

UT Direct - The University of Texas at Austin**Course - Instructor Survey Results****NAVIGATION MENU**[CIS Results Home \(Fall 2005 +\)](#)[CIS Results Home \(pre- Fall 2005\)](#)[Search CIS results](#)[CIS results summaries](#)[Logoff](#)**Links**[Instructional Assessment Resources \(IAR\)](#)[Ongoing Course Assessment \(OCA\)](#)

Course - Instructor Survey (CIS) Results

Download options:

- [Spreadsheet \(MS Excel\)](#)
- [Document \(MS Word\)](#)

Downing, Glenn P
C S315 (53880)
Spring 2006
Survey: Expanded

Number of Submitted Surveys: 21**Course Enrollment: 40**

| # | Survey Question | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree | Total | Avg |
|----|--|-------------------|------------|------------|-------------|----------------|-------|-----|
| 1 | The course was well organized. | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (4.8%) | 5 (23.8%) | 15 (71.4%) | 21 | 4.7 |
| 2 | The instructor communicated information effectively. | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 9 (42.9%) | 12 (57.1%) | 21 | 4.6 |
| 3 | The instructor showed interest in the progress of students. | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (4.8%) | 6 (28.6%) | 7 (33.3%) | 7 (33.3%) | 21 | 4.0 |
| 4 | The tests/assignments were usually graded and returned promptly. | 0 (0.0%) | 2 (9.5%) | 1 (4.8%) | 13 (61.9%) | 5 (23.8%) | 21 | 4.0 |
| 5 | The instructor made me feel free to ask questions, disagree, and express my ideas. | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (4.8%) | 6 (28.6%) | 14 (66.7%) | 21 | 4.6 |
| 6 | Course objectives and assignments were clearly stated. | 0 (0.0%) | 3 (14.3%) | 3 (14.3%) | 5 (23.8%) | 10 (47.6%) | 21 | 4.0 |
| 7 | The instructor seemed well prepared for class. | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 5 (23.8%) | 16 (76.2%) | 21 | 4.8 |
| 8 | The instructor showed a thorough knowledge of the course material. | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 3 (15.0%) | 17 (85.0%) | 20 | 4.9 |
| 9 | The instructor seemed genuinely interested in teaching the course. | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (4.8%) | 4 (19.0%) | 16 (76.2%) | 21 | 4.7 |
| 10 | The instructor was generally accessible to students outside of class. | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 6 (28.6%) | 7 (33.3%) | 8 (38.1%) | 21 | 4.1 |
| 11 | My performance in this course has been evaluated fairly. | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (4.8%) | 5 (23.8%) | 8 (38.1%) | 7 (33.3%) | 21 | 4.0 |
| 12 | The instructor gave adequate instructions concerning assignments. | 0 (0.0%) | 5 (23.8%) | 4 (19.0%) | 5 (23.8%) | 7 (33.3%) | 21 | 3.7 |
| 13 | The instructor has tried to make the course material educationally valuable to me. | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (4.8%) | 1 (4.8%) | 8 (38.1%) | 11 (52.4%) | 21 | 4.4 |
| 14 | The instructor has increased my knowledge and competence in the subject of this course. | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (4.8%) | 5 (23.8%) | 15 (71.4%) | 21 | 4.7 |
| 15 | The instructor has inspired me to think more about the content of the course than what was required. | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (4.8%) | 1 (4.8%) | 8 (38.1%) | 11 (52.4%) | 21 | 4.4 |
| 16 | In my opinion, the assignments, | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|----|-----|
| | presentations, projects or papers required in the course were worthwhile learning experiences. | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (4.8%) | 0 (0.0%) | 10 (47.6%) | 10 (47.6%) | 21 | 4.4 |
| 17 | At this point in time, I feel that this course will be (or has already been) of value to me. | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 2 (9.5%) | 9 (42.9%) | 10 (47.6%) | 21 | 4.4 |

| # | | Very Unsatisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Very Good | Excellent | Total | Avg |
|-----------|------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------|------------|-------------|-------|-----|
| 18 | Overall, this instructor was | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 8 (40.0%) | 12 (60.0%) | 20 | 4.6 |
| 19 | Overall, this course was | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 4 (19.0%) | 9 (42.9%) | 8 (38.1%) | 21 | 4.2 |

| # | | Excessive | High | Average | Light | Insufficient | Total | Avg |
|-----------|--|-----------|-------------|------------|-----------|--------------|-------|-----|
| 20 | In my opinion, the workload in this course was | 1 (4.8%) | 12 (57.1%) | 8 (38.1%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 21 | N/A |

| # | | Less than 2.00 | 2.00-2.49 | 2.50-2.99 | 3.00-3.49 | 3.50-4.00 | Total | Avg |
|-----------|------------------------------------|----------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|-------|-----|
| 21 | My overall G.P.A. to date at UT is | 0 (0.0%) | 4 (19.0%) | 1 (4.8%) | 8 (38.1%) | 8 (38.1%) | 21 | N/A |

| # | | A | B | C | D | F | Total | Avg |
|-----------|---|------------|-------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-------|-----|
| 22 | My probable grade to date in this course is | 8 (38.1%) | 10 (47.6%) | 3 (14.3%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 21 | N/A |

| # | | Text | Total |
|-----------|----------|---|-------|
| 23 | Comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I learned a lot from this course and am glad that I took it. If I had to complain, I would recommend more detail in the assignments. Especially the projects. We were given no information on what exactly the teacher wanted. Almost any amount of direction would have proved greatly helpful and would have saved hours of time on research in areas that we didn't need. For example, when programming the deque, we didn't know what a deque was or how the iterators were supposed to work. If we had understood the simple functionality of how the iterator needed to work, we could have spent our time actually making it work rather than trying to deduce its operation and then programming it incorrectly and have to go back and fix it, etc. Presentations could use more color, but that might be asking for too much. Overall the course was well-taught and I learned a lot of material but there were many problems in grading, especially with the minimum functionality requirements, which were not always explicit enough. Many times, I worked very hard for days for a project and still succumbed to these requirements, a few of which I agree were my fault but others in which I think should have been more clearly expressed. I think the 3-semester sequence of 305J, 307 and 315 is redundant and overlapping more than necessary. Also, many students took 3 or 4 puzzlers to get the hang of the system-- something which could have been resolved at the beginning. In addition, the discussion section was | 10 |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>rather useless.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I really enjoyed the data structure projects (i.e. BigInteger, Deque and Graph). Professor Downing is a CS ninja and a great instructor. I learned a lot in this class. Thanks. • I found this to be one of the best courses i have ever taken at UT. Professor Downing is truly interested in what he teaches, and that enthusiasm is shown in his lectures. However, the project assignments were often difficult to figure out, not in terms of how to do them, but in figuring out WHAT to do. For example, in Graph, when the project said "Map of Maps", it did not occur to me that a treemap is classified as a map, and therefore, i tried implementing graph with the INTERFACE map. if the assignment had been implement a Graph using your choice of a type of map, it would have made much more sense • Personally, I hate when teachers call out on me because I feel they put me on the spot and it's not that I don't know the answer to their questions, but I get so nervous that I fail to respond. Being one of the only women in the class is definitely intimidating. • overall a good course. It went a bit slow at times The single major complaint I would have is (although i think the problem extends beyond this particular class) that it was excessively java-centric, especially towards the first half of the course. I understand that coding in java means learning java • I enjoyed the wide variety of programming challenges. It was nice to have puzzlers and projects as well as papers to read instead of grinding out programs every week. The questions rounds also kept class interesting. I also liked how part of the learning process was by inference, it seemed like you explained the material 90% and left the easy last 10% for us to figure out when we were going through elements without you explaining. Thanks for not holding our hands through these projects. • Really enjoyed your lectures. Forums were a good source of info, and very organized. | |
|--|--|--|

Guide to the Interpretation of the Course-Instructor Surveys at UT Austin

The Basic Form items are used in almost all UT Austin colleges and schools. These items provide general information about the course and instructor. The three sets of scales used and the associated weights are:

Strongly Disagree.....1
 Disagree.....2
 Neutral.....3
 Agree.....4
 Strongly Agree.....5

Excessive
 High
 Average
 Light
 Insufficient

Very Unsatisfactory.....1
Unsatisfactory.....2
Satisfactory.....3
Very Good.....4
Excellent.....5

The Average (AVG) is calculated by adding all of the weights for a single question and dividing by the number of respondents. The course workload question is not averaged.

The number of students marking each option is reported for each of the items. These frequency distributions provide information about the level of student ratings and the spread and shape of the class distribution of responses. The distributions thus provide a general picture of how the class is viewed by students; e.g., Are student ratings toward the top of the scale? Is there a relatively large proportion of unsatisfactory ratings? Students will find that there are definite differences in the rating patterns of various courses.

Course-Instructor Surveys have been shown to be a valid indicator of teaching effectiveness. However, most experts on teaching evaluation advise that no one method gives the complete picture of an instructor's teaching ability; multiple measures, on multiple occasions, are advised to give a full picture of the teaching effectiveness of a particular instructor. Moreover, other factors, such as size of class, level of the class, and content of the course, can cause small variations in the ratings. Thus while the results reported for the Basic Form items can be useful in selecting courses, the results for a particular instructor should not be interpreted as providing complete information on the teaching effectiveness of that instructor.

[Return to top of page](#)

[Logoff](#)
Comments to: [CIS Comments](#)
[Division of Instructional Innovation and Assessment](#)
©The University of Texas at Austin 2005
[Web Privacy Policy](#) | [Accessibility](#)