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.

ENROLLMENT:	17
RETURNED FORMS:	15

	Strongly Agree = 5	Agree = 4	Neither Agree Nor Disagree = 3	Disagree = 2	Strongly Disagree = 1	Not Applicable or Did Not Answer	Mean
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.

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.

Note:

For University-added items, comparative data is inclusive of all Fall 2020 responses, as well as responses from the Spring 2020 pilot. All other levels of comparative data are inclusive of only Fall 2020 responses, if available, except for Law and Pharmacy, which include responses from the Spring 2020 (Law and Pharmacy) pilot.

SFF Instructor Report

Temple University Student Feedback Form - Spring 2021

CRN:	**26953**	CAMPUS:	**MN**
INSTRUCTOR NAME:	**Stanojevic, Marija**	COLLEGE:	**ST**
SUBJECT CODE:	**CIS**	INSTRUCTOR TUID:	**915377444**
COURSE #:	**2107**	COURSE NAME:	**Comp Sys & Low-Level Program**
SECTION #:	**004**	INSTRUCTOR:	**1 of 1**
MEETING TYPE:	**LAB**		

ENROLLMENT:	**17**
RETURNED FORMS:	**6**

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 = 6	(2)	(4)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
Section	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%		4.3
Subject Code	56%	31%	7%	5%	2%		4.3
College	54%	31%	8%	5%	2%		4.3
Level	62%	28%	5%	3%	2%		4.5
University	63%	27%	5%	3%	1%		4.5

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

So far, the instructor has applied grading policies fairly.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable	Mean
n = 6	(3)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
Section	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%		4.5
Subject Code	58%	30%	7%	2%	2%		4.4
College	54%	30%	9%	4%	3%		4.3
Level	62%	27%	7%	3%	2%		4.4
University	63%	26%	7%	3%	2%		4.5

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

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 = 6	(4)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
Section	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%		4.7
Subject Code	51%	30%	10%	6%	4%		4.2
College	46%	29%	12%	8%	6%		4.0
Level	55%	28%	9%	5%	3%		4.3
University	56%	28%	9%	5%	3%		4.3

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

CRN: **26953** INSTRUCTOR NAME: **Stanojevic, Marija**

Overall, I learned a great deal from this course.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable	Mean
n = 6	(3)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
Section	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%		4.5
Subject Code	51%	30%	10%	5%	3%		4.2
College	42%	31%	14%	8%	5%		4.0
Level	52%	29%	11%	5%	3%		4.2
University	53%	29%	10%	5%	3%		4.2

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

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 = 6	(2)	(2)	(1)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
Section	33%	33%	17%	17%	0%	0%	0%	5.8
Subject Code	8%	7%	13%	18%	20%	21%	13%	3.5
College	5%	6%	11%	17%	21%	24%	15%	3.2
Level	3%	4%	8%	14%	21%	32%	18%	2.8
University	3%	4%	9%	15%	21%	31%	17%	2.9

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

Course Attribute-Added Items

It was easy to access the online course materials.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable	Mean
n = 6	(3)	(1)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(1)	
Section	60%	20%	20%	0%	0%		4.4
Online	60%	31%	5%	3%	1%		4.5

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

The instructor regularly used course communication tools, such as announcements, group emails or web chats, to engage with students.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable	Mean
n = 6	(3)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(1)	
Section	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%		4.6
Online	58%	30%	7%	3%	2%		4.4

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

CRN: **26953**   INSTRUCTOR NAME: **Stanojevic, Marija**

School/College-Added Items

The instructor provided help when I had difficulties or questions.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable	Mean
n = 6	(4)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
Section	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%		4.7
Subject Code	53%	30%	10%	4%	3%		4.3
College	49%	31%	12%	5%	3%		4.2

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

The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to work and learning.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable	Mean
n = 6	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
Section	50%	33%	17%	0%	0%		4.3
Subject Code	52%	33%	9%	4%	3%		4.3
College	49%	31%	12%	5%	4%		4.2

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

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 = 6	(2)	(3)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
Section	33%	50%	17%	0%	0%		4.2
Subject Code	48%	30%	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 = 6	(4)	(1)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
Section	67%	17%	17%	0%	0%		4.5
Subject Code	47%	34%	11%	6%	3%		4.2

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

SFF Instructor Report

CRN: **26953**   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 = 6	(4)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
Section	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%		4.7
Subject Code	47%	33%	12%	4%	3%		4.2

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

I would enjoy taking another course from this instructor.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable	Mean
n = 6	(4)	(1)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)	
Section	67%	17%	17%	0%	0%		4.5
Subject Code	47%	25%	15%	5%	7%		4.0

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

SFF Instructor Report

CRN: **26953**   INSTRUCTOR NAME: **Stanojevic, Marija**

STUDENT #1 COMMENTS

1. What aspects of the course contributed most to your learning? (University-Added Item)   *TA's lessons and powerpoint presentations made the information we covered that week much clearer. Being able to access them later on her github was also very helpful.*

2. What aspects of the course would you change to improve your learning? (University-Added Item)   *I wish we got our grades back a little faster.*

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)   *N/A*

STUDENT #2 COMMENTS

1. What aspects of the course contributed most to your learning? (University-Added Item)   *Marija provided her own slides in recitation that were often times more effective than our lecture slides. She provided us with her own website that had many materials that greatly helped with our labs. Marija would also write code in front of us in recitation. It was very insightful to see an experienced programmer like her go about solving problems.*

2. What aspects of the course would you change to improve your learning? (University-Added Item)   *The server we used to test code was very bare-bones and difficult to work with. I wish we just used an IDE.*

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)   *Marija was very inclusive and respectful.*

STUDENT #3 COMMENTS

1. What aspects of the course contributed most to your learning? (University-Added Item)   *Labs*

STUDENT #4 COMMENTS

1. What aspects of the course contributed most to your learning? (University-Added Item)   *Self study*

2. What aspects of the course would you change to improve your learning? (University-Added Item)   *I would want an example for every new concept I learned.*