Individual Report for Instructor Koenig (30031-20153 : CSCI-360 Introduction to Artificial Intelligence (30031))

Viterbi Student Course Evaluations - Fall 2015

Project Audience 71
Responses Received 20
Response Ratio 28.17%

Creation Date   Sun, Apr 03, 2016

How would you rate the instructor's effectiveness on the following items?

1. Clearly articulated course goals.

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	5	25.00%
4 Above Average	4	20.00%
5 Excellent	11	55.00%
Total	20	

Statistics	Value
Response Count	20
Mean	4.30
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.86
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.84
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.19
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.19

2. Organized course to achieve those goals.

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	6	30.00%
4 Above Average	3	15.00%
5 Excellent	11	55.00%
Total	20	

Statistics	Value
Response Count	20
Mean	4.25
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.91
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.89
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.20
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.20

3. Carefully explained difficult concepts, methods, and subject matter.

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	2	10.00%
3 Average	5	25.00%
4 Above Average	3	15.00%
5 Excellent	10	50.00%
Total	20	

| Statistics	Value
Response Count	20
Mean	4.05
Median	4.50
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-1.10
Population Standard Deviation	+/-1.07
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.25
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.24

4. Encouraged students to participate in their learning (e.g., through discussion, projects, study groups and other appropriate activities).

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	3	15.00%
4 Above Average	4	20.00%
5 Excellent	13	65.00%
Total	20	

Statistics	Value
Response Count	20
Mean	4.50
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.76
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.74
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.17
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.17

5. Was accessible to students (e.g., during office hours, before and after class, etc.).

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	5	25.00%
4 Above Average	6	30.00%
5 Excellent	9	45.00%
Total	20	

6. Evaluated student work in fair and appropriate ways.

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	4	20.00%
4 Above Average	5	25.00%
5 Excellent	11	55.00%
Total	20	

| Statistics	Value		Statistics	Value
Response Count	20		Response Count	20
Mean	4.20		Mean	4.35
Median	4.00		Median	5.00
Mode	5		Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.83		Standard Deviation	+/-0.81
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.81		Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.79
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.19		Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.18
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.18		Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.18

7. Was enthusiastic about communicating the subject matter.

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	1	5.00%
4 Above Average	2	10.00%
5 Excellent	17	85.00%
Total	20	

8. Stimulated student interest in the subject matter.

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	1	5.00%
3 Average	4	20.00%
4 Above Average	6	30.00%
5 Excellent	9	45.00%
Total	20	

Statistics	Value
Response Count	20
Mean	4.80
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.52
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.51
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.12
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.11

| Statistics	Value
Response Count	20
Mean	4.15
Median	4.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.93
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.91
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.21
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.20

How would you rate the instructor's effectiveness on the following items? (continued)

9. Presented subject matter in ways that were academically challenging.

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	4	20.00%
4 Above Average	4	20.00%
5 Excellent	12	60.00%
Total	20	

Statistics	Value
Response Count	20
Mean	4.40
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.82
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.80
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.18
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.18

10. Provided students a valuable learning experience.

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	1	5.00%
3 Average	4	20.00%
4 Above Average	4	20.00%
5 Excellent	11	55.00%
Total	20	

Statistics	Value
Response Count	20
Mean	4.25
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.97
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.94
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.22
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.21

Overall, how would you rate this instructor?

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	4	20.00%
4 Above Average	5	25.00%
5 Excellent	11	55.00%
Total	20	

| Statistics	Value
Response Count	20
Mean	4.35
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.81
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.79
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.18
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.18

Overall, how would you rate this course?

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	6	30.00%
4 Above Average	8	40.00%
5 Excellent	6	30.00%
Total	20	

| Statistics	Value
Response Count	20
Mean	4.00
Median	4.00
Mode	4
Standard Deviation	+/-0.79
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.77
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.18
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.17

School of Engineering Supplemental Questions for Instructor

1. The instructor provided a good plan for the course.

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	6	30.00%
4 Above Average	4	20.00%
5 Excellent	10	50.00%
Total	20	

Statistics	Value
Response Count	20
Mean	4.20
Median	4.50
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.89
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.87
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.20
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.19

2. Graded work was returned in a timely fashion.

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	3	15.00%
3 Average	6	30.00%
4 Above Average	5	25.00%
5 Excellent	6	30.00%
Total	20	

Statistics	Value
Response Count	20
Mean	3.70
Median	4.00
Mode	3, 5
Standard Deviation	+/-1.08
Population Standard Deviation	+/-1.05
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.24
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.24

**3. There was adequate coordination between the TA/Grader and the instructor.**

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	9	45.00%
4 Above Average	3	15.00%
5 Excellent	8	40.00%
Total	20	

Statistics	Value
Response Count	20
Mean	3.95
Median	4.00
Mode	3
Standard Deviation	+/-0.94
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.92
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.21
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.21

Course Related Supplemental Questions

1. The prerequisites for the course were adequate.

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	4	20.00%
4 Above Average	4	20.00%
5 Excellent	12	60.00%
Total	20	

| Statistics	Value
Response Count	20
Mean	4.40
Median	5.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.82
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.80
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.18
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.18

2. There was a systematic progression of topics / materials throughout the course.

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	1	5.00%
3 Average	4	20.00%
4 Above Average	5	25.00%
5 Excellent	10	50.00%
Total	20	

Statistics	Value
Response Count	20
Mean	4.20
Median	4.50
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.95
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.93
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.21
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.21

3. The reading material / texts and assignments contributed to a coherent learning experience.

1 Poor	0	0.00%
2 Below Average	0	0.00%
3 Average	6	30.00%
4 Above Average	6	30.00%
5 Excellent	8	40.00%
Total	20	

Statistics	Value
Response Count	20
Mean	4.10
Median	4.00
Mode	5
Standard Deviation	+/-0.85
Population Standard Deviation	+/-0.83
Standard Error (base on SD)	+/-0.19
Standard Error (base on PSD)	+/-0.19