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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. Program and EP results are based on the prior three semesters.

- "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>92%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Subscore</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor and Course Score</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Instructor Related Questions

THE INSTRUCTOR...

A  Appeared knowledgeable about course content  14  79%  21%

B  Was prepared for class  14  79%  14%  7%

C  Displayed enthusiasm for teaching  14  86%  14%

D  Used appropriate examples to clarify points  14  86%  7%  7%

E  Demonstrated relationships between theory and practice  14  71%  14%  14%

F  Motivated me to learn  14  79%  21%

G  Gave understandable presentations  14  79%  7%  14%

Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Program Mean* (F2F)</th>
<th>EP Mean* (F2F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Program and EP results are based on the prior three semesters.
1. Instructor Related Questions (cont’d)

THE INSTRUCTOR…

H  Provided useful responses to questions  14
   Response Percents: 79%  14%  7%

I  Respected me as a student  14
   Response Percents: 86%  14%

J  Responded to my inquiries in a timely manner  14
   Response Percents: 86%  7%  7%

K  Helped me develop new skills  14
   Response Percents: 57%  29%  7%  7%

L  Graded my performance fairly  14
   Response Percents: 79%  21%

M  Provided grades in a timely manner  14
   Response Percents: 79%  21%

N  Provided useful feedback on assignments (e.g., homework)  14
   Response Percents: 57%  36%  7%  7%

O  Provided useful feedback on assessments (e.g., exams, papers, projects)  14
   Response Percents: 57%  36%  7%  7%
### 1. Course Related Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Response Percents</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>The required reading materials contributed to my learning</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>The course assignments (e.g., homework) contributed to my learning</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>The course assessments (e.g., exams, papers, projects) measured what I learned in the course</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>The course content was relevant to my career</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>The course content challenged me</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>The course workload requirements were reasonable</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistics**

- **Course Mean**
- **Standard Deviation**
- **Program Mean**
- **EP Mean**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Course Mean</strong></th>
<th><strong>Program Mean</strong></th>
<th><strong>EP Mean</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Program and EP results are based on the prior three semesters.*
Please provide any comments you wish to share about the course.

- Project archival system very cumbersome and difficult to use. Majority of workload frustration spent sidestepping archive system.
- Course was very well put together. Professor made sure it was very interactive, and applicable to real world scenarios.
- The project expectations could have been better communicated, and the project requirements could have been more explicitly related to the course content.
- The book (Mythical Man Month) was a great read; highly applicable in many settings, not just software engineering. As much as it pains me to say it, I liked having weekly quizzes because it forced me to review the material at least once weekly outside of class.
- The fact the whole team was working on a single project made the lessons taught by the professor very accessible since we could all observe the concepts at plain during our design, implementation, and integration of the software project.
- The course addressed considerations of my specialty career field as strongly as could reasonably be expected.
- The final project was unique and provided great instruction, but without a substantial preexisting knowledge of software languages, frameworks, and systems, it was a struggle to find ways to substantially contribute.
- Weekly exams kept me honest and ensured I was retaining material. They were a challenging, but effective (and welcome) element of the course.
- Challenges like the marshmallow and ping pong ball event built the class as a team, and demonstrated SE / Management principles so effectively I was taken by surprise.

- Class material was very interesting
- I think the way the course is currently structure is very effective and the project allows the exposure of the practical sense of the coarse.
- The course material was all useful and I learned a lot. See my comments in the previous section about how the class project could be improved in the future.
- Excellent reading materials (Mythical Man Month, for example) and weekly quizzes were fun.

There were a number of problems with the tools used for the final project, however: the collaboration tool (Phabricator) only worked with a particular version of Mercurial, many found it difficult to do reviews and manage revisions, it had its own command line tool and markup language that I didn't think were worth learning because I almost certainly won't use them anywhere else in the future, and we were unable to make Wiki pages. A less esoteric tool may have been more effective.

- The course helped me think more deeply and seriously about software engineering and was thus relevant and helpful to my career.
- The project could have used more structure, maybe just progress check-ins?

Please provide any comments you wish to share about this instructor.

- Great Professor and very approachable. No complaints
- Great instructor. Could have provided a little more structure to the project assignment.
- This class was highly oriented towards being successful in a working environment. Strong emphasis in project management, managing styles, and practices. The quizzes were designed for the student retaining the material which I fInd to important; quizzes often contained materials from 4-10 lessons prior. Mercurial was a struggle but did learn a lot by tackling those issues.
- Instructor was very knowledgeable about the material, and presented it in an extremely considered and effective manner. The instructor fostered an open, friendly environment, and stands out as one of the best instructors I have encountered in higher education, let alone the JHU EP program.

- Great instructor - enthusiastic about teaching and explains things well.
- The coarse was very well structured and taught. The instructor did a very good job explaining the material and ensuring the students would remember the material.

I do think the quizzes were a pain every week, but they are very useful to keep me studying the material on a weekly bases.
Joel Coffman does a very good job at relating the content of his class to real world examples that truly help me better understand the material. One thing that could be improved about the class is the structure of the group project and the tools used. I believe that using a version control system that is common in the industry would have 1. Given us more actionable skills from the class. 2. Would have cut down on confusion and bugs. Using a well documented and commonly used framework like Git would have been a whole lot easier in my opinion. Also due to the wide use of Git, the tools to track code/review code would not have been so finicky.

Clearly takes student feedback seriously and tries to use it to improve the class. Could have provided more feedback on assignments and project work.

Maybe post answers to quiz questions after they are graded?