

STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL REPORT II[®]

Enrollment	Admin. Date	Report No.	Batch No.
35	11/06	063502	4009



HOWARD UNIVERSITY

CLASS REPORT

DIMIAN 304

PERCENTAGES reported below are based on the total number responding, which is: 25

Assessing Courses and Instruction

A. Course Organization and Planning <i>Think about each practice as it contributed to your learning in this course.</i>	Omit	Not Applicable	5 Very Effective	4 Effective	3 Moderately Effective	2 Somewhat Ineffective	1 Ineffective	Mean
1. The instructor's explanation of course requirements . . .			80	20				4.80
2. The instructor's preparation for each class period . . .	4		84	12				4.88
3. The instructor's command of the subject matter . . .	12		84	4				4.95*
4. The instructor's use of class time . . .	4		84	12				4.88*
5. The instructor's way of summarizing or emphasizing important points in class . . .	8		64	28				4.78
Overall mean for COURSE ORGANIZATION AND PLANNING is: 4.84+ The comparative mean for FOUR-YEAR institutions is: 4.23.								

B. Communication <i>Think about each practice as it contributed to your learning in this course.</i>	Omit	Not Applicable	5 Very Effective	4 Effective	3 Moderately Effective	2 Somewhat Ineffective	1 Ineffective	Mean
6. The instructor's ability to make clear and understandable presentations . . .			52	48				4.52
7. The instructor's command of spoken English (or the language used in the course) . . .	4		48	48				4.50
8. The instructor's use of examples or illustrations to clarify course material . . .	4		64	32				4.67
9. The instructor's use of challenging questions or problems . . .	4		80	12	4			4.79
10. The instructor's enthusiasm for the course material . . .	8		72	20				4.78
Overall mean for COMMUNICATION is: 4.65 The comparative mean for FOUR-YEAR institutions is: 4.28.								

C. Faculty/Student Interaction <i>Think about each practice as it contributed to your learning in this course.</i>	Omit	Not Applicable	5 Very Effective	4 Effective	3 Moderately Effective	2 Somewhat Ineffective	1 Ineffective	Mean
11. The instructor's helpfulness and responsiveness to students . . .			96	4				4.96*
12. The instructor's respect for students . . .	4		92	4				4.96*
13. The instructor's concern for student progress . . .	4		96					5.00*
14. The availability of extra help for this class (taking into account the size of the class) . . .	4		92	4				4.96*
15. The instructor's willingness to listen to student questions and opinions . . .	4		76	20				4.79
Overall mean for FACULTY/STUDENT INTERACTION is: 4.93+ The comparative mean for FOUR-YEAR institutions is: 4.27.								

+ This mean is higher than the comparative mean. See page 4.

- This mean is lower than the comparative mean. See page 4.

For explanation of flagging (*), see "Number of Students Responding," page 4.

STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL REPORT II[®]

D. Assignments, Exams, and Grading <i>Mark the response that is closest to your learning in this course.</i>	Omit	Not Applicable	5 Very Effective	4 Effective	3 Moderately Effective	2 Somewhat Ineffective	1 Ineffective	Mean
16. The information given to students about how they would be graded . . .			92	8				4.92+
17. The clarity of exam questions . . .	4		72	24				4.75+
18. The exams' coverage of important aspects of the course . . .	4		80	16				4.83+
19. The instructor's comments on assignments and exams . . .	4		88	8				4.92+
20. The overall quality of the textbook(s) . . .	4		40	16	32	4	4	3.88
21. The helpfulness of assignments in understanding course material . . .	4		72	24				4.75+

Overall mean for ASSIGNMENTS, EXAMS, AND GRADING is: 4.67+ The comparative mean for FOUR-YEAR institutions is: 4.02.

E. Supplementary Instructional Methods <i>Rate the effectiveness of each practice used as it contributed to your learning.</i>	Omit	Not Used	5 Very Effective	4 Effective	3 Moderately Effective	2 Somewhat Ineffective	1 Ineffective	Mean
22. Problems or questions presented by the instructor for small group discussions . . .		20	56	24				***
23. Term paper(s) or project(s) . . .			68	16	16			***
24. Laboratory exercises for understanding important course concepts . . .	4	56	32	8				***
25. Assigned projects in which students worked together . . .		4	56	28	12			***
26. Case studies, simulations, or role playing . . .	4	40	40	8	8			***
27. Course journals or logs required of students . . .	4	56	36	4				***
28. Instructor's use of computers as aids in instruction . .			76	24				***

Means are not reported (*) for SUPPLEMENTARY INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS.**

F. Course Outcomes <i>Mark the response that is closest to your view.</i>	Omit	Not Applicable	5 Much More Than Most Courses	4 More Than Most Courses	3 About the Same as Others	2 Less Than Most Courses	1 Much Less Than Most Courses	Mean
29. My learning increased in this course . . .			44	44	12			4.32
30. I made progress toward achieving course objectives . . .			48	28	24			4.24
31. My interest in the subject area has increased . . .	4		36	32	28			4.08
32. This course helped me to think independently about the subject matter . . .			44	28	28			4.16
33. This course actively involved me in what I was learning . . .		4	44	32	16	4		4.21

Overall mean for COURSE OUTCOMES is: 4.20 The comparative mean for FOUR-YEAR institutions is: 3.85.

G. Student Effort and Involvement <i>Mark the response that is closest to your view.</i>	Omit	Not Applicable	5 Much More Than Most Courses	4 More Than Most Courses	3 About the Same as Others	2 Less Than Most Courses	1 Much Less Than Most Courses	Mean
34. I studied and put effort into this course . . .			48	36	12	4		4.28
35. I was prepared for each class (writing and reading assignments) . . .			24	36	32	8		3.76
36. I was challenged by this course . . .			84	12	4			4.80+

Overall mean for STUDENT EFFORT AND INVOLVEMENT is: 4.28 The comparative mean for FOUR-YEAR institutions is: 3.63.

+ This mean is higher than the comparative mean. See page 4.

- This mean is lower than the comparative mean. See page 4.

For explanation of flagging (*), see "Number of Students Responding," page 4.

ASSESSING COURSES AND INSTRUCTION

H: Course Difficulty, Workload, and Pace <i>Mark the response that is closest to your view.</i>	Omit	Very Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	About Right	Somewhat Elementary	Very Elementary
37. For my preparation and ability, the level of difficulty of this course was . . .		44	44	12		
	Omit	Much Heavier	Heavier	About the Same	Lighter	Much Lighter
38. The work load for this course in relation to other courses of equal credit was . . .	4	20	36	40		
	Omit	Very Fast	Somewhat Fast	Just About Right	Somewhat Slow	Very Slow
39. For me, the pace at which the instructor covered the material during the term was . . .		4	28	68		
Means are not appropriate for COURSE DIFFICULTY, WORKLOAD, and PACE. Review the distribution of students' responses.						

I: Overall Evaluation	Omit	5 Very Effective	4 Effective	3 Moderately Effective	2 Somewhat Ineffective	1 Ineffective	Mean
40. Rate the quality of instruction in this course as it contributed to your learning. (Try to set aside your feelings about the course content.)		68	32				4.68
OVERALL EVALUATION mean is: 4.68 The comparative mean for FOUR-YEAR institutions is: 3.97.							

J: Student Information	Omit	Requirement in Major	College Requirement	Elective	Other			
41. Which one of the following best describes this course for you?		100						
42. What is your class level?	Omit	Freshman/1st Year	Sophomore/2nd Year	Junior/3rd Year	Senior/4th Year	Graduate	Other	
		4	84	12				
43. Do you communicate better in English or in another language?	Omit	Better in English	Better in Another Language	Equally well in English and Another Language				
		80		20				
44. Sex	Omit	Female			Male			
		20			80			
45. What grade do you expect to receive in this course?	Omit	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C	Below C
		28	12	12	16	28	4	

K: Supplementary Questions	Omit	NA	5	4	3	2	1
46.							
47.							
48.							
49.							
50.							
51.							
52.							
53.							
54.							
55.							

+ This mean is higher than the comparative mean. See page 4.
 - This mean is lower than the comparative mean. See page 4.
 For explanation of flagging (*), see "Number of Students Responding," page 4.

The SIR II is designed to:

- Identify areas of strength and/or areas for improvement.
- Provide information on new teaching methods or techniques used in class.
- Provide feedback from students about their courses.

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING

The number of students responding can affect the results when the class is very small (fewer than 10 students are enrolled), or when fewer than two-thirds of the students enrolled in the class actually respond. For this reason, a Class Report will not be produced when fewer than five students responded, that is, fewer than five completed answer sheets were received for a class.

The degree of accuracy for each item mean increases as the number of students responding increases. For example, the estimated reliability for the Overall Evaluation Item is .85 if 15 students respond and .90 if 25 students respond. (A full discussion of the reliability of student evaluation items can be found in *SIR Report No. 3*.) To call attention to possible reliability concerns, a report will be flagged (*) for one or more of the following.

- * The number responding will be flagged when: 10 or fewer students responded or less than 60 percent of the class responded (this calculation is based on information from the *Instructor's Cover Sheet*).
- * An item mean will not be reported when: 50 percent or more of the students did not respond, or marked an item "Not Applicable," or fewer than five students responded to an item.
- * An overall mean is not reported when one or more item means are not reported.

PRELIMINARY COMPARATIVE DATA

The comparative means used throughout this report are based on user data from a sample of two and four year colleges and universities that participated in the 1995-98 SIR II pilot administration. The comparative means for 4-year institutions were obtained by averaging the mean ratings for more than 4,800 classes from 19 4-year institutions. The comparative means for 2-year institutions were obtained by averaging the mean ratings for approximately 2,700 classes from five 2-year institutions. These means will be updated periodically. An institution is identified by type - two-year or four-year - on the Processing Request Form that is returned with the questionnaires for scoring. Either two-year or four-year comparative data are used, based on that identification. However, the selected comparison group is not necessarily the most appropriate comparison group for a particular class or institution. For example, mean ratings within each institution type may vary depending upon class characteristics such as class size, level, and subject area. The *Comparative Data Guides* for two-year and four-year colleges contain class means and percentile distributions for different class sizes, levels, types of class (e.g., lecture, discussion, lab), and for several different subject areas. A copy of the appropriate *Guide* is sent to institutional coordinators with the SIR II reports.

Local Comparative Data: Equally important and useful are an institution's own comparative data. Such local comparative data - e.g., an Institutional Summary, departmental summaries, program summaries - are available to any user institution. Forms for ordering these reports are included in the *Institutional Coordinator's Manual*.

Understanding Mean Ratings

Ratings can vary by class size and discipline. The *Comparative Data Guides* provide data by various categories to assist users in interpreting the SIR II reports. Please refer to the *Guide* and to the SIR II Guidelines for further information. Since student ratings typically tend to be favorable, it is important to have comparative data to interpret a report fully. For example, while a 3.6 is numerically above average on a 5-point scale, it may be average or even slightly below average in comparison to other means for items in SIR II.

What Makes a Score Difference Significant?

The mean scores on all of the items and scales in this report have been compared against the scores obtained by all of the classes in one of the appropriate comparative data groups (two-year or four-year institutions). Specifically, the scores have been compared against the score values corresponding to the 10th percentile and 90th percentile in the comparative group. If the results indicate a score is sufficiently reliable and is below the 10th percentile or above the 90th percentile, it will be flagged in the report as follows:

- + This class mean is reliably at or above the 90th percentile.
- This class mean is reliably at or below the 10th percentile.

Scores above the 90th percentile or below the 10th percentile are flagged when there is appropriate statistical confidence that the "true scores" (i.e., the scores that would be obtained if there were no measurement error) fall within these ranges. If a score is flagged with a +, there is less than one chance in 20 that the "true score" is below the 90th percentile; if a score is flagged with a -, there is less than one chance in 20 that the "true score" is above the 10th percentile. (One chance in 20 is the commonly accepted measurement standard for a 95% confidence level.)

Because measurement error varies from class to class, instructors with identical means on the SIR II items may not have the same items flagged. In particular, measurement error tends to be larger when the number of respondents is low and when disagreement among the respondents is high. For example, instructors in small classes are likely to have fewer items flagged than those in large classes because there is less confidence of the reliability of means in small classes.