



Ohio University
Class Climate Survey System

Survey Evaluation Results

Dear MARTIN MOHLENKAMP,

In this report, you will find Introductory Data Science results for Spr 22-23.

The overall indicator is listed first. It consists of the following scales:

- Instructor Evaluation
- Course Evaluation

The overall indicator is followed by the individual average values of the scales mentioned above. In the second part of the analysis, the average values of all individual questions are listed.

Sincerely,
Kara Dunfee, dunfeek@ohio.edu
College of Arts & Sciences, Academics Unit




Overall indicators

Global Index

2. Instructor Evaluation


3. Course Evaluation



Survey Results

Legend


Question text




n=No. of responses
 av.=Mean
 md=Median
 dev.=Std. Dev.
 ab.=Abstention

2. Instructor Evaluation


2.1) Instructor created an environment that was conducive to learning.




2.2) Instructor gave clear explanations.




2.3) Instructor used helpful examples and illustrations.




2.4) Instructor consistently followed grading criteria.




2.5) Instructor provided useful feedback.



2.6) Instructor provided timely feedback.




2.7) Instructor made herself or himself available for assistance outside of class.




3. Course Evaluation


3.1) Outside class activities (readings, assignments, homework, problem sets, etc.) helped me to understand the subject.




3.2) In-class activities (lecture, discussion, handouts, group-work, etc.) contributed to my understanding of the subject.




3.3) This course challenged me intellectually.



3.4) Course grading criteria were communicated clearly.




3.5) Course objectives were met.




4. Additional Questions


4.1) Instructor encouraged participation.




4.2) Instructor was respectful to students.




4.3) Examinations were a good test of my knowledge.



4.4) Overall, considering its content, design and structure, this course was excellent.



4.5) Instructor was an effective teacher.



Profile

Subunit: **A&S-MATH**
 Name of the instructor: **MARTIN MOHLENKAMP**
 Name of the course: **Introductory Data Science (MATH2530100_2235_Regular)**
 (Name of the survey)

Values used in the profile line: Mean

2. Instructor Evaluation

Item	Scale	Mean	SD	n	av.	md	dev.
2.1) Instructor created an environment that was conducive to learning.	STRONGLY DISAGREE to STRONGLY AGREE	4.00	1.41	2	4.00	4.00	1.41
2.2) Instructor gave clear explanations.	STRONGLY DISAGREE to STRONGLY AGREE	4.50	0.71	2	4.50	4.50	0.71
2.3) Instructor used helpful examples and illustrations.	STRONGLY DISAGREE to STRONGLY AGREE	4.50	0.71	2	4.50	4.50	0.71
2.4) Instructor consistently followed grading criteria.	STRONGLY DISAGREE to STRONGLY AGREE	4.50	0.71	2	4.50	4.50	0.71
2.5) Instructor provided useful feedback.	STRONGLY DISAGREE to STRONGLY AGREE	5.00	0.00	2	5.00	5.00	0.00
2.6) Instructor provided timely feedback.	STRONGLY DISAGREE to STRONGLY AGREE	5.00	0.00	2	5.00	5.00	0.00
2.7) Instructor made herself or himself available for assistance outside of class.	STRONGLY DISAGREE to STRONGLY AGREE	4.00	1.41	2	4.00	4.00	1.41

3. Course Evaluation

Item	Scale	Mean	SD	n	av.	md	dev.
3.1) Outside class activities (readings, assignments, homework, problem sets, etc.) helped me to understand the subject.	STRONGLY DISAGREE to STRONGLY AGREE	3.50	2.12	2	3.50	3.50	2.12
3.2) In-class activities (lecture, discussion, handouts, group-work, etc.) contributed to my understanding of the subject.	STRONGLY DISAGREE to STRONGLY AGREE	4.50	0.71	2	4.50	4.50	0.71
3.3) This course challenged me intellectually.	STRONGLY DISAGREE to STRONGLY AGREE	4.50	0.71	2	4.50	4.50	0.71
3.4) Course grading criteria were communicated clearly.	STRONGLY DISAGREE to STRONGLY AGREE	5.00	0.00	2	5.00	5.00	0.00
3.5) Course objectives were met.	STRONGLY DISAGREE to STRONGLY AGREE	5.00	0.00	2	5.00	5.00	0.00

4. Additional Questions

Item	Scale	Mean	SD	n	av.	md	dev.
4.1) Instructor encouraged participation.	STRONGLY DISAGREE to STRONGLY AGREE	5.00	0.00	2	5.00	5.00	0.00
4.2) Instructor was respectful to students.	STRONGLY DISAGREE to STRONGLY AGREE	5.00	0.00	2	5.00	5.00	0.00
4.3) Examinations were a good test of my knowledge.	STRONGLY DISAGREE to STRONGLY AGREE	4.50	0.71	2	4.50	4.50	0.71
4.4) Overall, considering its content, design and structure, this course was excellent.	STRONGLY DISAGREE to STRONGLY AGREE	4.00	1.41	2	4.00	4.00	1.41
4.5) Instructor was an effective teacher.	STRONGLY DISAGREE to STRONGLY AGREE	4.00	1.41	2	4.00	4.00	1.41

Comments Report

5. Open Response

^{5.1)} What do you consider to be the greatest **STRENGTH** of the **INSTRUCTOR**?

- Enthusiastic about the material and class

5.2) What do you consider to be the greatest **WEAKNESS** of the **INSTRUCTOR**? Suggestions for improvement?

- Did not get the chance to have a real lecture, it was like a discussion. Which can be helpful but there were times an actual lecture would have been beneficial.

5.3) What do you consider to be the greatest **STRENGTH** of the **COURSE**? (texts, content, etc.)?

- Lots of hands on material that aided the lessons being taught.

5.4) What do you consider to be the greatest **WEAKNESS** of the **COURSE**? Suggestions for improvement?

- Textbook was not super helpful in lesson learning. Would like to see reading that talked about the math or how the computer is working.