

MATH 5410 1
Complex Analysis
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A
Responses: 7/12 (58% high)

Taught by: Kirill Lazebnik
Instructor Evaluated: Kirill Lazebnik-Assist Prof

Overall Summative Rating represents the combined responses of students to the four global summative items and is presented to provide an overall index of the class's quality:

Median
4.5
(0=lowest; 5=highest)

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI) combines student responses to several *IASystem* items relating to how academically challenging students found the course to be and how engaged they were:

CEI: 5.8
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median
The course as a whole was:	7	43%	29%	29%				4.2
The course content was:	7	43%	29%	29%				4.2
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	7	57%	14%	29%				4.6
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	7	57%	14%	29%				4.6

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	Average (5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Relative to other college courses you have taken:									
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	7		29%	29%	14%	14%	14%		4.8
The intellectual challenge presented was:	7	29%	71%						6.2
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	7	29%	43%	29%					6.0
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	7	29%	43%	14%	14%				6.0
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	7	29%	43%	29%					6.0

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?

Class median: 10.0 Hours per credit: 3.3 (N=7)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
			29%	14%	29%	14%				14%	

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?

Class median: 8.5 Hours per credit: 2.8 (N=7)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
			43%	14%	14%	14%				14%	

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.3 (N=6)

A (3.9-4.0)	A- (3.5-3.8)	B+ (3.2-3.4)	B (2.9-3.1)	B- (2.5-2.8)	C+ (2.2-2.4)	C (1.9-2.1)	C- (1.5-1.8)	D+ (1.2-1.4)	D (0.9-1.1)	D- (0.7-0.8)	E (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
33%	17%		33%			17%								

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as:

(N=6)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
17%	67%	17%			

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median
Course organization was:	7	57%	29%		14%			4.6
Clarity of instructor's voice was:	7	71%	29%					4.8
Explanations by instructor were:	7	57%	29%		14%			4.6
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	7	57%	14%		29%			4.6
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	7	57%	14%	29%				4.6
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	7	71%	14%	14%				4.8
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	7	57%	43%					4.6
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	7	43%	29%	14%	14%			4.2
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	7	57%	29%		14%			4.6
Answers to student questions were:	7	43%	43%		14%			4.3
Availability of extra help when needed was:	7	43%	57%					4.4
Use of class time was:	7	57%	29%	14%				4.6
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	7	57%	29%			14%		4.6
Amount you learned in the course was:	7	43%	43%	14%				4.3
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	7	86%	14%					4.9
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	7	57%	29%		14%			4.6
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	7	57%	43%					4.6
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	7	57%	29%	14%				4.6

MATH 5410 1
Complex Analysis
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A
Responses: 7/12 (58% high)

Taught by: Kirill Lazebnik
Instructor Evaluated: Kirill Lazebnik-Assist Prof

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Was this class intellectually stimulating? Did it stretch your thinking? Why or why not?

1. Yes I thought the class was very intellectually stimulating. As a physics PhD student this was what I expected and wanted from a math class.
2. Yes. I liked that we covered so much material. That should really help when it comes time to study for the qual.
3. The class was interesting as it has connections to other areas of mathematics. This caused me to try to recall material I previously learned and see how I can connect it to the new ideas presented.
4. The exercises were interesting.
5. Yes, the material is difficult.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. I think the homework and in-class examples contributed the most to my learning. I really wish there were more homeworks, and that the professor went over the homeworks in class, or at the very least published solutions afterwards. The textbook we are using has only recently been published, so there are essentially no resources available to the text if you get stuck on something. Having problems to work on that are from other resources would be beneficial, or providing more help on the homework would've been nice.
2. The lectures were very helpful, and I really appreciate that you followed a textbook. The pictures and examples were especially useful. I also appreciated your exams. It's not easy to write a 50-minute exam that is the right level of difficulty, but I think you nailed it. I had enough time to answer the easier problems and still be able to think about the challenging problems.
3. Homework
4. Doing the exercises.
5. Explanations by the instructor were incredible. It is obvious that the instructor has a very deep knowledge of the material.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. The lack of graded assignments. I expected to struggle in this class, and I certainly did struggle throughout the entirety of the class, but I felt the way the assignments were organized punished me extra for struggling. We did not receive our first grade in the course until about a week and a half before the midterm, and so that gave me very little time to go back and study the things that I was shaky on before the midterm. Over the entire course it looks like we are only going to be assigned 4 homeworks, and so there is a ton of information that we are covering that we are not getting practice with. Having more homework assignments would provide students more opportunities to figure out where their struggles lie and help understand the material better before having to take midterm and final exams.
5. Nothing detracted from my learning in the class.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Assigning more homeworks, maybe with more problems but simpler to solve, and maybe with problems that are outside the textbook. Providing a second resource to learn the material would be helpful too. Using a textbook that has only recently been published causes extra hardship for the students as there are no established resources for it. At least providing a link or example of a more established textbook and maybe a solution manual would help students greatly when studying the material and preparing for exams. It was very hard to prepare for exams because I when practicing the problems in the book I wasn't sure if I was getting the correct answers or not.
2. The only thing I can think of is more helpful hints on the homework. A lot of the solutions feel like they come out of nowhere, so having a direction to go is useful. However, I do understand your desire for us to struggle through them on our own. It would be a lot more stressful if we had to worry more about the grade, so I appreciate that the grade is less of an issue. It helped me focus more on the material.
3. Maybe some more concrete examples of certain major theorems to emphasize their importance.
4. More recommended problems.
5. I suggest the instructor to do more practice problems in class.

IASystem Course Summary Reports summarize student ratings of a particular course or combination of courses. They provide a rich perspective on student views by reporting responses in three ways: as frequency distributions, average ratings, and either comparative or adjusted ratings. Remember in interpreting results that it is important to keep in mind the number of students who evaluated the course relative to the total course enrollment as shown on the upper right-hand corner of the report.

Frequency distributions. The percentage of students who selected each response choice is displayed for each item. Percentages are based on the number of students who answered the respective item rather than the number of students who evaluated the course because individual item response is optional.

Median ratings. IASystem reports average ratings in the form of item medians. Although means are a more familiar type of average than medians, they are less accurate in summarizing student ratings. This is because ratings distributions tend to be strongly skewed. That is, most of the ratings are at the high end of the scale and trail off to the low end.

The median indicates the point on the rating scale at which half of the students selected higher ratings, and half selected lower. Medians are computed to one decimal place by interpolation.¹ In general, higher medians reflect more favorable ratings. To interpret median ratings, compare the value of each median to the respective response scale: *Very Poor, Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent (0-5); Never/None/Much Lower, About Half/Average, Always/Great/Much Higher (1-7); Slight, Moderate, Considerable, Extensive (1-4)*.

Comparative ratings. IASystem provides a normative comparison for each item by reporting the decile rank of the item median. Decile ranks compare the median rating of a particular item to ratings of the same item over the previous two academic years in all classes at the institution and within the college, school, or division. Decile ranks are shown only for items with sufficient normative data.

Decile ranks range from 0 (lowest) to 9 (highest). For all items, higher medians yield higher decile ranks. The 0 decile rank indicates an item median in the lowest 10% of all scores. A decile rank of 1 indicates a median above the bottom 10% and below the top 80%. A decile rank of 9 indicates a median in the top 10% of all scores. Because average ratings tend to be high, a rating of "good" or "average" may have a low decile rank.

Adjusted ratings. Research has shown that student ratings may be somewhat influenced by factors such as class size, expected grade, and reason for enrollment. To correct for this, IASystem reports **adjusted medians** for summative items (items #1-4 and their combined global rating) based on regression analyses of ratings over the previous two academic years in all classes at the respective institution. If large classes at the institution tend to be rated lower than small classes, for example, the adjusted medians for large classes will be slightly higher than their unadjusted medians.

When adjusted ratings are displayed for summative items, **relative rank** is displayed for the more specific (formative) items. Rankings serve as a guide in directing instructional improvement efforts. The top ranked items (1, 2, 3, etc.) represent areas that are going well from a student perspective; whereas the bottom ranked items (18, 17, 16, etc.) represent areas in which the instructor may want to make changes. Relative ranks are computed by first standardizing each item (subtracting the overall institutional average from the item rating for the particular course, then dividing by the standard deviation of the ratings across all courses) and then ranking those standardized scores.

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI). Several IASystem items ask students how academically challenging they found the course to be. IASystem calculates the average of these items and reports them as a single index. *The Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI)* correlates only modestly with the global rating (median of items 1-4).

Optional Items. Student responses to instructor-supplied items are summarized at the end of the evaluation report. Median responses should be interpreted in light of the specific item text and response scale used (response values 1-6 on paper evaluation forms).

¹ For the specific method, see, for example, Guilford, J.P. (1965). *Fundamental statistics in psychology and education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, pp. 49-53.