COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Philosophy
Term: Winter 2019

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

PHIL 115 AA
Practical Reasoning
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Blake Hereth
Instructor Evaluated: Blake Hereth-TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 19/30 (63% high)

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:

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
4.8	**4.6**
(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: 3.7
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The quiz section as a whole was:	19	63%	26%	11%				4.7	4.5
The content of the quiz section was:	19	58%	37%		5%			4.6	4.5
The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was:	19	79%	16%		5%			4.9	4.7
The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	19	74%	21%	5%				4.8	4.6

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Relative to other college courses you have taken:	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	19	16%	42%	26%	16%				5.7
The intellectual challenge presented was:	19		26%	32%	21%	16%		5%	4.8
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	19		16%	21%	26%	16%	11%	11%	4.0
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	19		11%	37%	26%	16%	5%	5%	4.4
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	19	16%	16%	32%	11%	11%	5%	11%	4.9

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: 3.9 (N=19)

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
16%	26%	37%	21%								

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

Class median: 3.6 (N=19)

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
21%	26%	37%	16%								

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.6 (N=19)

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)	F (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
26%	53%	11%	11%											

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

(N=19)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
11%	21%	21%	5%	16%	26%

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Philosophy
Term: Winter 2019

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Explanations by the QSI were:	19	68%	26%	5%				4.8	7
QSI's use of examples and illustrations was:	19	63%	32%		5%			4.7	16
Quality of questions or problems raised by QSI was:	19	58%	32%	11%				4.6	18
QSI's enthusiasm was:	19	89%	5%		5%			4.9	9
Student confidence in QSI's knowledge was:	19	84%	11%		5%			4.9	14
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	19	74%	21%	5%				4.8	15
Answers to student questions were:	19	68%	26%	5%				4.8	11
Interest level of quiz sections was:	19	53%	26%	11%	11%			4.5	12
QSI's openness to student views was:	19	84%	11%	5%				4.9	6
QSI's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	19	68%	26%	5%				4.8	10
Availability of extra help when needed was:	19	68%	26%	5%				4.8	13
Use of quiz section time was:	18	67%	17%	17%				4.8	5
QSI's interest in whether students learned was:	19	68%	26%	5%				4.8	17
Amount you learned in the quiz sections was:	19	74%	16%		11%			4.8	1
Relevance and usefulness of quiz section content were:	19	68%	21%		11%			4.8	8
Coordination between lectures and quiz sections was:	19	68%	26%	5%				4.8	3
Reasonableness of assigned work for quiz section was:	19	74%	21%	5%				4.8	4
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	19	79%	16%	5%				4.9	2

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Philosophy
Term: Winter 2019

PHIL 115 AA
Practical Reasoning
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Blake Hereth
Instructor Evaluated: Blake Hereth-TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 19/30 (63% high)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Fairly, taught a new but easy to understand concept

2. I liked the topics we discussed and felt that everything was planned at a good pace.

3. Yes, the TA presented topics in a way that was very interesting and stimulating.

4. Yes, this class was very interesting. It helped me understand argumentation in a clear, logical way.

5. Especially the second half of the quarter was intellectually stimulating because it seemed more applicable to real life; techniques on how to evaluate arguments will be helpful outside this course

6. yes it was fun to change casual arguments into standard forms to more easily attack them or defend them

7. Yes it was because I hadn't learned about this subject before

8. Yes, because we had to evaluate different ways to reconstruct different arguments and see if it was cogent or not.

9. Yes it is intellectually stimulating. The question asked in quizzes are interesting and useful to comprehend terms in the book.

10. It did stretch my thinking. It put everyday arguments/conversations into meaningful patterns and logic symbols.

11. It did, the questions presented during section

12. Yes this class was intellectually stimulating, I was introduced to a new way of analyzing and building environments. Prior to this class I had never taken a logic class so everything I learned was new and stimulating. This class helped me construct arguments for papers and other assignments for other classes. It's cool to see just how useful this class is, in and out of the classroom.

13. The content was interesting and was good at getting me to critically think about the nature of language.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The quiz section and online lectures and polls

2. The interaction and time to figure things out on our own.

3. The TA's enthusiasm helped contribute to my engagement

4. Reading the textbook and lecture.

5. Going through examples in QS, PollEverywhere in class

6. the whiteboard

7. The practice problems we did in class

8. Quiz section made me think the most and was the most engaging

9. The quiz section and the book

10. Weekly quizzes

11. all the questions

12. I loved the way section was taught. Having such an open and collaborative section made it easier to get to know other people and not feel isolated. Having practice problems to go through every section was very helpful practice for the weekly quizzes.

13. Quiz sections and being able to interact with examples and apply knowledge was how I was able to establish my understanding of the course content.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. Lecture itself was extremely repetitive from reading, quiz section, and online lectures; lectures unnecessary

2. nope!

4. None

6. standing so much

7. Standing the whole time

9. none

10. N/A

11. Nothing

12. There wasn't anything from section that detracted from my learning.

13. The poor layout of the lecture hall

1. do something different in the lecture section

2. nothing

4. None

5. One QS a week would be enough to cover the same amount of content

6. let us sit

7. None

9. Less poll everywhere more teaching in the lecture section

10. Don't focus on textbook examples too much during quiz section. The book has been read already and the online lectures also go over the examples.

11. No

12. No suggestions!

13. I found the class enjoyable and almost exceedingly generous in terms of course workload (not that I'm complaining though)

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.

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Philosophy
Term: Winter 2019

PHIL 115 AC
Practical Reasoning
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Blake Hereth
Instructor Evaluated: Blake Hereth-TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 15/25 (60% high)

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:

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
4.9	**4.7**

(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: 3.6
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The quiz section as a whole was:	15	80%	20%					4.9	4.7
The content of the quiz section was:	15	67%	27%	7%				4.8	4.6
The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was:	15	87%	13%					4.9	4.8
The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	15	87%	13%					4.9	4.7

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Relative to other college courses you have taken:	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	15	13%	40%	27%	13%	7%			5.6
The intellectual challenge presented was:	15	13%	13%	13%	40%	13%		7%	4.2
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	15	7%	13%	7%	40%	20%	13%		3.9
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	15	13%	7%	7%	40%	20%	13%		3.9
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	15	7%	27%	13%	47%		7%		4.4

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: 5.0 (N=15)**

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
	20%	40%	20%	7%	13%						

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?   **Class median: 4.5 (N=15)**

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
13%	20%	33%	13%	20%							

What grade do you expect in this course?   **Class median: 3.6 (N=15)**

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)	F (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
27%	53%	13%	7%											

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as: **(N=15)**

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
13%	13%	33%	13%	20%	7%

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Philosophy
Term: Winter 2019

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Explanations by the QSI were:	15	73%	27%					4.8	4
QSI's use of examples and illustrations was:	15	60%	33%	7%				4.7	11
Quality of questions or problems raised by QSI was:	15	53%	27%	13%	7%			4.6	17
QSI's enthusiasm was:	15	93%	7%					5.0	7
Student confidence in QSI's knowledge was:	15	87%	13%					4.9	8
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	15	67%	20%	13%				4.8	15
Answers to student questions were:	15	67%	13%	20%				4.8	10
Interest level of quiz sections was:	15	60%	40%					4.7	3
QSI's openness to student views was:	15	67%	20%	7%	7%			4.8	13
QSI's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	15	67%	20%	13%				4.8	9
Availability of extra help when needed was:	15	60%	27%	7%	7%			4.7	16
Use of quiz section time was:	15	53%	40%	7%				4.6	14
QSI's interest in whether students learned was:	15	60%	40%					4.7	18
Amount you learned in the quiz sections was:	15	53%	33%	13%				4.6	12
Relevance and usefulness of quiz section content were:	15	73%	27%					4.8	5
Coordination between lectures and quiz sections was:	15	80%	13%	7%				4.9	1
Reasonableness of assigned work for quiz section was:	15	80%	20%					4.9	2
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	15	73%	27%					4.8	6

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Philosophy
Term: Winter 2019

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

PHIL 115 AC
Practical Reasoning
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Blake Hereth
Instructor Evaluated: Blake Hereth-TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 15/25 (60% high)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Yes it was

2. This class did stretch my thinking, I was faced with challenging problems to solve that were intellectually stimulating.

3. It did. Especially when it comes to evaluating and objecting to arguments

4. Yes this class was intellectually stimulating! It made me think twice before giving an answer out. Plus I was able to actually use the concepts in class during quiz sections and practice it out.

5. Not especially, although there were interesting ideas and questions presented, they were not especially challenging. This is more due to the nature of the course material than the way the course was run.

6. Mildly. I had never had to reconstruct and analyze arguments before.

7. Yes! Many of the questions presented challenged the class to apply what we learned to more complicated issues.

8. Yes, philosophy entails the use of logic and reasoning which definitely stimulates the mind a lot.

9. Yes! At times I thought I was clearly following the material until something new was introduced and everything I thought I knew flew out the door! But all difficult in a good way!

10. Yes! Helped me to apply logic to everyday things I never thought about in this way before.

11. This class was very interesting to me and gave me a lot of new insight as to what goes into constructing an argument. Quiz section was definitely very engaging and stimulating.

12. Yes, provide a good way to think about argument

13. yes - gave me tools to combat real life problems

15. Yes, this was a field that I didn't have any experience with, but now I feel more confident.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The quiz session, the online lecture and the Wednesday class

2. The quiz section and going over and solving different problems in the book.

3. the evaluation of arguments piece

4. Quiz sections for sure! it was my favorite part about this class as well. We were all able to practice problems out during this time, and ask questions about the readings/lecture if we didn't understand anything. I feel like quiz section for this class really helped me out.

5. Discussions and group discussion in quiz section was much more valuable to my learning than any time spent in lecture.

6. Quiz section practice

7. Quiz section, PollEV, and reading the book

8. I really appreciate how the examples shown in class related really close to the lessons. Everything was also explained step-by-step which was really helpful. Also, class was very interactive, which was also really good.

9. Blake's engagement and energy kept me engaged in section

10. All the examples we did really made sure I understood practical application of the material!

11. Involving the students in the example problems in quiz section was very helpful and hands-on. I think it was a great way to connect the readings to the quizzes and the big ideas for that week.

12. Learning to reconstruct argument

13. blake's explanations in quiz sec

15. Easy work load, enthusiasm, and good explanation

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. I think it's been pretty great

2. There were no aspects of this class that detracted from my learning.

3. Nothing really

4. nothing!

5. The way that PollEverywhere questions were done in lecture; there wasn't much point to them because the answers were given, and I think there are more efficient ways of marking participation, such as attendance.

6. None

7. The snow days but everything was very well organized to counteract the missed class time.

8. Nothing.

9. None

10. None!

11. Nothing. I feel that the quiz section time was used productively and if we finished early, we were dismissed early rather than wasting time.

12. Nothing

13. n/a

15. None

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. more time on Wednesday lecture

2. NONE! This was a great class!

3. none

4. Nothing!

5. Faster and more detailed presentation of ideas and better use of lecture time.

6. More quiz style practicing

7. Cover more material every week or at least in the weeks where the material was thin. More questions for quiz section since we often ran out of stuff to do. Have Blake always teach section for this class:))

8. Everything worked for me, so I think that the class is fine the way it is already.

9. None

10. None!

11. Honestly, as said previously, I really enjoyed quiz section and I think that it was organized in a great way.

12. None

13. clone blake

14. With extra time in quiz sections especially towards the second half of the quarter, I would have liked to try reconstructing and analyzing more arguments from today's politics (local national or university level)

15. Can't think of anything

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Philosophy
Term: Winter 2019

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

PHIL 115 AD
Practical Reasoning
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Blake Hereth
Instructor Evaluated: Blake Hereth-TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 21/30 (70% high)

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:

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
4.9	**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: 4.0
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The quiz section as a whole was:	21	90%	5%	5%				4.9	4.6
The content of the quiz section was:	21	81%	10%	10%				4.9	4.6
The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was:	21	86%	14%					4.9	4.6
The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	21	76%	14%	10%				4.8	4.4

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Relative to other college courses you have taken:	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	21	48%	33%	14%	5%				6.4
The intellectual challenge presented was:	21	5%	24%	10%	38%	24%			4.2
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	21	19%	14%	29%	10%	19%	5%	5%	4.9
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	21	10%	14%	38%	14%	14%	5%	5%	4.8
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	21	38%	19%	10%	19%	10%		5%	5.9

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: 5.7   (N=21)**

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
5%	10%	33%	24%	19%	5%	5%					

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?   **Class median: 4.2   (N=21)**

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
10%	33%	19%	24%	5%	5%	5%					

What grade do you expect in this course?   **Class median: 3.9   (N=21)**

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)	F (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
67%	29%	5%												

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as: **(N=21)**

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
19%	24%	24%	5%	14%	14%

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Philosophy
Term: Winter 2019

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Explanations by the QSI were:	21	81%	10%	10%				4.9	9
QSI's use of examples and illustrations was:	21	81%	19%					4.9	12
Quality of questions or problems raised by QSI was:	21	76%	24%					4.8	13
QSI's enthusiasm was:	21	90%	10%					4.9	17
Student confidence in QSI's knowledge was:	21	86%	14%					4.9	18
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	21	90%	5%	5%				4.9	15
Answers to student questions were:	20	95%	5%					5.0	6
Interest level of quiz sections was:	21	81%	14%	5%				4.9	1
QSI's openness to student views was:	21	95%		5%				5.0	10
QSI's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	21	86%	10%	5%				4.9	8
Availability of extra help when needed was:	21	81%	10%	10%				4.9	14
Use of quiz section time was:	21	71%	19%	10%				4.8	11
QSI's interest in whether students learned was:	21	81%	14%	5%				4.9	16
Amount you learned in the quiz sections was:	21	86%	5%	10%				4.9	4
Relevance and usefulness of quiz section content were:	20	95%	5%					5.0	5
Coordination between lectures and quiz sections was:	21	86%	10%	5%				4.9	3
Reasonableness of assigned work for quiz section was:	21	95%		5%				5.0	2
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	21	86%	10%	5%				4.9	7

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Philosophy
Term: Winter 2019

PHIL 115 AD
Practical Reasoning
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Blake Hereth
Instructor Evaluated: Blake Hereth-TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 21/30 (70% high)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Yes

2. It helped me understand practical reasoning. It stretched my thinking but it was not intellectually challenging.

3. It wasn't very hard to grasp the concepts, but it was intellectually stimulating because the curriculum consisted of things I haven't learned before.

4. The material itself was pretty basic and not super interesting, but Blake made it SO awesome. It did stretch my thinking a little, as the way philosophical arguments in the class are made is different than any other philosophy class I have taken. I would definitely recommend this class (with this format taught by Lee and Blake) to anyone!

5. Yes - it stretched my thinking in terms of learning about new topics.

6. Yes - I actually ended up using the techniques I learned in this course to structure a paper that I wrote in another course. I enjoyed thinking about and employing what I learned in that regard, and feel like I think about the world a little bit differently than I did prior to the course.

7. The content

8. It did because it basically took our normal way of thinking and formalized it, with concrete concepts and terminology.

9. made me think about how we use logic in reasoning

10. Yes, with the problems and questions posed.

11. Yes. I learned how to think more critically about arguments

12. Mildly, the concepts were new to me because I have never taken a philosophy class before

13. Yes, I learned a lot of things that I wouldn't have learned in any other course taught at UW. It taught me how to better construct and analyze arguments.

14. This was the most intellectually stimulating class I've had in recent memory. It expanded my of thinking by giving me new ways to approach arguments or ideas. Blake's guidance, explanations, and prompting to push further in our thinking was my favorite aspect of this class!

15. Yes, this class really made me think. The concepts were really interesting and were taught in a way that made it easy to understand.

16. YES! The best TA I've had at UW by far. Having us be interactive with each other by writing out problems and solving them on the board was the best way to learn.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Writing in the white board

2. The class discussions in which we all stood up and wrote on the white boards was very engaging.

3. The quiz sections and the hands on white board learning. As well as the poll everywhere questions and going through the answers in groups/with the class

4. Blake as our TA was awesome! His use of quiz section and the way the material was taught helped me so much.

5. Reading the book and quiz section. Lectue helped as well so the class a whole contributed to my learning.

6. Hands-on learning in section was very helpful. Felt like I was actively learning the material.

7. The passion of teachers

8. The fact that we were constantly up on our feet and working together was a great way of keeping us engaged. Physically working problems out on the board together with the help of Blake was a good time. Blake was funny, charismatic and approachable.

9. Going over examples of proofs

10. Group work on the boards.

11. Working out the argument examples given in lecture and quiz section as a class was very helpful

12. Blake's quiz section. Your passion and commitment to our learning is seriously impressive. Thank you so much!

13. Blake was an amazing TA and was always so understanding and accommodating when I had to make up quizzes or had any questions.

14. Doing the examples at the board in groups was the time that was the most beneficial to me. The hands on experience helped the information to stick and made it much easier to understand.

15. The way the class was structured allowed me to be the most successful I could be.

16. Writing and solving problems on the board.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. None

2. Nothing

3. Quiz sections that felt too long or where the material being practice became redundant.

4. none

5. None.

6. N/A

7. sometimes cant see the board

8. Nothing really detracted from my learning.

9. being at ode

10. Just sitting and being explained things because no one participated.

12. Nothing at all! you were incredible Blake.

13. None

14. I can't think of anything!

15. N/A

16. Nothing. Each minute was very useful.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. None

2. Nothing

3. MORE PEOPLE LIKE BLAKE!! ZE'S THE BEST!

4. None! This was one of my favorite classes I have taken at UW

5. None. This class was my favorite this quarter.

6. Quiz section was great! Condensed key points and explained/worked with examples to solidify retention of those points.

7. different lecture room :)

8. I might suggest like a low stakes reading assignment just to keep us accountable but other than that we're good.

10. Nothing

12. nothing

13. None , I really enjoyed this class and I loved the way it was taught and set up. Very well organized and one of the nest classes I've taken.

14. I think it's beneficial and functional just the way it is!

15. N/A This class is one of my favorites!

16. NOTHING! Best TA ever... cannot stress this enough.

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.