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Summary of Results

This **Summary of Results** provides an overview of the results of your course's evaluation by the students who enrolled in your course and completed a Course and Instructor Evaluation of Educational Quality. It supplements the detailed results presented in the Instructor Standard Report that follows. Three indices covering students' overall assessment of courses and instructors have been developed and are described below. You will also see similar scores for your program in the same modality (i.e., online, on-site, or partnership courses), and for the whole Engineering for Professionals (EP) program in the same modality.

- **"Instructor Subscore"** = A score on the 0%-100% percentage scale that represents the results of the instructor-oriented questions on the evaluation form. For each possible response (strongly disagree; disagree; neutral; agree; strongly agree), a value is assigned. Every response is tallied for the instructor-oriented questions, divided by the total possible score (i.e., if all students select “strongly agree”), and then expressed as a percentage. Instances where the student does not respond or selects “not applicable” are not counted in this calculation.

- **"Course Subscore"** = A score on the 0%-100% percentage scale that represents the results of the course-oriented questions on the evaluation form. For each possible response (strongly disagree; disagree; neutral; agree; strongly agree), a value is assigned. Every response is tallied for the course-oriented questions, divided by the total possible score (i.e., if all students select “strongly agree”), and then expressed as a percentage. Instances where the student does not respond or selects “not applicable” are not counted in this calculation.

- **"Course and Instructor Score"** = A score on the 0%-100% percentage scale that represents the results of all questions on the evaluation form (both Instructor and Course items). For each possible response (strongly disagree; disagree; neutral; agree; strongly agree), a value is assigned. Every response is tallied for all questions, divided by the total possible score (i.e., if all students select “strongly agree”), and then expressed as a percentage. Instances where the student does not respond or selects “not applicable” are not counted in this calculation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Your Course’s Total</th>
<th>Program Total for On-Site Courses</th>
<th>EP Total for On-Site Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Subscore</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Subscore</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor and Course Score</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Enrolled: 5; # of Responses: 3; Participation: 60%

THE INSTRUCTOR...
A Appeared knowledgeable about course content

Number of students responding to each question.

Questionnaire item wording.

The response options in the above bar graph. Bar graph shows the % of participating students who selected each response option for the questionnaire item.

Line charts and numerical displays of
1) the mean score for the course,
2) the standard deviation around the mean for the course,
3) the mean for the Program and
4) the mean for Global JHU-EP.
# 1. Instructor Related Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE INSTRUCTOR…</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Response Percents</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Appeared knowledgeable about course content</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33% Neutral 67%</td>
<td>Instructor Mean 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Was prepared for class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33% Neutral 67%</td>
<td>4.3 0.6 4.3 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Displayed enthusiasm for teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33% Neutral 67%</td>
<td>4.3 0.6 4.4 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Used appropriate examples to clarify points</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33% Neutral 67%</td>
<td>4.3 0.6 4.1 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Demonstrated relationships between theory and practice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33% Neutral 67%</td>
<td>4.3 0.6 4.2 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Motivated me to learn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33% Neutral 67%</td>
<td>4.3 0.6 3.9 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Gave understandable presentations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33% Neutral 67%</td>
<td>4.3 0.6 4.0 4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6/3/2014
1. Instructor Related Questions (cont’d)

THE INSTRUCTOR...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Provided useful responses to questions</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>33%</th>
<th>67%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Respected me as a student</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Responded to my inquiries in a timely manner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Helped me develop new skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Graded my performance fairly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Provided grades in a timely manner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Provided useful feedback on assignments (e.g., homework)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Provided useful feedback on assessments (e.g., exams, papers, projects)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Course Related Questions

A. The required reading materials contributed to my learning
   - Number Responding: 3
   - Response Percents:
     - Strongly Agree: 33%
     - Agree: 33%
     - Neutral: 33%
   - Course Mean: 3.0
   - Standard Deviation: 1.0
   - Program Mean: 4.0
   - E.P. Mean: 4.1

B. The course assignments (e.g., homework) contributed to my learning
   - Number Responding: 3
   - Response Percents:
     - Strongly Agree: 100%
   - Course Mean: 4.0
   - Standard Deviation: 0.0
   - Program Mean: 4.4
   - E.P. Mean: 4.4

C. The course assessments (e.g., exams, papers, projects) measured what I learned in the course
   - Number Responding: 3
   - Response Percents:
     - Strongly Agree: 100%
   - Course Mean: 4.0
   - Standard Deviation: 0.0
   - Program Mean: 4.1
   - E.P. Mean: 4.2

D. The course content was relevant to my career
   - Number Responding: 3
   - Response Percents:
     - Strongly Agree: 33%
     - Agree: 67%
   - Course Mean: 3.3
   - Standard Deviation: 0.6
   - Program Mean: 4.2
   - E.P. Mean: 4.2

E. The course content challenged me
   - Number Responding: 3
   - Response Percents:
     - Strongly Agree: 67%
     - Agree: 33%
   - Course Mean: 3.7
   - Standard Deviation: 0.6
   - Program Mean: 4.3
   - E.P. Mean: 4.3

F. The course workload requirements were reasonable
   - Number Responding: 3
   - Response Percents:
     - Strongly Agree: 100%
   - Course Mean: 4.0
   - Standard Deviation: 0.0
   - Program Mean: 4.2
   - E.P. Mean: 4.2
Course Comments
- Overall, the course was very informative and, for the most part, the weekly readings related well to the lectures. I believe the course could have been more effective in two ways. First, there was not enough direction for most of the assignments. It was not very easy to decipher exactly what the professor wanted as a finished product. I would suggest having clearer goals and requirements for each graded assignment. Second, the group project did not define specific roles, scope, or expectations for each group member allowing for a few of the members to basically take over the project. I would recommend defining specific items each member will be graded on in order to provide students with more leverage in determining his or her role in the project. This could include the mandatory rotation of students into different functions allowing for each student to gain more experience and provide more tangible work for the professor to assess.
- Weekly quizzes are one of the best ways to reinforce the material because it forces the student to study each week's material well. There is also less pressure because doing bad on 1-2 quizzes is not going to destroy your grade like bombing 1 midterm.

Instructor Comments
- The professor was very knowledgeable across all topics and was able to emphasize the most important "real world" takeaways.
- The instructor was great! His lectures are interesting and how he organized his class with weekly quizzes really helps reinforce the material. I would prefer weekly quizzes over midterms anyday.