COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Spring 2024

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

LING 450 A, Joint with LING 550 A, LING 550 B
Introduction To Linguistic Phonetics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Yuan Chai
Instructor Evaluated: Yuan Chai-Lect Inst

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A
Responses: 21/58 (36% moderate)

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
4.6	**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: 4.5
(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 course as a whole was:	21	52%	24%	24%				4.5	4.7
The course content was:	21	48%	38%	14%				4.4	4.5
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	21	67%	19%	10%	5%			4.8	4.9
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	21	52%	33%	10%		5%		4.5	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:	21	14%	24%	19%	33%	10%			4.9
The intellectual challenge presented was:	21	24%	24%	29%	24%				5.4
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	21	24%	10%	24%	38%	5%			4.8
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	21	19%	19%	19%	38%	5%			4.9
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	21	14%	19%	19%	38%	10%			4.6

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: 6.2 Hours per credit: 1.2 (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%	21%	37%	16%	5%						5%

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

Class median: 5.3 Hours per credit: 1.1 (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
	26%	26%	26%	16%	5%						

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.8 (N=18)

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
44%	39%	11%	6%											

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
63%	21%	5%	5%	5%	

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Spring 2024

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
Course organization was:	21	57%	24%	10%	10%			4.6	3
Clarity of instructor's voice was:	21	57%	19%	19%	5%			4.6	18
Explanations by instructor were:	21	67%	10%	19%	5%			4.8	1
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	21	57%	29%	10%	5%			4.6	9
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	21	62%	24%	14%				4.7	6
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	21	57%	19%	19%	5%			4.6	11
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	21	76%	14%	10%				4.8	5
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	21	71%	24%	5%				4.8	8
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	21	57%	29%	14%				4.6	17
Answers to student questions were:	21	52%	29%	19%				4.5	15
Availability of extra help when needed was:	21	62%	29%	10%				4.7	10
Use of class time was:	21	48%	38%	14%				4.4	16
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	21	57%	29%	14%				4.6	14
Amount you learned in the course was:	21	62%	19%	19%				4.7	2
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	21	62%	19%	19%				4.7	7
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	21	62%	29%	10%				4.7	4
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	21	52%	24%	19%	5%			4.5	13
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	21	57%	29%	14%				4.6	12

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Linguistics
Term: Spring 2024

LING 450 A, Joint with LING 550 A, LING 550 B
Introduction To Linguistic Phonetics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A
Responses: 21/58 (36% moderate)

Taught by: Yuan Chai
Instructor Evaluated: Yuan Chai-Lect Inst

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Yes, phonetics is a very difficult part of linguistics and I've eventually gotten the hang of it

2. Yes, I especially like all the experiments

4. Yes. I've learned some very interesting topics.

5. I appreciated the opportunity to more deeply engage with core phonetic concepts, their methodological underpinnings, and how they can inform the study of language. I was able to get a grip on my own biases in how I approach pronunciation and gain a deeper awareness of how various languages operate on a phonetic level.

6. It was. I didn't know anything about phonetics beforehand.

7. Yes but not as much as it would have if I had been able to devote more mental energy to it

9. This course introduced some complex concepts but I wouldn't say it stretched my thinking.

10. This class was very stimulating, and I felt that there was a constant flow of new information and new challenges, but that it was always related back to previous learning and has a good flow. Phonology is an aspect of linguistics that I struggle with, and Yuan was the perfect Professor to assist in my development and understanding of more difficult concepts.

11. Yes, this is the most upper division class i've taken yet

12. It is, since I take this course, it stimulated my enthusiasm of learning another language.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The assignments and materials provided

2. Well made charts and graphs, good info organization. Excellent TA section

3. Hands-on practice with transcription, writing the project and reading phonetics papers.

4. It might be a bit funny, I think it's about memorizing IPA. PS, I didn't expect to spend my time on the treadmill memorizing IPA while running (as I seemed to almost make it) every day for the last half of the quarter. It is an unforgettable experience.

5. My personal favorite parts of the class were related to hands-on phonetic analysis through Praat, including the sessions we did on the topic and our two labs. I was also greatly appreciative of the opportunity we got to do blind analysis of a language through our final project. Lastly, I thought that the slides on methodology were some of the most helpful ones in the course (e. g., the one on segmental analysis), as they helped bridge the gap between theoretical models and the complexity that they seek to capture.

6. The professor's ability to explain the necessary information herself without necessitating that students fully rely on the textbook.

7. In class lectures and labs

8. The instructor was really interested in us learning the material and in pedagogy and it made the course really engaging and made learning easy. I also appreciate that it is also available online; being able to look up and reference things in the lecture recordings later is extremely helpful! I wish all my classes were recorded (and I wish that all my instructors were as eager to teach and help us learn as Yuan is)!

9. I found homework assignments to be the most helpful in cementing concepts, much more than lecture.

10. The amount and distribution of assignments was very good, and I didn't feel too much stress while working on assignments or when thinking about grades. I knew that there were always resources available, and assistance if I needed it.

11. lectures

12. Writting exercises.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. I think class organization could use some work, and explanations from the professor could be better and more concise

2. Sometimes there was so much info it was hard to pick out what is truly relevant to the class and what is more like fun facts

4. Hardly ever. If there is, it's my native language. Actually, I still find it very difficult to distinguish between voiced and voiceless sounds:(

5. I was generally not a fan of the IPA homework assignments (which is to say, the ones requiring us to describe the sounds represented by IPA symbols from a drop-down menu), as having to select so many options inevitably begets misclicks. I also feel like the content of the class was sometimes moving a bit slowly, but that isn't necessarily a bad thing; I just personally felt like some of the topics were already clear and not in need of further explanation.

7. Personal motivation and time management

9. I can't think of any.

12. Nope.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. N/A

2. A better Praat tutorial

4. The instructor is already doing very well.

5. I feel like the more interactive elements I outlined above could be expanded on a little bit, and that personal phonetic training (i. e., teaching students to distinguish and produce unfamiliar sounds) could have been given more space in the course.

6. More in class practice time for heady subjects like spectrograms.

7. N/a

9. I can't think of any.

10. I think having some more student language examples would be even better. It's so difficult to get, but when there was a member of the class who was able to provide current audio files or in-class readings of words and sentences, it was extremely interesting and assisted in my understanding of class material.

12. Nope.

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.