

2014 CptS Teaching Assessment Report

Chris Hundhausen

Chair, CS & EECS Assessment Committee

1. Background

Students in our courses are encouraged to complete end-of-semester course evaluation surveys that ask them to evaluate and reflect on their experiences in the courses they take. The Teaching Excellence Committee is charged with the task of writing an annual report that analyzes these course evaluation data for each course offering and instructor. The CS Assessment Committee uses that report as input to our continuous assessment process.

2. Assessment Methodology

The CS Assessment Committee receives the Teaching Excellence Committee's report each April. The 2013 report is included as Appendix A. According to the Assessment Manual, the CS Assessment Committee Chair makes the report available to the CS Assessment Committee online, and opens up an online discussion to discuss results and make recommendations. A transcript of that online discussion is included as Appendix B of this report.

3. Results

The 2013 Teaching Excellence Report highlighted concerns about three courses; however, a closer reading of the report reveals other courses with equally concerning evaluations. Our Assessment Committee discussion focused on how we might use these results to improve courses identified in the report as having problems.

4. Discussion and Recommendations

Based on our discussion, we propose the following recommendations regarding how to improve courses with demonstrated problems:

- Have CS instructors who receive below-average evaluations write a short report that (a) notes the changes they incorporated into their most recent course offerings based on the previous year's evaluations; and (b) assesses the extent to which the changes improved the course. These reports could be collected by the CS Assessment Committee as documentation that our instructors are working on continuously improving.
- Implement a policy in which a senior member of the department, or an instructional adviser from the WSU Office of Assessment of Teaching and Learning (OATL), sits in one of the classes of first-time instructors, in order to provide feedback to the instructor on how to improve.

Appendix A:

2013 Teaching Excellence Committee Report

Classroom Performance – Summary of Teaching Evaluations – 2013

General Comments

- In CptS 402 there were concerns about the way the course was taught. Also, some concerns about the instructor.
- In EE 416 there were concerns about its structure. A few students mentioned it has soured their experiences/image with/of the EECS program.
- EE 234 taught in the TC by Robert Ford received very negative reviews.

Summary of Course Evaluations

Geoffrey Allen

Spring

No courses.

Fall

CPT_S.224.01.pul.Geoffrey Allen

Respondents: 22/90

Overall Instructor: 4.62

Comment Summary: Comments were very positive overall.

Antoinette Austin

Spring

CPT_S.401.402.01.tri.Antoinette Austin (3/12, 3.80)

Few comments; overall mixed feedback.

Fall

Antoinette Austin CptS 402 7/8 4.74

Students were very positive about the way Antoinette taught CptS 402. They found it to be well organized, interactive, and engaging.

Sakire Arslan Ay

Spring

Sakire Arslan Ay CptS 323 23/48 3.98

This was the first time Sakire taught CptS 323, and she seems to have done a reasonably good job. The feedback from students was mixed with some liking the project and slides and others not liking them. It's likely that the next time Sakire teaches this course she'll make improvements where it makes sense to do so based on the feedback she received.

Sakire Arslan Ay CptS 423 14/23 4.60

In general students were very happy with the way Sakire handled CptS 423 and can't think of any way she can improve the course. Also, it's good to know students are enjoying the senior design sequence and that Sakire is doing a great job.

Fall

CPT_S.421.01.pul.Sakire Arslan Ay

Respondents: 17/29

Overall Instructor: 4.29

Comment Summary: Comments relative to the instructor were primarily positive. Comments tended to be relative to "mentors" rather than to the course instructor.

David Bakken

Spring

CPT_S.E_E.483.580.582.1.04.pul.David Bakken

Respondents: 9/22

Overall Instructor: 4.00

Comment Summary: Mixed comments, though there were a couple of complaints about not getting feedback. (One student noted that no assignments were returned?)

CPT_S.E_E.483.580.582.2.04.pul.David Bakken

Respondents: 17/26

Overall Instructor: 4.18

Comment Summary: Several negative comments relative to lack of feedback on assignments. Students did seem to appreciate the on-line materials.

Fall

CPT_S.500.01.pul.David Bakken

Respondents: 8/9

Overall Instructor: 4.38

Comment Summary: High response rate. Comments are positive overall, but have no apparent trends.

CPT_S.580.02.pul.David Bakken

Respondents: 10/11

Overall Instructor: 4.67

Comment Summary: High response rate. Comments are positive.

Benjamin Belzer

Spring

E_E.341.01.pul.Benjamin Belzer

Respondents: 19/43

Overall Instructor: 4.11

Comment Summary: Comments were mixed, though mainly positive.

E_E.352.01.pul.Benjamin Belzer

Respondents: 15/37

Overall Instructor: 4.33

Comment Summary: Comments were mixed. Several students complained about the Diligent lab assignments, and the need for updated equipment in the lab. Several people also complained that the requirements for the design reports were ambiguous or vague.

Fall

E_E.432.01.pul.Benjamin Belzer (14/16, 4.51)

Overall mixed comments.

Anjan Bose

Spring

No courses.

Fall

EE.521.01.pul.Anjan Bose:

Respondents: 15/19. Overall: 4.47. Generally positive comments. Students appreciated the MATLAB assignments. One comment stated “the course is very good”.

Kerry Bragg

Spring

No courses.

Fall

CPTS.422.01.tri 7/11 (63.6%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 4.0

Students considered the instructor to a good one. They commented that several classes were canceled.

Shira Broschat

Spring

CPTS.111.01.pul 20/35 (57.1%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 4.40

Very positive comments about instructor.

Fall

EE.331.01.pul.Shira Broschat:

Respondents: 38/53. Overall: 4.56. Generally positive comments. Students appreciated the instructor's organization, examples, lectures, and explanations. One comment stated the instructor is "definitely the best professor for the class". Another indicated the course was "great".

Rick Calawa

Spring

E_E.483.101L.pul.Rick Calawa (6/6, 5.00)

Few comments, but positive.

Fall

Brent Carper

Spring

Brent Carper EE 494 3/8 4.90

There weren't many comments on this lab course, but the few there were indicated general satisfaction.

Fall

EE.492.01.pul.Brent Carper:

Respondents: 8/16. Overall: 4.65. Generally positive comments. Comments stated instructor was enthusiastic and "pretty good" at teaching.

Adam Carter

Spring

No courses.

Fall

CPTS.122.01.pul 32/125 (25.6%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 3.19

Positive and neutral comments

CPTS.223.02.pul 32/125 (15.6%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 3.50

Few comments were included.

Clint Cole

Spring

EE.214.01.pul.Clint Cole:

Respondents: 9/53. Overall: 3.73. Mixed comments. Students appreciated the lectures, examples, and teaching modules. However, it seems students did not receive much feedback on assignments until the end of the semester.

Fall

Clint Cole EE 214 30/88 3.68

Students appreciated Clint's knowledge of the EE 214 material and his way of presenting it. They also liked the labs and lectures, but a lot of students complained about the lack of instruction in Verilog, the language used for programming in labs. It wasn't covered at all during the lectures.

Clint Cole EE 324 5/30 4.59

Not many students evaluated EE 324, and there weren't many comments. One student thought more material could have been covered.

Diane Cook

Spring

Diane Cook CptS 580 4/14 4.58

This was a continuation of a course from fall 2012, and the focus was on team projects. Students seemed happy with the project as their main source of learning.

Fall

CPTS.580.01.pul 3/7 (42.9%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 4.33

Only one student provided comments.

Courtney Corley

Spring

CPT_S.483.580.03.pul.Courtney Corley

Respondents: 7/10

Overall Instructor: 3.71

Comment Summary: No apparent trends. Most comments seemed to require some familiarity with the course structure, so I'm unable to assess.

Fall

No courses.

Neil Corrigan

Spring

CPTS.322.01.tri 6/12 (50%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 4.83

There were very few comments which were positive.

Fall

No courses.

Zhe Dang

Spring

CPT_S.317.01.pul.Zhe Dang (25/64, 4.28)

Generally positive comments. Several students mentioned not receiving graded assignments in a timely fashion.

CPT_S.516.01.pul.Zhe Dang (12/15, 4.08)

Generally positive comments.

Fall

CPTS.317.01.pul.Zhe Dang:

Respondents: 14/26. Overall: 4.34. Generally positive comments. One comment stated “he is the best instructor I’ve had at WSU so far.” Another stated “Professor Dang has absolutely amazing skills for teaching.” Other comments noted an appreciation of the instructor’s lectures.

CPTS.450.01.pul.Zhe Dang:

Respondents: 21/57. Overall: 4.31. Generally positive comments. Students raved about the instructor’s teaching abilities. One comment stated “one of the best classes I have taken at WSU”.

Jose Delgado-Frias

Spring

Jose Delgado-Frias EE 415 14/27 3.85

Students were not very happy with the quality of the instruction, but in general they liked their projects.

Jose Delgado-Frias EE 582 4/5 3.88

Students didn’t seem to have faith in Jose’s knowledge of the subject, and they thought the course was too easy.

Fall

CPT_S.E_E.524.561.01.pul.Jose Delgado-Frias (13/19, 4.36)

Overall mixed comments.

E_E.416.01.pul.Jose Delgado-Frias (17/27, 4.16)

Overall mixed comments. Some teams struggled in terms of uniform contributions and disengaged sponsors.

Robert Dillon

Spring

No courses.

Fall

CPT_S.MATH.430.448.530.548.01.pul.Robert Dillon (7/16, 4.01)

Overall mixed comments. Several mention wanting more examples in class.

Yuriy Eero

Spring

EE.362.01.pul 7/12 (58.3%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 4.29

Very positive comments.

Fall

No courses.

Matthias Engels

Spring

E_E.361.01.tri.Matthias Engels (3/16, 4.51)

Few comments. Students would like more examples worked out.

Fall

Matthias Engels EE 352 3/16 4.71

No comments left for EE 352 taught by Matthias Engels.

Thomas Fischer

Spring

E_E.451.01.pul.Thomas Fischer

Respondents: 8/12

Overall Instructor: 4.43

Comment Summary: Positive comments overall.

E_E.582.01.pul.Thomas Fischer

Respondents: 5/6

Overall Instructor: 4.80

Comment Summary: Few comments. No apparent trends.

Fall

EE.321.01.pul.Thomas Fischer:

Respondents: 19/43. Overall: 4.54. Generally positive comments. Students appreciated the lectures and projects.

EE.548.01.pul.Thomas Fischer:

Respondents: 8/9. Overall: 4.88. Very few comments provided. One indicated the class is “great”.

Robert Ford

Spring

Robert Ford EE 234 7/19 2.56

Students generally were unhappy about all aspects of this course except for the TAs.

Fall

No courses.

Thoshitha Gamage

Spring

CPTS.464.564.01.pul.Thoshitha Gamage:

Respondents: 4/10. Overall: 3.38. Few comments provided. They did not reveal any trends.

Fall

No courses.

Timothy Hanshaw

Spring

E_E.221.01.pul.Timothy Hanshaw (60/205, 4.08)

Generally positive comments. Students would like more examples in MatLab. Several students mentioned issues with the TA's grading consistency.

E_E.261.01.pul.Timothy Hanshaw (28/75, 4.42)

Very positive comments. Only negative were a few comments about differences between homework and exam problems.

Fall

Tim Hanshaw EE 261 33/78 4.58

Students appreciated Tim's lectures, examples, and the online videos for EE 261. Most students were very happy with the course.

Tim Hanshaw EE 262 6/24 4.20 9/19 4.58

Students liked the online lab videos for EE 262. They also like the projects. One student wished there were more TA support during labs.

Tim Hanshaw EE 304 36/97 4.54

Students liked all the in-class examples Tim worked through in EE 304. They also liked the lectures and online videos. Mostly petty ways of improving the course were offered; many couldn't think of ways to improve the course.

Tim Hanshaw EE 352 13/35 4.51

Most students seemed satisfied with EE 352. One commented that s/he really liked the Analog Discovery board.

Carl Hauser

Spring

Carl Hauser CptS 483/580 TC 4/8 4.18

Students seemed to appreciate the projects and homework assigned by Carl for this course. However, there were several complaints regarding the lack of timely feedback on the homework.

Carl Hauser CptS 483/580 Pullman 9/22 4.29

Students generally were happy with the way this course was taught by Carl. They liked the materials, but would have liked more timely feedback.

Carl Hauser CptS/EE 483, et al. 17/26 4.16

Students were okay with this course. They liked the group assignments, but complained about lack of timely feedback.

Fall

CPTS.355.01.pul 24/57 (42.1%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 3.83

Mixed set of comments: a number of students liked the class and other students comment about the difficulty of the class and exams.

CPTS.EE.455.01.pul 22/34 (64.7%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 4.45

Positive comments.

Deuk Heo

Spring

EE.431.01.pul 17/19 (89.5%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 4.47

Students liked the course and its lab.

Fall

E_E.496.01.pul.Deuk Heo (19/22, 4.19)

Generally positive comments. Several mention wanting more examples in class.

Lawrence Holder

Spring

No courses.

Fall

CPTS.440.540.01.tri.Lawrence Holder:

Respondents: 8/13. Overall: 4.26. Generally positive comments. Students appreciated the instructor's knowledge of the material.

CPTS.440.540.01.pul.Lawrence Holder:

Respondents: 21/43. Overall: 4.00. Generally positive comments. Students appreciated the lectures, assignments, and knowledge of the instructor.

Scott Hudson

Spring

EE.518.01.tri.Scott Hudson:

Respondents: 3/6. Overall: 4.39. Few, but positive comments. Students appreciated the lectures and provided solutions to assignments.

Fall

E_E.489.01.tri.Scott Hudson

Respondents: 4/17

Overall Instructor: 5.00

Comment Summary: Very few comments. The two comments available were positive.

Christopher Hundhausen

Spring

CPTS.402.01.pul.Christopher Hundhausen:

Respondents: 25/43. Overall: 3.75. Mixed comments. Many students stated the in-class discussions were helpful. Several negative comments such as the class was “pointless” and “terrible”.

CPTS.443.543.01.pul.Christopher Hundhausen:

Respondents: 7/19. Overall: 3.38. Mixed comments. Some students stated quizzes and assigned readings helped them learn the material. Some negative comments about the way the course was taught.

Fall

CPT_S.402.01.pul.Christopher Hundhausen (5/9, 3.82)

Generally positive comments.

Md Islam

Spring

EE.331.01.pul 7/29 (24.3%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 2.57

Mostly neutral or negative comments. Students mentioned that instructor needs to improve teaching skills.

Fall

No courses.

Anantharaman Kalyanaraman

Spring

CPTS.471.571.01.pul.Anantharaman Kalyanaraman:

Respondents: 17/18. Overall: 4.50. Generally positive comments. Students appreciated the instructor's ability to clearly present the material. Many also indicated they learned a lot. One commented stated: "This was the best class I've ever taken at WSU."

Fall

No courses.

Lars Kangas

Spring

CPTS.355.01.tri 6/12 (50%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 3.17

Mix comments. Some students recommended having a more organized class.

Fall

CPT_S.224.01.tri.Lars Kangas

Respondents: 3/13

Overall Instructor: 3.67

Comment Summary: Very few comments. No real trends apparent.

Brian Lamarche

Spring

CPTS.323.01.tri.Brian Lamarche:

Respondents: 6/11. Overall: 4.33. Generally positive comments. Positive comments about the lectures and projects.

Fall

CPT_S.223.01.tri.Brian Lamarche

Respondents: 4/11

Overall Instructor: 4.00

Comment Summary: Comments were sparse, though one student did complain that graded assignments were not returned in a timely manner.

Sergey Lapin

Spring

CPT_S.MATH.430.448.530.548.01.pul.Sergey Lapin

Respondents: 6/25

Overall Instructor: 4.5

Comment Summary: Overall positive comments

Fall

No courses.

George Larue

Spring

E_E.311.01.pul.George Larue (14/42, 3.64)

Generally negative comments. Several students mentioned errors in the notes, and a belittling attitude towards questions.

E_E.596.01.pul.George Larue (7/10, 4.78)

Few comments. Overall, neutral.

Fall

No courses.

Robert Lewis

Spring

CPTS.121.01.tri.Robert Lewis:

Respondents: 6/19. Overall: 3.58. Mixed comments. Positive comments related to the TA and the labs.

CPTS.360.01.tri.Robert Lewis:

Respondents: 4/9. Overall: 3.72. Very few comments provided. Comments did not reveal any trends.

Fall

CPTS.260.01.tri.Robert Lewis:

Respondents: 5/12. Overall: 3.91. Mixed comments. Some concerns about the number of classes cancelled and rescheduled by the instructor. One commented stated "I did learn a lot though."

CPTS.442.552.01.tri.Robert Lewis:

Respondents: 3/9. Overall: 4.25. Few comments provided. One comment indicated there were many "good" aspects to the class, including that the instructor "cares" about students and about the material.

CPTS.442.552.01.pul.Robert Lewis:

Respondents: 8/23. Overall: 3.01. Mixed comments. Students indicated assignments helped them learn. However, some also were concerned about the provided "starting" points for the assignments.

Chen-Ching Liu

Spring

No courses.

Fall

EE.491.01.pul 11/26 (42.3%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 4.36

Students provided very positive comments.

Sheng-Chi Liu

Spring

No courses.

Fall

CPT_S.MATH.453.553.01.pul.Sheng-Chi Liu

Respondents: 6/25

Overall Instructor: 3.17

Comment Summary: Negative comments overall. Most CptS students felt that the class was mathematically intensive and did not meet their needs. Students also complained that there was too much overlap between the text and the lectures.

Samuel Long

Spring

No courses.

Fall

CPT_S.111.01.pul.Samuel Long (22/110, 3.54)

Many positive comments focusing on good use of examples. Many negative comments focusing on lack of organization.

E_E.221.01.pul.Samuel Long (28/95, 2.93)

Generally negative comments. Class was disorganized. Too long to receive feedback on assignments.

David Lowry

Spring

E_E.261.01.tri.David Lowry (11/11, 4.79)

Very positive comments.

E_E.304.01.tri.David Lowry (13/20, 4.79)

Very positive comments.

E_E.341.01.tri.David Lowry (6/16, 4.61)

Few comments. Generally positive.

Fall

E_E.221.01.tri.David Lowry

Respondents: 3/4

Overall Instructor: 4.67

Comment Summary: Very few comments (due to small class size). No real trends, except that students wanted more lectures. (This confuses me – don't we require a set number of lecture during the semester?)

E_E.321.01.tri.David Lowry

Respondents: 5/16

Overall Instructor: 4.80

Comment Summary: Comments were sparse, but positive.

E_E.331.01.tri.David Lowry

Respondents: 5/16

Overall Instructor: 4.50

Comment Summary: Virtually no comments. The only comment was, "lecture is amazing".

David Manz

Spring

No courses.

Fall

David Manz CptS 4/527 3/11 4.00

Student comments indicated issues with grading in CptS 4/527, both in terms of instructions given and points deducted. Otherwise students seemed okay with the organization and content of the course.

Archibald McKinnon

Spring

No courses.

Fall

CPTS.427.527.01.pul 11/26 (42.3%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 2.0

Student comments were from neutral to negative. From comments, it seems that the instructor is not well organized.

CPTS.427.527.01.tri 3/11 (27.3%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 3.0

Few comments were included on the positive side.

Ali Mehrizi-Sani

Spring

Ali Mehrizi-Sani EE 486 20/22 4.49

Students were generally happy with the way Ali taught EE 486. They like his lectures and his homework assignments but did some grumbling about exams.

Fall

EE.525.01.pul 10/10 (100%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 4.80

Students provided very positive comments.

John Miller

Spring

CPT_S.450.01.tri.John Miller (3/8, 4.33)

Few comments. Generally positive.

CPT_S.MATH.430.448.530.548.01.tri.John Miller (6/18, 4.70)

Few comments. Overall mixed.

Fall

John Miller CptS 317 11/12 4.70

Students were very happy with the way John taught Cpt 317. They liked his enthusiasm, the examples he did in class, and the way he taught the course in general. They thought the course was taught very well.

John Miller CptS 572 3/3 4.75

There were few comments, but one student liked the way CptS 572 was organized into three distinct parts.

Jacob Murray

Spring

No courses.

Fall

Jacob Murray EE 434 21/22 4.41

Students believed that Jacob was using materials created by Partha for EE 434. Some liked the PowerPoint slides; others didn't like them very much. They liked having the material available. Two students commented on Jacob's apparent attitude toward students and believe he should work on his demeanor. One student commented that s/he thought Jacob was teaching the course to please Partha and not in a way most beneficial to student learning.

Andrew Ofallon

Spring

CPTS.121.01.pul 107/216 (49.5%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 4.51

Student comments were very positive. Andy is doing a good job.

CPTS.466/566.01.pul 19/34 (55.9%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 4.79

Student comments were very positive.

EE.234.01.pul 22/53 (41.5%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 4.91

Student comments were very positive.

Fall

CPT_S.121.01.pul.Andrew Ofallon (86/223, 4.37)

Generally positive comments. Several noted Andy's enthusiasm for the topic.

CPT_S.422.01.pul.Andrew Ofallon (23/39, 4.70)

Generally positive comments. Several noted Andy's enthusiasm for the topic.

E_E.234.01.pul.Andrew Ofallon (27/48, 4.65)

Generally positive comments.

Evan Olds

Spring

No courses.

Fall

CPT_S.223.01.pul.Evan Olds (11/42, 4.11)

Overall mixed comments.

Mohamed Osman

Spring

EE.491.01.tri.Mohamed Osman:

Respondents: 4/6. Overall: 4.42. Few, but generally positive comments.

Fall

EE.311.01.tri 3/16 (18.8%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 5.0

No comments were provided.

EE.492.01.tri 4/14 (28.6%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 4.25

Two students provided positive comments.

Partha Pande

Spring

E_E.587.01.pul.Partha Pande

Respondents: 6/7

Overall Instructor: 5.00

Comment Summary: Uniformly positive comments.

Fall

EE.466.586.01.pul 10/20 (50%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 4.10

Students provided positive comments.

Patrick Pedrow

Spring

EE.351.01.pul.Patrick Pedrow:

Respondents: 20/23. Overall: 4.20. Generally positive comments. Students seemed to appreciate the lectures, and the instructor's help.

EE.416.01.pul.Patrick Pedrow:

Respondents: 29/40. Overall: 3.69. Mixed comments. Experiences with senior design seemed to vary from team to team. Several concerns about the required assignments for the course. A couple of comments stated the course sheds a negative light on the program.

Fall

EE.415.01.pul 18/38 (47.4%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 3.11

Students liked to work on their projects.

Barbara Philipp

Spring

EE.416.01.tri 5/10 (50%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 2.75

Only two students provided comments. Both asked for more information about project management.

Fall

E_E.415.01.tri.Barbara Philipp (4/14, 3.94)

Few comments. Overall mixed.

John Ringo

Spring

No courses.

Fall

E_E.311.01.pul.John Ringo

Respondents: 21/42

Overall Instructor: 3.90

Comment Summary: Comments were rather negative, though there wasn't a strong trend in the results. Exams seemed problematic, as did examples and homework solutions (homework solutions were apparently not available). Some students also complained that lectures were difficult to follow.

Nirmalya Roy

Spring

CPTS.223.01.pul 20/62 (32.3%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 3.37

Students' comments were positive or neutral

CPTS/EE.555.01.pul 12/21 (57.1%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 4.25

Mostly positive comments.

Fall

No courses.

Sandip Roy

Spring

E_E.321.01.pul.Sandip Roy

Respondents: 16/47

Overall Instructor: 4.75

Comment Summary: Very positive comments.

E_E.501.01.pul.Sandip Roy

Respondents: 16/27

Overall Instructor: 4.44

Comment Summary: Positive comments overall.

Fall

EE.489.01.pul.Sandip Roy:

Respondents: 23/45. Overall: 4.52. Generally positive comments. Students appreciated the projects and lectures. One comment stated the course “was extremely well taught”.

EE.507.01.pul.Sandip Roy:

Respondents: 7/15. Overall: 4.33. Very few comments provided. Comments did not provide any trends.

Ali Saberi

Spring

E_E.502.01.pul.Ali Saberi

Respondents: 4/6

Overall Instructor: 4.75

Comment Summary: Very few comments. No apparent trends.

Fall

No courses.

John Schneider

Spring

CPTS.122.01.pul 32/113 (28.3%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 4.25

Very positive comments

Fall

No courses.

Javier Guerrero Sedeno

Spring

EE.493.01.pul.Javier Guerrero Sedeno:

Respondents: 13/20. Overall: 4.07. Generally positive comments. One comment stated “The lectures were AMAZING...”

Fall

EE.361.01.pul 8/25 (32%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 4.50

Three positive comments.

Behrooz Shirazi

Spring

CPT_S.421.01.pul.Behrooz Shirazi

Respondents: 3/9

Overall Instructor: 2.33

Comment Summary: Comments were sparse, but very negative relative to the instructor.

Fall

CPT_S.423.01.pul.Behrooz Shirazi

Respondents: 6/10

Overall Instructor: 3.00

Comment Summary: Comments were sparse but very negative relative to the instructor. The few comment indicated that the instructor appeared disinterested in the students and the class.

Krishnamoorthy Sivakumar

Spring

E_E.530.01.pul.Krishnamoorthy Sivakumar (3/5, 3.73)

Few comments. Overall mixed.

Fall

E_E.341.01.pul.Krishnamoorthy Sivakumar (15/35, 4.12)

Overall mixed comments. Several thought the instructor should talk slower.

E_E.464.01.pul.Krishnamoorthy Sivakumar (18/26, 4.21)

Overall mixed comments.

Anurag Srivastava

Spring

CPTS.EE483.580.582.1.04.pul.Anurag Srivastava:

Respondents: 9/22. Overall: ? - There's a spreadsheet calculation error. Generally positive comments. One student stated "this was a great class."

CPTS.EE483.580.582.2.04.pul.Anurag Srivastava:

Respondents: 17/26. Overall: 4.12. Generally positive comments. Students appreciated the recorded lectures and online materials.

Fall

E_E.536.01.pul.Anurag Srivastava (8/17, 4.07)

Overall mixed comments.

Russell Swannack

Spring

Russell Swannack CptS 451 14/42 3.14

The response to CptS 451 as taught by Russell was polarized. Some students thought he did a great job, and others thought he did a terrible job. This might be related to the wide range of student ability that we have seen in recent years.

Fall

CPT_S.121.01.tri.Russell Swannack

Respondents: 6/22

Overall Instructor: 2.50

Comment Summary: Very negative comments relative to the teaching style. Students also complained that the later homework assignments in the course were not useful as a learning tool. It also appeared (based on one comment) that there was only one exam during the semester?

CPT_S.460.01.tri.Russell Swannack

Respondents: 4/8

Overall Instructor: 4.75

Comment Summary: Few comments, but most were positive.

Li Tan

Spring

No courses.

Fall

CPTS.421.01.tri 9/13 (69.2%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 3.78

In general positive comments.

Matthew Taylor

Spring

No courses.

Fall

Matt Taylor CptS 483 6/14 4.75

Students learned from the labs and homework and liked the hands-on experience with the robots. This was the first offering of the Intro to Robotics course, and it seemed to go well.

Vaithianath Venkatasubramanian

Spring

EE.581.01.pul 6/13 (46.1%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 4.33

Only two positive comments were posted.

Fall

No courses.

Eric Wang

Spring

CPT_S.260.01.pul.Eric Wang

Respondents: 10/36

Overall Instructor: 3.11

Comment Summary: Many complaints about lecture style. Students characterized lectures as being disorganized and unprepared-for.

Fall

CPT_S.260.01.pul.Eric Wang

Respondents: 4/40

Overall Instructor: 3.75

Comment Summary: Very low response rate. Comments were primarily positive.

Kung-Chi Wang

Spring

KC Wang CptS 360 19/53 4.54

KC is a master at teaching the material in CptS 360, and most of the feedback indicated that the students appreciate his knowledge and ability to explain complex concepts in a way anyone can understand. They also appreciate the notes he provides. Some students consider this course to be central to our CS program.

KC Wang CptS 460 10/24 4.52

Students appreciated the lectures, examples, labs, and notes KC provides in CptS 460. Overall, KC seems to do an excellent job in this course.

KC Wang CptS 550 3/5 3.41

As reflected by the weighted instructor summary score of 3.41, students don't appreciate the way KC teaches CptS 550 as much as they do CptS 360 and 460. One student commented that they thought the course was disorganized, but there were few comments overall.

Fall

KC Wang CptS 360 13/33 4.18

Opinions regarding CptS 360 in fall 2013 were polarized. One student indicated KC is one of the best professors he's had at WSU and two indicated that didn't learn anything from KC. Some students found the online notes to be very useful and others didn't.

KC Wang CptS 460 13/20 4.28

The comments on CptS 460 for fall 2013 were rather terse. Students seemed to like the labs and lectures, but a couple mentioned that some of the code provided for the labs was buggy.

Eric Wemlinger

Spring

Erik WemlingerEE 331 7/29 3.02

Mixed comments. Most students thought course suffered because instructor was teaching it for the first time. One student commented that the quality improved significantly when John Schneider took over for the last 7 or so lectures.

Fall

No courses.

Paul Wettin

Spring

EE.334.01.pul 5/24 (20.8%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 2.4

Mostly neutral or negative comments. Students provided feedback on how to improve his teaching skills: "The power point presentations were read through too fast and it was hard to keep up with what was being said."

Fall

No courses.

Pradeep Kumar Yemula

Spring

E_E.361.01.pul.Pradeep Kumar Yemula

Respondents: 21/34

Overall Instructor: 2.95

Comment Summary: Very negative comments overall. Lectures were apparently disorganized and too much time was spent on review of material covered in previous classes. Students also complained about the lack of homework assignments.

Fall

No courses.

Ramon Zamora

Spring

EE.362.01.pul 15/26 (57.7%)

Instructor overall effectiveness was 4.07

Very positive comments.

Fall

No courses.

Bolong Zeng

Spring

No courses.

Fall

CPTS.322.01.pul.Bolong Zeng:

Respondents: 42/69. Overall: 4.00. Generally positive comments. However, there were some concerns about the delivery of the material in lecture. The terms “boring” and “dry” were used several times to describe the lectures and material.

Appendix B:

CS Assessment Committee's Online Discussion of the 2013 Teaching Excellence Committee Report



(Course/Community):

CSABET 101 - ABET Assessment, SU, 2012 (Instructor)

[Dashboard](#) | [Assignments](#) | [Grades](#) | [Users](#) | [Course Settings](#) | [Administration](#)

Discussion of 2013 Teaching Excellence Report - Team 01

[Toggle Anonymity](#)

Select Discussion: Team 01

Please review this teaching excellence report and discuss, with an eye toward issues relevant to our assessment process and actionable items.

Enter new discussion post here...

**Christopher Hundhausen (Instructor)**

06/27/2014 10:27 AM

I have looked over this report, and I don't see anything too striking in the results. The Teaching Excellence Committee's general comments single out CptS 40 EE 416, and EE 234 as problem spots, but I noted other courses with equally concerning evaluations. Maybe what we, as an assessment committee, need to decide upon is just what constitutes a "concern" and how we, in general, would address such a concern. ABET wants to know that we're considering these and making changes if necessary. One idea is to put "on watch" an instructor with an average evaluation below some threshold. We could have an action plan for what to do if the evaluations don't improve in the subsequent year. Any thoughts?

**Ananth Kalyanaram**

06/27/2014 12:51 PM

I am reluctant to have this committee play a policing role and put instructors "on watch". I would instead be in favor of a mechanism that is more self correcting/self improving from the instructor point of view. One option is to have each instructor note down a list of main changes they incorporated into the most recent year's course offering based on the previous year's comments, at the end of every year. This note can be preserved for ABET viewing later so that it can be shown as evidence that there is some kind of self awareness about an instructor's approach to teaching and a thought process targeted at continuous improvement. We could either expect this from instructors falling below a threshold (for lower & upper division classes) or ask this of everyone with the idea that there is always scope for continuous improvement for anyone. Of course this would mean one more paperwork/reporting but if we leave it to the instructors to decide how short or long the report needs to be then it should be ok.

**Larry Holder**

07/02/2014 03:23 PM

Since I chair the Teaching Excellence Committee, which compiled the report, I do not have much more to say beyond the general comments already in the report. Behrooz did start a policy in which all first-time instructors would have someone sit in on one of their classes to make sure they are competent. For non first-timers who are getting below average reviews, I like the idea of requiring (Behrooz, not CSCC) them to write an improvement plan, and then a followup description after the next offering as to how it went.