

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 S371P (54115)
Fall 2005
Survey: Expanded

Number of Submitted Surveys: 22
Course Enrollment: 32

#	Survey Question	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total	Avg
1	The course was well organized.	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.5%)	8 (36.4%)	13 (59.1%)	22	4.5
2	The instructor communicated information effectively.	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (22.7%)	17 (77.3%)	22	4.8
3	The instructor showed interest in the progress of students.	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (9.1%)	10 (45.5%)	10 (45.5%)	22	4.4
4	The tests/assignments were usually graded and returned promptly.	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.5%)	11 (50.0%)	10 (45.5%)	22	4.4
5	The instructor made me feel free to ask questions, disagree, and express my ideas.	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.5%)	7 (31.8%)	14 (63.6%)	22	4.6
6	Course objectives and assignments were clearly stated.	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.5%)	7 (31.8%)	14 (63.6%)	22	4.6
7	The instructor seemed well prepared for class.	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (22.7%)	17 (77.3%)	22	4.8
8	The instructor showed a thorough knowledge of the course material.	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (18.2%)	18 (81.8%)	22	4.8
9	The instructor seemed genuinely interested in teaching the course.	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (18.2%)	18 (81.8%)	22	4.8
10	The instructor was generally accessible to students outside of class.	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (35.0%)	4 (20.0%)	9 (45.0%)	20	4.1
11	My performance in this course has been evaluated fairly.	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (18.2%)	7 (31.8%)	11 (50.0%)	22	4.3
12	The instructor gave adequate instructions concerning assignments.	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.8%)	10 (47.6%)	10 (47.6%)	21	4.4
13	The instructor has tried to make the course material educationally valuable to me.	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (23.8%)	16 (76.2%)	21	4.8
14	The instructor has increased my knowledge and competence in the subject of this course.	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (28.6%)	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%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (14.3%)	8 (38.1%)	10 (47.6%)	21	4.3
16	In my opinion, the assignments,							

	presentations, projects or papers required in the course were worthwhile learning experiences.	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (40.0%)	12 (60.0%)	20	4.6
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%)	1 (4.8%)	9 (42.9%)	11 (52.4%)	21	4.5

#		Very Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent	Total	Avg
18	Overall, this instructor was	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (28.6%)	15 (71.4%)	21	4.7
19	Overall, this course was	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (14.3%)	10 (47.6%)	8 (38.1%)	21	4.2

#		Excessive	High	Average	Light	Insufficient	Total	Avg
20	In my opinion, the workload in this course was	2 (9.5%)	13 (61.9%)	4 (19.0%)	2 (9.5%)	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%)	1 (5.0%)	1 (5.0%)	11 (55.0%)	7 (35.0%)	20	N/A

#		A	B	C	D	F	Total	Avg
22	My probable grade to date in this course is	6 (33.3%)	8 (44.4%)	2 (11.1%)	1 (5.6%)	1 (5.6%)	18	N/A

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](#)