

SWED 201 A
Second-Year Swedish
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: E
Responses: 9/13 (69% high)

Taught by: Kim Kraft

Instructor Evaluated: Kim Kraft-Lecturer

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 |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 4.8 | 4.4 |
| (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 course as a whole was: | 9 | 67% | 33% | | | | | 4.8 | 4.3 |
| The course content was: | 9 | 56% | 33% | 11% | | | | 4.6 | 4.2 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 9 | 89% | 11% | | | | | 4.9 | 4.6 |
| The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was: | 9 | 89% | 11% | | | | | 4.9 | 4.5 |

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

| | N | Much Higher (7) | (6) | (5) | Average (4) | (3) | (2) | Much Lower (1) | Median |
|--|---|-----------------|-----|-----|-------------|-----|-----|----------------|--------|
| Relative to other college courses you have taken: | | | | | | | | | |
| Do you expect your grade in this course to be: | 9 | 33% | 22% | 11% | 33% | | | | 5.8 |
| The intellectual challenge presented was: | 9 | | 44% | 22% | 22% | 11% | | | 5.2 |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was: | 9 | | 56% | 22% | 11% | 11% | | | 5.6 |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was: | 9 | | 44% | 11% | 33% | 11% | | | 5.0 |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 9 | 22% | 33% | 22% | 11% | 11% | | | 5.7 |

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: 11.0 Hours per credit: 2.2 (N=9)

| 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% | 11% | 11% | 22% | 33% | 11% | | | | |

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

Class median: 10.0 Hours per credit: 2 (N=9)

| 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% | 11% | 22% | 22% | 22% | 11% | | | | |

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 4.0 (N=9)

| 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 |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|---------|------|--------|-----------|
| 78% | 11% | | | | | | | | | | | 11% | | |

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

(N=9)

| In your major | A core/distribution requirement | An elective | In your minor | A program requirement | Other |
|---------------|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------------|-------|
| 22% | | 22% | 33% | | 22% |

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

| | N | Excellent (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair (2) | Poor (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Relative Rank |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|--------|------------------|
| Opportunity for practicing what was learned was: | 9 | 67% | 33% | | | | | 4.8 | 12 |
| Sequential development of skills was: | 9 | 56% | 33% | 11% | | | | 4.6 | 9 |
| Explanations of underlying rationales for new techniques or skills were: | 9 | 67% | 22% | 11% | | | | 4.8 | 6 |
| Demonstrations of expected skills were: | 9 | 67% | 22% | 11% | | | | 4.8 | 10 |
| Instructor's confidence in students' ability was: | 9 | 78% | 11% | 11% | | | | 4.9 | 11 |
| Recognition of student progress by instructor was: | 9 | 78% | 22% | | | | | 4.9 | 7 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 9 | 78% | 22% | | | | | 4.9 | 14 |
| Freedom allowed students to develop own skills and ideas was: | 9 | 78% | 22% | | | | | 4.9 | 15 |
| Instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was: | 8 | 88% | | 12% | | | | 4.9 | 2 |
| Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was: | 9 | 67% | 33% | | | | | 4.8 | 8 |
| Availability of extra help when needed was: | 9 | 56% | 44% | | | | | 4.6 | 17 |
| Use of class time was: | 9 | 22% | 56% | 22% | | | | 4.0 | 18 |
| Instructor's interest in whether students learned was: | 9 | 89% | | 11% | | | | 4.9 | 4 |
| Amount you learned in the course was: | 9 | 56% | 33% | 11% | | | | 4.6 | 13 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 9 | 56% | 33% | | 11% | | | 4.6 | 16 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 9 | 78% | 11% | 11% | | | | 4.9 | 3 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 9 | 67% | 22% | 11% | | | | 4.8 | 5 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 9 | 89% | 11% | | | | | 4.9 | 1 |

SWED 201 A
Second-Year Swedish
Course type: Online

Taught by: Kim Kraft

Instructor Evaluated: Kim Kraft-Lecturer

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: E
Responses: 9/13 (69% high)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Classes are always fun and engaging!
2. It's a language, so...
3. Yes! Everyday I learned something new. Everyday Kim challenged us which I think is really important when learning a language.
4. Yes it was, I found it much harder than 100-level Swedish
5. Yes, I liked to learn a lot more- especially once we started diving into the Rivstart book! It was also really good to learn your swedish! It is a bit different from Brad's so it was nice to be able to understand not just one person in swedish ;)
6. This class was a highlight of my 2020 pandemic year. I appreciate that I was challenged and that Kim was encouraging as we navigated language acquisition in a virtual setting!
7. Yes! It's challenging but in a productive way, and in a way that encourages growth

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. I think the variety in types of class lessons from lectures to group work to talking with Swedes was really helpful.
2. practice
3. Classes, homework (even though rivstart can be a little tedious).
4. Discussions, especially with the Swedes
5. I love being corrected! I really do! You can't correct me enough! Thanks for helping with pronunciation as we read aloud.
6. I appreciated the varied learning activities, from making videos, to reading books, to writing, to speaking with native speaker!
7. I felt comfortable making mistakes, which was really helpful. I tried my best, of course, but it was understood that I wasn't going to do everything perfectly and that was okay!

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. It felt like most of the time the workload in the class would be pretty light and then all in one week there would be a ton of work and then back to normal which was sometimes hard to manage (especially the amount assigned thanksgiving weekend).
2. struggling with organization of breakout rooms
3. Nothing really, aside from being online which is not Kim's fault.
4. I think it would be much better in person unfortunately
5. I feel like I didn't really learn the vocab as well as I should have because we weren't tested on all of it. I don't want to say we should have more quizzes though because I know there are already a lot of other assignments that should be helping solidify the new vocab.
6. Technical difficulties, to be expected.
7. Nothing!

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. I think it's been pretty great!
2. less review, more new material
3. Kim really cares for us- keep that compassion! We notice and appreciate it.
4. Maybe more explanations of words, even if it means explaining the meaning or usage of a word on multiple occasions.
5. Maybe be meaner and correct more of our mispronunciations in class? It was really helpful when the swedes would correct us while we were reading, even if it did make me start a sentence again. I think it was worth it! I just don't want to go to sweden and mispronounce things and have people do the "Aw, your so cute, I won't correct you" thing haha! I do also acknowledge that some people might have poor eyesight and that's the only reason they are mispronouncing so it truly is difficult to find a median between overcorrecting and just letting people talk!
6. I don't know that we had to be in small groups as often as we were. Sometimes I think being together was more productive in this zoom learning environment.
7. I don't have any!

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.