so that students won't make similar errors in next weekly assignment.

8. The homework assignments do not test whether a student has learned the material, but rather whether they have ten hours to implement a nonsensical spec.

9. It was very much appreciated that our assignments for this class were graded in a timely manner!

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.

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Spring 2018

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

LING 269 AA
Swearing And Taboo Language
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Sara Ng
Instructor Evaluated: Sara Ng-TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 14/25 (56% 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:

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
4.3	**4.1**
(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: 3.3
(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 quiz section as a whole was:	14	50%	29%	21%				4.5	4.3
The content of the quiz section was:	14	43%	36%	14%	7%			4.3	4.1
The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was:	14	50%	36%	7%	7%			4.5	4.3
The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	14	36%	43%	21%				4.2	4.0

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:	14	29%	21%	29%	14%		7%		5.5
The intellectual challenge presented was:	14		14%	21%	21%	14%	21%	7%	3.8
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	14		21%	14%	21%	29%	14%		3.8
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	14	7%	14%	14%	21%	36%	7%		3.8
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	14		29%	21%	43%	7%			4.5

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: 3.5 (N=12)**

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
25%	25%	17%	25%		8%						

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education? **Class median: 2.5 (N=12)**

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
42%	17%	25%	17%								

What grade do you expect in this course? **Class median: 3.8 (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
46%	31%	15%					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
15%		77%			8%

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Spring 2018

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Explanations by the QSI were:	14	36%	43%	14%	7%			4.2	13
QSI's use of examples and illustrations was:	14	43%	43%	7%	7%			4.3	7
Quality of questions or problems raised by QSI was:	14	43%	29%	14%	14%			4.2	11
QSI's enthusiasm was:	14	57%	36%	7%				4.6	4
Student confidence in QSI's knowledge was:	14	43%	29%	29%				4.2	17
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	14	29%	43%	29%				4.0	18
Answers to student questions were:	14	36%	43%	7%	14%			4.2	14
Interest level of quiz sections was:	14	36%	29%	21%	7%	7%		4.0	10
QSI's openness to student views was:	14	50%	36%	14%				4.5	6
QSI's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	14	43%	43%	14%				4.3	8
Availability of extra help when needed was:	14	43%	43%	7%	7%			4.3	12
Use of quiz section time was:	14	29%	43%	14%	14%			4.0	15
QSI's interest in whether students learned was:	14	50%	36%	14%				4.5	5
Amount you learned in the quiz sections was:	14	29%	36%	21%	7%	7%		3.9	16
Relevance and usefulness of quiz section content were:	14	43%	36%	7%	7%	7%		4.3	9
Coordination between lectures and quiz sections was:	14	50%	21%	21%	7%			4.5	2
Reasonableness of assigned work for quiz section was:	14	57%	21%	21%				4.6	1
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	14	50%	29%	21%				4.5	3

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Spring 2018

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

LING 269 AA
Swearing And Taboo Language
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Sara Ng
Instructor Evaluated: Sara Ng-TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 14/25 (56% high)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Learning about hints I had never considered on a topic that I am involved with

2. It was interesting and in a field I did not believe I'd ever take a class in. It was a refreshing change of pace from my usual class load

3. this quiz section did not. I don't remember any particular time in this section where I thought I was learning a lot. I could've not come and probably still gotten the same scores on tests and hw if not for the mandatory quizzes

4. I wouldn't say it stretched my thinking, it was a solid quiz section that reinforced what we learned in lectures. And a few questions brought up in class did require some critical thought.

5. Yes! It made me consider things about swearing and taboo language that I hadn't really noticed in day to day life.

6. Yes because we did experiments to test some theories.

7. Yes, it made me reconsider things that I wouldn't have otherwise and think about other cultures, too.

8. Yes

9. Yes. The different explanations from another person (TA) were very interesting to hear but also very helpful.

10. It was incredibly in-depth and thorough. Required memorization and recognition of words and phrases in different languages as well

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The lectures and the quiezzes

2. The effective, straightforward teaching by Sara was very good

3. probably the poll everywhere before quizzes? other than that nothing I can remember

4. The poll everywhere review questions were extremely helpful as was the chance to review before quizzes.

5. Polling questions actually helped a lot to keep me engaged.

6. The slide reviews.

7. Reviewing for quizzes and taking quizzes

8. Review activities (practice exams, writing questions)

9. The examples and her slides were very clear with what she wanted to say.

10. Lecture notes and Quiz Section quizzes

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. Nothing really

2. Since this class was an elective, throughout the wuarter I elected to do other things instead of doing the homework or going to lecture

3. the section just felt weird, her humor did not do it for me

4. Not having enough time for group work for the project in class.

5. Start time wasn't great but that has nothing to do with Sara.

6. How early it is.

7. Groupwork felt kinda tedious and pointless. Also don't feel like I can rely on people

8. None

9. Group projects. It's kinda hard to coordinate with everyone and also I think I can get more done/learn more by doing things myself.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Nothing

2. None - it's a great course

5. None!

6. Nothing.

7. No group project

8. None

9. Nothing. Great class!

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.

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Spring 2018

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

LING 269 AB
Swearing And Taboo Language
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Sara Ng
Instructor Evaluated: Sara Ng-TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 20/25 (80% 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:

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
4.6	**4.2**
(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: 3.6
(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 quiz section as a whole was:	20	50%	20%	20%	5%	5%		4.5	4.1
The content of the quiz section was:	20	55%	20%	15%	5%	5%		4.6	4.3
The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was:	20	55%	30%	5%	5%	5%		4.6	4.3
The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	20	55%	15%	20%	5%	5%		4.6	4.2

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:	20	35%	35%	25%	5%				6.1
The intellectual challenge presented was:	20			25%	35%	15%	25%		3.8
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	20		10%	15%	55%		20%		4.0
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	20		5%	25%	40%	10%	20%		4.0
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	20	10%	15%	20%	45%		10%		4.4

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: 4.2 (N=19)**

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
11%	26%	37%	16%	11%							

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education? **Class median: 3.6 (N=19)**

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
21%	26%	37%	16%								

What grade do you expect in this course? **Class median: 3.8 (N=18)**

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
50%	33%	11%		6%										

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as: **(N=19)**

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
11%	11%	68%		5%	5%

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Spring 2018

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Explanations by the QSI were:	20	45%	25%	20%	5%	5%		4.3	17
QSI's use of examples and illustrations was:	20	50%	35%	5%	10%			4.5	15
Quality of questions or problems raised by QSI was:	20	55%	20%	5%	20%			4.6	8
QSI's enthusiasm was:	20	65%	30%		5%			4.7	14
Student confidence in QSI's knowledge was:	20	55%	30%	10%	5%			4.6	18
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	20	70%	5%	15%	5%	5%		4.8	7
Answers to student questions were:	20	55%	20%	15%	5%	5%		4.6	13
Interest level of quiz sections was:	20	55%	15%	15%	15%			4.6	1
QSI's openness to student views was:	20	60%	15%	10%	5%	10%		4.7	12
QSI's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	20	65%	10%	10%	5%	10%		4.7	2
Availability of extra help when needed was:	20	65%	10%	10%	15%			4.7	3
Use of quiz section time was:	20	50%	20%	15%	10%		5%	4.5	10
QSI's interest in whether students learned was:	20	60%	15%	10%	10%		5%	4.7	11
Amount you learned in the quiz sections was:	20	50%	25%	5%	15%	5%		4.5	9
Relevance and usefulness of quiz section content were:	20	60%	25%		10%	5%		4.7	6
Coordination between lectures and quiz sections was:	20	45%	35%	15%	5%			4.4	16
Reasonableness of assigned work for quiz section was:	20	60%	30%	5%	5%			4.7	4
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	20	60%	25%	10%	5%			4.7	5

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Spring 2018

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

LING 269 AB
Swearing And Taboo Language
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Sara Ng
Instructor Evaluated: Sara Ng-TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 20/25 (80% very high)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. I learned a lot about different types of swear words and their usages

2. Yes it was very interesting

4. Yes! For an "easy course" this was very interesting and engaging

5. Not really, I did think I guess but I wasn't challenged by the course. I just heard the facts and then wrote them down on the quiz

6. Yes it did.

7. It was intellectually stimulating because it is something closely related to my everyday life.

8. This, the parts of the class that delved into the social aspects of everything was great.

9. Yes, I thought this class was stimulating because I really liked learning about the topic. I thought it was very interesting and kept me entertained.

10. Yes, concepts from class were very interesting and Sara did a good job of going further in depth on those concepts from lecture

11. Yes, I learned so much new information that was particularly interesting and applicable to real life. Sara taught us stuff in quiz section that was really interesting.

12. This class was extremely interesting: lots of very interesting material was covered in a very effective/efficient way!

13. N/A

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Activities in quiz section really helped me understand the material more

2. Taking quizzes on the topics we went over in class

3. I like that we did review before the quizzes, those were really helpful.

4. In quiz section, reviews before quiz

5. the quiz portion was good

6. Review and quizzes I suppose. Demonstrations were fun/interesting.

7. Use of PollEverywhere.

8. Lecture -mainly lectures about the social aspects of swearing. I liked that more than the linguistic part of it.

9. I liked that we had quizzes, because it kept me on top of the information that we were learning in lecture, and I didn't feel like I was lagging behind.

10. quizzes and review time in section

11. Quiz section reviews

12. The lectures and weekly homework helped me review material in preparations for the weekly quizzes.

13. Sara Was a great TA and helped us all learn the material.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. None

2. Nothing

4. none

5. other people being slackers, not having enough class time to work on group work

6. None.

8. I found that after attending class and studying a good bit my hw and quiz grade was always lower than I expected.

9. I thought that the TA could've done a better job teaching the subject and guiding the quiz section. Although I liked her style, sometimes I felt a little belittled when I got a question wrong or asked a question. I felt targeted at times and frankly, I was a little uncomfortable in most of the quiz sections.

11. Technical difficulties (they were unavoidable though)

12. I think that some of the time in the quiz sections could have been spent more efficiently: Even though I really appreciate Sara learning everybody's name, I don't think it was a good use of a very significant amount of quiz section time.

13. N/A

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. More videos of various topics - or more video examples. For example I enjoyed watching the South park example videos or the short clips from talk shows

2. Nothing

4. none

5. More time for group work or a change the group project to make it less work

6. Very good, maybe be a little less passive aggressive towards students answers, at times it just comes off as a bit rude/hurtful.

9. I think that the TA could've been a little more open and welcoming to student ideas, instead of making them feel like they were completely wrong. I wish that she would answer our questions instead of being so elusive.

11. N/a sorry it was too good

12. I think it would be incredibly helpful to plan the time in the quiz sections to be spent more effectively. In the quiz section, it often seemed like we were jumping around when reviewing the material...

13. N/A

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.

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Spring 2018

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

LING 269 AC
Swearing And Taboo Language
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Sara Ng
Instructor Evaluated: Sara Ng-TA

Evaluation Delivery:	Online
Evaluation Form:	F
Responses:	19/25 (76% 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:

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
4.2	**3.8**

(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: 3.8

(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 quiz section as a whole was:	19	37%	37%	21%		5%		4.1	3.8
The content of the quiz section was:	19	37%	42%	16%	5%			4.2	3.8
The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was:	19	37%	37%	16%	11%			4.1	3.8
The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	19	42%	32%	16%	11%			4.2	3.9

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:	19	32%	53%	5%	11%				6.2
The intellectual challenge presented was:	19	11%		26%	47%	11%	5%		4.2
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	19	11%		11%	53%	21%	5%		4.0
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	19	11%		16%	53%	21%			4.0
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	18	6%	6%	28%	44%	17%			4.2

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: 2.7 (N=19)

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
21%	47%	16%	11%			5%					

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

Class median: 2.1 (N=19)

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
37%	47%	11%				5%					

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.7 (N=19)

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
42%	32%	21%		5%										

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

(N=19)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
11%	11%	53%	5%	5%	16%

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Spring 2018

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Explanations by the QSI were:	19	26%	47%	16%	11%			4.0	11
QSI's use of examples and illustrations was:	19	42%	32%	16%	11%			4.2	5
Quality of questions or problems raised by QSI was:	19	32%	32%	32%		5%		3.9	17
QSI's enthusiasm was:	19	58%	21%	16%	5%			4.6	1
Student confidence in QSI's knowledge was:	19	47%	26%	21%	5%			4.4	10
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	19	37%	37%	11%	11%	5%		4.1	12
Answers to student questions were:	19	32%	37%	21%	11%			4.0	15
Interest level of quiz sections was:	19	37%	32%	16%	5%	5%	5%	4.1	2
QSI's openness to student views was:	19	32%	37%	16%	11%	5%		4.0	18
QSI's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	19	32%	37%	21%		5%	5%	4.0	14
Availability of extra help when needed was:	19	37%	32%	21%	5%	5%		4.1	13
Use of quiz section time was:	18	39%	28%	22%	11%			4.1	7
QSI's interest in whether students learned was:	19	32%	42%	16%	11%			4.1	16
Amount you learned in the quiz sections was:	19	37%	37%	21%		5%		4.1	4
Relevance and usefulness of quiz section content were:	19	42%	26%	21%	11%			4.2	8
Coordination between lectures and quiz sections was:	19	37%	42%	16%	5%			4.2	3
Reasonableness of assigned work for quiz section was:	19	42%	32%	26%				4.2	6
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	19	37%	37%	21%		5%		4.1	9

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Spring 2018

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

LING 269 AC
Swearing And Taboo Language
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Sara Ng
Instructor Evaluated: Sara Ng-TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 19/25 (76% very high)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Yes, it changed my perspective on taboo languages and made me think in a more linguistic way

2. Yes. It made me think about why people swear and under what conditions they do it.

3. it was interesting but not too difficult

4. Yes. Interesting stuff.

5. Yes, it required a lot of memorization skills

8. Yes, overall this class was very informative and did stretch my thinking.

9. Yes, she made us come up with our own examples and back them up with reasoning.

10. Yes, it took a concept I was so familiar with and broke it down and told me why it was the way it was!

12. Kind of, I learned some things that I never knew before and I started to think about how swearing and others affect daily life and what not.

13. Yes

14. It was because it allowed me to consider a facet of language that I never had before.

15. Yes, because it teaches me how taboo word may affect our lives and where they came from.

16. No because the questions asked were usually either obvious, or random. I feel like there was a lot of useless additions.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Engagement in quiz section

2. The activities were really fun and engaging like jeopardy.

3. i liked the time in section to review material before quizzes

4. Lectures. Polling stuff was helpful.

5. Studying

6. Interactive lessons (Ie., clicker questions)

8. I think the whole class as a whole was very well taught and very good.

9. When she reviewed what the professor talked about in lecture.

10. Sara was enthusiastic and awesome so it made Quiz section fun

11. The slides that summarized lecture notes and presenting the slides before the quiz as a refresher really helped!

12. Quiz section overviews

13. The quizzes and the reviews before them

14. The in class examples, the group project

15. Polling Questions

16. None.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. nothing

2. Nothing

3. some of the content taught in lecture wasnt relevant to the material being tested so that was sometimes a little confusing

4. Not much.

5. None

6. Group project didn't really seem to serve much of a purpose. Maybe I'm bias because I hate group projects

7. Book was worthless, save a few chapters that could've easily been scanned and uploaded instead of making us buy the text

8. Nothing

9. I didn't get much out of the group project.

10. Some info was irrelevant

11. Stopping class to tell other students to stop talking.

12. Nothing

13. Class atmosphere was uncomfortable at times.

15. The tabooness

16. Structure, non thought-provoking atmosphere.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. More polling question

2. Keep the poll everywhere and jeopardy games. They really helped us review information.

3. the class is really interesting keep it up!

4. Class was great. I would keep it the same.

5. N/A

8. Nothing, overall thought this class was great.

9. Do more fun activities like jeopardy and the ice experiment to keep class interesting.

10. Good work

11. I think that students with valid reason to miss class (illness, emergencies, etc.) should be able to retake quizzes in another quiz section, if arranged prior to class. This should be considered because people cannot predict when they will get sick and that would be unfair for them not to have the same chances as someone else. Additionally, since our quiz section had people that were constantly talking, maybe have assigned seating as a punishment next time?

12. Nothing all good

13. Create a less condescending/uneasy environment

15. Do more polling questions

16. Be more necessary.

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.

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Spring 2018

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

LING 269 AD
Swearing And Taboo Language
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Sara Ng
Instructor Evaluated: Sara Ng-TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 20/25 (80% 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:

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
4.2	**3.8**
(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: 3.6
(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 quiz section as a whole was:	20	40%	30%	25%			5%	4.2	3.7
The content of the quiz section was:	20	40%	35%	20%			5%	4.2	3.8
The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was:	20	45%	40%	10%			5%	4.4	4.0
The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	20	40%	30%	25%			5%	4.2	3.7

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:	19	42%	32%	5%	21%				6.2
The intellectual challenge presented was:	19	11%	5%	26%	32%	16%	5%	5%	4.2
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	19	11%	11%	21%	26%	32%			4.2
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	19	11%	11%	21%	21%	37%			4.1
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	19	11%	32%	16%	32%	11%			5.0

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: 3.3 (N=17)**

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
24%	29%	24%	12%	12%							

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education? **Class median: 3.2 (N=17)**

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%	24%	29%	6%	12%							

What grade do you expect in this course? **Class median: 3.9 (N=17)**

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
59%	29%	12%												

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as: **(N=18)**

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
11%	6%	56%			28%

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Spring 2018

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Explanations by the QSI were:	19	42%	42%	11%		5%		4.3	9
QSI's use of examples and illustrations was:	19	42%	42%	11%		5%		4.3	15
Quality of questions or problems raised by QSI was:	19	47%	26%	21%		5%		4.4	5
QSI's enthusiasm was:	19	63%	21%	5%	11%			4.7	3
Student confidence in QSI's knowledge was:	19	47%	32%	21%				4.4	18
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	19	47%	42%	5%			5%	4.4	14
Answers to student questions were:	19	47%	32%	16%	5%			4.4	8
Interest level of quiz sections was:	19	37%	26%	32%		5%		4.0	17
QSI's openness to student views was:	19	47%	42%	5%		5%		4.4	12
QSI's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	19	42%	42%	11%			5%	4.3	16
Availability of extra help when needed was:	19	53%	37%	5%		5%		4.5	4
Use of quiz section time was:	19	42%	32%	26%				4.2	10
QSI's interest in whether students learned was:	19	47%	47%			5%		4.4	11
Amount you learned in the quiz sections was:	19	42%	37%	11%	5%		5%	4.3	7
Relevance and usefulness of quiz section content were:	19	42%	47%	5%	5%			4.3	13
Coordination between lectures and quiz sections was:	19	47%	53%					4.5	2
Reasonableness of assigned work for quiz section was:	19	53%	42%		5%			4.5	1
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	19	47%	37%	11%		5%		4.4	6

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Spring 2018

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

LING 269 AD
Swearing And Taboo Language
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Sara Ng
Instructor Evaluated: Sara Ng-TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 20/25 (80% very high)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. This class was great! Very interesting, well organized quiz section.

3. Thinking about the different usage of swear words and how different people rate them

4. Yes, because it allowed me to think more about a topic I had previously taken for granted

5. Quiz section and the weekly quizzes

6. There are a great deal of aspects that are stimulating, especially since as a Chem major I do not often get to branch out. So this class was a different avenue of thinking for me.

7. Yeah, it was a very interesting class and learned a lot more than I expected

8. Oh very, and Sara did a great job getting us all to think

9. No. The quiz section did not add to my learning. Therefore, the quiz section did not stretch my thinking

10. It was interesting but not very difficult

11. It taught me a lot about different swear words, and helped me learn how to create Google Surveys, so that's a plus.

12. yes

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The quizzes felt low-stakes, but a great way to reinforce ideas from lectures.

2. quiz review, poll everywhere questions

3. The polling questions

4. The review of course material

5. Weekly quizzes

6. I would say the lectures as well as the quiz section. The section is integral in reviewing and clarifying the material and the quizzes really help ensure you do not fall behind on the material.

7. Quiz review and group activities

8. Sara's explanations for everything with her sarcastic goofiness

9. Probably the weekly quizzes. It was kinda like a benchmark for me

10. Review time up to a certain point

11. The more detailed explanations of things learned in class were always helpful. The activities were pretty engaging and fun as well. The TA was constantly enthusiastic and tried to get people to participate.

12. review

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. Very little, efficient setup for accomplishing the class goals.

2. people in class did not want to respond the majority of the time, and I think in this situation cold-calling is appropriate. Obviously it's not fun to do, but its also not fun to waste class time waiting for people to respond.

3. None

4. The dead space in class discussions where no kne talked

5. None

6. None

7. Kinda short sections

8. The fact that all of us were dead silent through every clsss

9. Everything except the quizzes

11. Our class could be a little quiet sometimes, which slowed down the pace of the class. Nothing the TA could've done about that though, she definitely tried her best to keep the class on topic.

12. nothing

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Keep doing it!

3. Slow down the course a little bit or do not pack so much into the quarter

4. Force people to talk more

5. None

6. I feel like the group project as a two part thing is a bit excessive.

7. Nothing

8. Not sure, just something to engage the class more

9. Sara should get a haircut

10. I would have preferred less review time and more group work time

11. Keep doing what you're doing

12. nothing

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.