MATH1513.001TH-College Algebra-TestInstructor
Instructor: James TestInstructor

Mark as shown: □ X □ □ Please use a ball-point pen or a thin felt tip. This form will be processed automatically.
Correction: □ X □ □ X Please follow the examples shown on the left hand side to help optimize the reading results.

Student surveys are conducted for every instructor and course at Oklahoma State University. Information gained from this survey will be useful to the instructor, the department, students, and administrators responsible for instruction at OSU. You are asked to give some information about yourself, then your views of the INSTRUCTOR and then your views of the COURSE. In addition, space is also provided for written comments.

Information about yourself

My college is:
□ Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources
□ Education
□ Human Sciences
□ None of these
Classification:
□ Freshman
□ Senior
□ Undergraduate (non-degree seeking)

Purpose for taking the course:
□ Major
□ Elective
Course is required:
□ Yes
□ No
Type of course:
□ Lecture
□ Lab
□ IPI

Rank the INSTRUCTOR

Preparation and organization:
Effort devoted to teaching:
Presentation of materials:
Knowledge of subject:
Ability to explain subject matter:
Positive attitude toward students:
Overall INSTRUCTOR appraisal:

Views on the COURSE

I learned a lot in this course.
Workload was appropriate for the credit hours.
Assignments were relevant and useful.
Testing and evaluation procedures were good.
Students were adequately involved.
This course was worthwhile to me.
Overall, this was a good COURSE.
Please add any comments you wish about the following:

Course

Instructor

Instruction

Teaching Assistants / Associates

Laboratory, Practicum, or Discussion Section

Work Load

Examinations

Grading

Textbook

Other Comments
Spring 2019 Student Survey of Instruction (SSI) Results

Dear <<Instructor First Name>> <<Instructor Last Name>>,

In the attached report you will find the Student Survey of Instruction (SSI) results for the following course:

<<Course Name>>

The SSI results report is comprised of the following sections:

- Overall indicators
- Information about yourself (demographic information reported by the students who completed the survey)
- Rank the INSTRUCTOR
- Views on the COURSE
- Comments Report – text comments submitted by students
- Profile – graphic representations of the averages of each survey question

For a more detailed explanation of the information contained in this survey report, an annotated PDF of a sample report is available on the SSI website at the following link: http://uat.okstate.edu/sites/default/files/assessPDFs/survey/traditional.pdf

If you have questions or comments please let me know.

Thank you!

Susan Sharpton
Assessment Specialist
University Assessment and Testing
201 UAT
Stillwater, OK 74078
405-74-6924
s.s.i@okstate.edu
http://ssi.okstate.edu/
Overall indicators

Rank the INSTRUCTOR

Views on the COURSE

This section summarizes the overall averages for the instructor and course.

Survey Results

Legend

Use this legend to help with interpreting the histograms that appear on the next pages.

Information about yourself

My college is:

- Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources: 4
- Arts and Sciences: 8
- Spears School of Business: 1
- Education: 2
- Engineering, Architecture and Technology: 4
- Graduate College: 0
- Human Sciences: 21
- Veterinary Health Sciences: 0
- University College: 0
- None of these: 2

This section includes bar graphs and frequency counts for survey participants' demographic information.
This section uses a 5-point scale from 1-5 for calculations. The previous paper SSIs also used a 5-point scale for calculations, which ran from 0-4. The scale is corrected here to provide "Very Low" responses with a value (1) rather than no value (0).
Ability to explain subject matter:

For further explanation of this section and the next, use the legend on page 1 of the report.

Positive attitude toward students:

Overall INSTRUCTOR appraisal:

Views on the COURSE:

I learned a lot in this course.

Workload was appropriate for the credit hours.

Assignments were relevant and useful.

Testing and evaluation procedures were good.

Students were adequately involved.

This course was worthwhile to me.

Overall, this was a good COURSE.
Profile

Subunit: Arts & Sciences
Name of the instructor: John Doe
Name of the course: UNIV/000.001TH-Fake Course-DOE
(Name of the survey)

Values used in the profile line: Mean

These profile line graphs present an alternative way to view the rankings from the previous pages. These profile line graphs can be used to see a "snapshot" of the mean responses to all questions in each section of the course evaluation at once.

Rank the INSTRUCTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>av.</th>
<th>md</th>
<th>dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation and organization:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=42</td>
<td>av.=4.05</td>
<td>md=4.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort devoted to teaching:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=42</td>
<td>av.=4.12</td>
<td>md=4.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of materials:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=42</td>
<td>av.=3.40</td>
<td>md=3.00</td>
<td>dev.=1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of subject:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=42</td>
<td>av.=4.40</td>
<td>md=5.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to explain subject matter:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=42</td>
<td>av.=3.10</td>
<td>md=3.00</td>
<td>dev.=1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive attitude toward students:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=42</td>
<td>av.=4.26</td>
<td>md=4.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall INSTRUCTOR appraisal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=42</td>
<td>av.=3.62</td>
<td>md=4.00</td>
<td>dev.=1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Views on the COURSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Definitely No</th>
<th>Definitely Yes</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>av.</th>
<th>md</th>
<th>dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I learned a lot in this course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=42</td>
<td>av.=2.74</td>
<td>md=3.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload was appropriate for the credit hours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=42</td>
<td>av.=3.21</td>
<td>md=3.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments were relevant and useful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=42</td>
<td>av.=3.14</td>
<td>md=3.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing and evaluation procedures were good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=42</td>
<td>av.=2.98</td>
<td>md=3.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students were adequately involved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=42</td>
<td>av.=2.38</td>
<td>md=2.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This course was worthwhile to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=42</td>
<td>av.=2.50</td>
<td>md=3.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, this was a good COURSE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=42</td>
<td>av.=2.69</td>
<td>md=3.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please add any comments you wish about the following:

Course

- Fake Course
- Pointless. I see no point in having to take this course.
- The presentation of materials did not seem to follow a logical order. Difficult to follow along in textbook. Textbook presented things in a very straightforward manner but then lecture would only be confusing.
- This is a difficult subject, but I do think that the department could do things to improve it.
- Having homework due at 6 oclock was really difficult. I work and sometimes am not able to start my homework until late, this would stress me out knowing it had to be done by 6.
- n/a
Instructor

■ Couldn't hear or understand him, which made going to class a waste of time. I basically taught myself.

■ Dr. Doe had a very positive attitude came to class prepared, and was always very organized. I appreciated his effort, expertise, and he was fun.

■ I couldn't understand the material being presented because of the language barrier

■ Made changes to originally stated procedures midway through the semester that negatively effected grades. Not very consistent with expectations of students.

■ Professor was really good about coming prepared to teach everyday and was also really good with keeping the class informed on the happenings of the course. This was very helpful in balancing a heavy course load this semester.

■ He is way too nice to students, and too hard on himself. Please, do not tell the students that you have not done a good job of teaching. That is one of the worst things you can say. You must be confident in your teaching ability for the students to respect you. Also, often times you would tell us how so few students are coming to class and how you are going to check attendance - I felt like you were just preaching to the choir during these moments. The students you were telling this to were always there - so it didn't matter.

■ He was difficult to understand and follow at times.

■ He was very good at explaining the material and was very helpful if I needed something. He was always available to help me during office hours and easy to understand.

■ John Doe

■ Very hard to understand at times. He copied slides from the book and read straight from them. I was getting more out of doing the homework on my own than coming to class. Also doesn't know how to talk to students very well

■ Very nice guy, however, it can be hard to understand him.

■ Wants to help out his students as much as he can, but has a difficult time teaching. It is not one of his strengths.
Instruction

- Access to Powerpoint slides at the beginning of the units would have been very helpful.
- Bad. I didn't understand what was going on in the class. I taught myself everything I know.
- Couldn't understand him.
- Ok, sometime hard to understand.
- Sometimes talked a bit too fast, but good otherwise.
- Too large of a language barrier
- Very good effort in teaching.
- average
- confusing, I had to teach myself all the material.
- It would've been helpful to have the lectures posted after we finished it in class for those who missed or just couldn't keep up. It made it hard to learn when they were only available 2 days before the exams
- n/a
Teaching Assistants / Associates

- Never saw the TA.
- n/a
Laboratory, Practicum, or Discussion Section

- N/A
- n/a
Work Load

- appropriate to course hours.
- n/a
Examinations

- Having multiple choice and true/false questions worth 10 points is a little absurd when the questions are so poorly written.
- I thought the exams were always perfect - not too hard and not too easy.
- Tests were relevant to the material, and he gave us plenty of study material before the tests.
- The exams focused more on definitions and specifics than what was in the homework.
- They were not like the homework at all, which made them confusing and not seem fair.
- Very hard
Grading

- Good.
- I liked the way he graded because he gave points for showing that you understood/knew how to solve the problem, even if you solved it wrong.
- There were a few instances where I couldn't understand the comments he made on my returned quizzes so I wasn't really sure what I did wrong.
- Updates to D2L would have been appreciated, especially since the weight of certain assignments changed midway through the semester.
- Appropriate.
- n/a
Textbook

- Didn't really use the book. Don't see a point in buying it.
- Textbook was more helpful than the professor was
- Textbook was really unnecessary, waste of money because I never used it.
- Very effective. A saving grace.
- n/a
- not necessary.
Other Comments

- I enjoyed the class, he was a positive and professional instructor.
- n/a
- He is so sweet!!!