Temple University

SFF Instructor Report

Included in this report are the results from the student feedback forms for your course. The results are based on those student ratings that were submitted for your course. This report contains a summary of the rating data and a listing of all the comments made by the students in your course to the open-ended questions on the evaluation form. A brief explanation of how to interpret the data is presented below.

Data from a hypothetical course section for the SFF:

Overall, I learned a great deal from this course.

	Strongly Agree = 5	Agree = 4	Neither Agree Nor Disagree = 3	Disagree = 2	Strongly Disagree = 1	Not Applicable or Did Not Answer	Mean
ENROLLMENT:			17				
RETURNED FORMS:			15				
n = 15	(6)	(5)	(4)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
Section	40%	33%	27%	0%	0%		4.1
Subject Code	42%	33%	21%	4%	0%		4.1
College	42%	33%	21%	4%	0%		4.1
Level	40%	33%	27%	0%	0%		4.1
University	42%	33%	21%	4%	0%		4.1

Performance Level (U=Upper, M=Middle, L=Lower): **M**

The data presented above indicate that there were 17 students enrolled in the course, but that only 15 returned the feedback form. The second line in the table reports the number of students who used each of the possible ratings. Thus, of the 15 students who completed the rating form, six indicated that they "Strongly Agree" with the statement that "Overall, I learned a great deal from this course," five indicated that they "Agree" with this statement, four students reported "Neither Agree nor Disagree," and no student indicated disagreement with the statement. In addition, no student checked "Not Applicable" or did not answer the question.

The second line of the table (labeled "Section") presents these same data converted into percentages. Since 6 out of the 15 students used the rating of "Strongly Agree," this is 40% of the ratings. The 5 students who indicated that they "Agree" with the statement represent 33% of the ratings, and so on. Using a value of 5 for "Strongly Agree," 4 for "Agree," 3 for "Neither Agree nor Disagree" and so on, the mean (or average) for this section is 4.1.

The other lines of the table report the data for different comparison groups (Subject Code, College, Level, and University) and reflect the percentages across each classification. For example, in the "Strongly Agree" column, the percentage reported on the third line (labeled "Subject Code") indicates that 42% of students in the same subject code as the hypothetical course section used the rating of "Strongly Agree" for this item. These percentages allow for comparison of the data from your course section to the data from all the courses in the same Subject Code, in the same College, at the same Level (lower division undergraduate, upper division undergraduate, or graduate/professional), and/or across the entire University. If there are fewer than ten sections from the four prior semesters to produce comparative data, the level will display *"insufficient responses"*.

At the bottom of the table, the overall teaching performance is reported by one of three broad levels - upper, middle and lower. Instructors are classified into the 'upper' category if more than 50% of respondents rated the instructor "Strongly Agree." Instructors are classified into the 'lower' category if more than 20% of respondents rated the instructor "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree." Instructors not classified according to the prior rules are classified into the 'middle' category. Accordingly for this item, since the percentage of respondents who rated the item "Strongly Agree" was 50% or less, the performance level is in the 'middle' category, denoted by 'M.'

Student Feedback Forms are designed to be customizable at various levels: University, School/College, Department (Subject Code), Course Attribute (GenEd, Honors, Online, Writing Intensive), and Course/Instructor. Within the report, headers are used to designate the item level. Data for different comparison groups are presented based on item level. University-wide items are reported with data from all comparison groups (Subject Code, College, Level, and University). School/College items are reported with data from the College and Subject Code comparison groups; Department (Subject Code) items are reported with data from the Subject Code comparison group; and Course Attribute and Course/Instructor items are only reported with Section level data.

Please be advised that data are not reported for any course in which the enrollment is fewer than five students. This decision was made to ensure that confidentiality is maintained for students whose identity might be determined in courses with limited enrollment.

If you have suggestions about the way the form is structured or the data are reported, please send your suggestions to the Assessment of Instruction Committee at sff@temple.edu. Thank you for your participation.

SFF Instructor Report

CRN:	**23416**	INSTRUCTOR NAME:	**Stanojevic, Marija**

Temple University Student Feedback Form - Fall 2021

CAMPUS:	**MN**	COLLEGE:	**ST**
SUBJECT CODE:	**CIS**	INSTRUCTOR TUID:	**915377444**
COURSE #:	**2107**	COURSE NAME:	**Comp Sys & Low-Level Program**
SECTION #:	**003**	INSTRUCTOR:	**1 of 1**
MEETING TYPE:	**LAB**		

ENROLLMENT:	**20**
RETURNED FORMS:	**7**

Feedback From Instructor

How would you describe the primary teaching modality of this course for the majority of the semester? *Mostly in-person*

Is there anything about the course (the context, the way you decided to teach it, the students, etc.) that would help in understanding the SFFs? *I've also streamed and recorded what I talked about during the in-person labs.*

University-Added Items

The instructor was organized and prepared for class.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable	Mean
n = 7	(4)	(1)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
Section	57%	14%	29%	0%	0%		4.3
Subject Code	55%	31%	7%	4%	3%		4.3
College	55%	31%	8%	4%	2%		4.3
Level	63%	27%	5%	3%	1%		4.5
University	64%	27%	5%	3%	1%		4.5

Performance Level (U=Upper, M=Middle, L=Lower): **U**

So far, the instructor has applied grading policies fairly.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable	Mean
n = 7	(3)	(4)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
Section	43%	57%	0%	0%	0%		4.4
Subject Code	57%	31%	7%	3%	3%		4.4
College	54%	29%	9%	5%	3%		4.3
Level	63%	26%	7%	3%	2%		4.4
University	63%	25%	7%	3%	2%		4.5

Performance Level (U=Upper, M=Middle, L=Lower): **M**

Temple University

SFF Instructor Report

CRN:	**23416**	INSTRUCTOR NAME:	**Stanojevic, Marija**

Overall, the instructor was effective in helping me learn the material in this course.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable	Mean
n = 7	(4)	(2)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
Section	57%	29%	14%	0%	0%		4.4
Subject Code	49%	31%	10%	6%	4%		4.1
College	46%	29%	12%	7%	6%		4.0
Level	57%	27%	9%	5%	3%		4.3
University	57%	27%	8%	4%	3%		4.3

Performance Level (U=Upper, M=Middle, L=Lower): **U**

Overall, I learned a great deal from this course.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable	Mean
n = 7	(4)	(2)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
Section	57%	29%	14%	0%	0%		4.4
Subject Code	50%	32%	10%	5%	4%		4.2
College	44%	30%	14%	7%	5%		4.0
Level	53%	29%	10%	5%	3%		4.2
University	54%	29%	10%	5%	3%		4.3

Performance Level (U=Upper, M=Middle, L=Lower): **U**

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course (or section), including: attending class, doing homework, attending rehearsals, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers, attending study groups, doing lab work (unless the lab is a separate section), and any other course related work?

	19+	16-18	13-15	10-12	7-9	4-6	0-3	Mean
n = 7	(0)	(0)	(1)	(3)	(1)	(1)	(1)	
Section	0%	0%	14%	43%	14%	14%	14%	3.3
Subject Code	8%	8%	13%	20%	20%	19%	11%	3.6
College	5%	7%	11%	18%	21%	24%	14%	3.3
Level	3%	4%	8%	15%	21%	32%	18%	2.9
University	4%	5%	9%	15%	21%	30%	16%	3.0

Performance Level (U=Upper, M=Middle, L=Lower): **M**

School/College-Added Items

SFF Instructor Report

CRN:	**23416**	INSTRUCTOR NAME:	**Stanojevic, Marija**

The instructor provided help when I had difficulties or questions.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable	Mean
n = 7	(3)	(3)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
Section	43%	43%	14%	0%	0%		4.3
Subject Code	51%	31%	11%	4%	3%		4.2
College	49%	30%	12%	5%	3%		4.2

Performance Level (U=Upper, M=Middle, L=Lower): **M**

The instructor respected and valued students of all cultures and backgrounds.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable	Mean
n = 7	(5)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
Section	71%	29%	0%	0%	0%		4.7
Subject Code			*insufficient responses*				
College			*insufficient responses*				

Performance Level (U=Upper, M=Middle, L=Lower): **U**

The instructional materials for this course (books, handouts, etc.) were valuable in helping me learn.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable	Mean
n = 7	(3)	(1)	(1)	(2)	(0)	(0)	
Section	43%	14%	14%	29%	0%		3.7
Subject Code	46%	31%	14%	4%	4%		4.1
College	44%	33%	13%	6%	4%		4.1

Performance Level (U=Upper, M=Middle, L=Lower): **M**

Subject Code-Added Items

The instructor explained course concepts clearly.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable	Mean
n = 7	(3)	(3)	(0)	(1)	(0)	(0)	
Section	43%	43%	0%	14%	0%		4.1
Subject Code	45%	35%	11%	5%	3%		4.1

Performance Level (U=Upper, M=Middle, L=Lower): **M**

SFF Instructor Report

CRN:	**23416**	INSTRUCTOR NAME:	**Stanojevic, Marija**

The course improved my problem-solving skills.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable	Mean
n = 7	(3)	(2)	(1)	(1)	(0)	(0)	
Section	43%	29%	14%	14%	0%		4.0
Subject Code	46%	35%	12%	4%	3%		4.2

Performance Level (U=Upper, M=Middle, L=Lower): **M**

I would enjoy taking another course from this instructor.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable	Mean
n = 7	(4)	(2)	(0)	(1)	(0)	(0)	
Section	57%	29%	0%	14%	0%		4.3
Subject Code	47%	26%	15%	5%	7%		4.0

Performance Level (U=Upper, M=Middle, L=Lower): **U**

Student Comments

STUDENT #1 COMMENTS

1. What aspects of the course contributed most to your learning? (University-Added Item) Hearing tips the professor gave for lab assignments and asking questions, if I had any, to the professor

2. What aspects of the course would you change to improve your learning? (University-Added Item) The lab professor tends to go on tangents that deviates from learning what to do to solve the lab assignments accordingly. I appreciate the passion but it can get in the way of the main focus of the current lab assignment.

3. Please comment on the instructor's willingness to create an inclusive environment for all students in this course, with respect to disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, national origin, political viewpoint, race, religion, and sexual orientation. (University-Added Item) The professor treats everyone equally which is always a positive.

STUDENT #2 COMMENTS

1. What aspects of the course contributed most to your learning? (University-Added Item) During the lab session when the TA went over labs and answered questions.

2. What aspects of the course would you change to improve your learning? (University-Added Item) Alter the quizzes so that align more so with the content learned in class and lab assignments. It felt like the quizzes were harder than the exams and lab assignments.

3. Please comment on the instructor's willingness to create an inclusive environment for all students in this course, with respect to disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, national origin, political viewpoint, race, religion, and sexual orientation. (University-Added Item) The TA was inclusive.

STUDENT #3 COMMENTS

1. What aspects of the course contributed most to your learning? (University-Added Item) Instructor provided a lot of examples, including tricky ones, to solidify our understanding.

2. What aspects of the course would you change to improve your learning? (University-Added Item) More challenging assignments, as they were all too easy.

CRN:	**23416**	INSTRUCTOR NAME:	**Stanojevic, Marija**

3. Please comment on the instructor's willingness to create an inclusive environment for all students in this course, with respect to disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, national origin, political viewpoint, race, religion, and sexual orientation. (University-Added Item)   Instructor was fair to everyone, as far as I know.

STUDENT #4 COMMENTS

1. What aspects of the course contributed most to your learning? (University-Added Item)   Explanations on the board

2. What aspects of the course would you change to improve your learning? (University-Added Item)   Showing more coding examples and less slides

3. Please comment on the instructor's willingness to create an inclusive environment for all students in this course, with respect to disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, national origin, political viewpoint, race, religion, and sexual orientation. (University-Added Item)   No issues with this

STUDENT #5 COMMENTS

1. What aspects of the course contributed most to your learning? (University-Added Item)   Professor's analogies to how code works

2. What aspects of the course would you change to improve your learning? (University-Added Item)   better late policy

3. Please comment on the instructor's willingness to create an inclusive environment for all students in this course, with respect to disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, national origin, political viewpoint, race, religion, and sexual orientation. (University-Added Item)   He seemed to accept all, never showed any hint as to the opposite.

STUDENT #6 COMMENTS

1. What aspects of the course contributed most to your learning? (University-Added Item)   I would say that it was a good refresher on low-level concepts, but that it lacked depth needed to make me feel confident for the next level of this course.

2. What aspects of the course would you change to improve your learning? (University-Added Item)   More in depth focus towards preparing for Introduction to Operating Systems.

3. Please comment on the instructor's willingness to create an inclusive environment for all students in this course, with respect to disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, national origin, political viewpoint, race, religion, and sexual orientation. (University-Added Item)   I don't think there was any problem and the TA was very kind.

STUDENT #7 COMMENTS

1. What aspects of the course contributed most to your learning? (University-Added Item)   The course was fine just a basic C course but I do feel we moved kinda slow. This is more for the lecture side. Overall the Lab was great and the labs were challenging but nothing we were not prepared for.

2. What aspects of the course would you change to improve your learning? (University-Added Item)   From a lab aspect there isn't many improvements I would make. But seems it depends on your TA cause the other lab section sounded like a nightmare.

3. Please comment on the instructor's willingness to create an inclusive environment for all students in this course, with respect to disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, national origin, political viewpoint, race, religion, and sexual orientation. (University-Added Item)   The TA Marija is amazing. Always willing to help students even outside of her hours. She prepares us for each lab and was very accommodating this semester with all the issues we faced. She could easily be a great prof at any college. She deserves a raise.