



Akram Al-Rawi

Course Evaluation Results

Akram Al-Rawi,

Attached are the results of the course evaluation for Ethical Hacking.

The report includes:

- * Overall summary of each section:

- Course Structure
- Class Environment
- Instructor Responsiveness
- Effectiveness
- Overall

- * Breakout of each section by item

- * Open-ended comments (if no comments received, this section will be blank)

If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Gina Brewer
Market and Survey Research Analyst
Office of Institutional Research
rbrewer6@jccc.edu



Akram Al-Rawi

Ethical Hacking (201808_82537_IT_239_376)

No. of responses = 13

No. of enrolled = 14

% returned = 92.9


Overall indicators

1. Course Structure



av.=4.7
dev.=0.5

2. Class Environment



av.=4.6
dev.=0.8

3. Instructor Responsiveness




av.=4.8
dev.=0.4

4. Effectiveness



av.=4.3
dev.=0.9

5. Overall



av.=4.3
dev.=1.1

Survey Results

Legend


Question text



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

1. Course Structure


1.1) Material is presented in a clear, logical manner.



Strongly Agree

n=13
av.=4.6
dev.=0.5


1.2) The instructor provided a class syllabus.



Strongly Agree

n=13
av.=4.7
dev.=0.5


1.3) The instructor followed the guidelines in the syllabus.



Strongly Agree

n=13
av.=4.7
dev.=0.5


1.4) The instructor clearly communicates how grades are determined.




Strongly Agree

n=13
av.=4.8
dev.=0.4


2. Class Environment




3. Instructor Responsiveness



4. Effectiveness



5. Overall



Profile

Subunit: CSIT: IT
 Name of the instructor: Akram Al-Rawi
 Name of the course: Ethical Hacking (201808_82537_IT_239_376)
 (Name of the survey)

Values used in the profile line: Mean

1. Course Structure

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|----------------|------|---------|
| 1.1) Material is presented in a clear, logical manner. | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree | n=13 | av.=4.6 |
| 1.2) The instructor provided a class syllabus. | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree | n=13 | av.=4.7 |
| 1.3) The instructor followed the guidelines in the syllabus. | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree | n=13 | av.=4.7 |
| 1.4) The instructor clearly communicates how grades are determined. | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree | n=13 | av.=4.8 |

2. Class Environment

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|----------------|------|---------|
| 2.1) The instructor creates an atmosphere conducive to learning. | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree | n=13 | av.=4.5 |
| 2.2) The instructor encourages participation and questions. | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree | n=13 | av.=4.5 |
| 2.3) The instructor treats students with respect. | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree | n=13 | av.=4.8 |

3. Instructor Responsiveness

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|----------------|------|---------|
| 3.1) The instructor grades assignments in a timely manner. | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree | n=13 | av.=4.8 |
| 3.2) The instructor clearly communicates how I am doing in the course. | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree | n=13 | av.=4.8 |
| 3.3) The instructor answers e-mail within a reasonable time (within 24 hours during the work week, for example). | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree | n=13 | av.=4.8 |

4. Effectiveness

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|----------------|------|---------|
| 4.1) Feedback from the instructor on my work helps me learn. | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree | n=13 | av.=4.6 |
| 4.2) The instructor's method of teaching is effective. | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree | n=13 | av.=4.1 |

5. Overall

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|--|--|--|--|--|-----------|------|---------|
| 5.1) Overall evaluation of the instruction for this course. | Poor | | | | | | Excellent | n=13 | av.=4.3 |
|---|------|--|--|--|--|--|-----------|------|---------|

Comments Report

1. Course Structure

1.5) Additional comments for items 1.1 - 1.4

No data available.

2. Class Environment

2.4) Additional comments for items 2.1 - 2.3.

- Providing the opportunity for more hands on learning in class would be more beneficial rather than going through the labs and quizzes

3. Instructor Responsiveness

3.4) Additional comments for items 3.1 - 3.3.

- Very responsive with grading and emails

4. Effectiveness

4.3) Additional comments for items 4.1 - 4.2.

- A more open environment for penetration testing would help instead of using netlab. Perhaps it would be possible to use an isolated VMware environment emulating the netlab material but with more current methodologies; throw on seperate VLAN, completely isolate it, make it so no traffic can leave the "lab" areas.
- Walking through the labs were not the most effective way to teach the subject, activities that encouraged critical thinking that the labs did not give us would have been more beneficial to learn the material

5. Overall

5.2) Additional comments concerning this course.

- Class consists of going through labs that we already do for homework and are laid out already enough. Material in book is complex but never brought up in class.
- I really liked this class and learned a lot. Doctor Al-Rawi did a great job explaining the assignments and the objectives. I think this is the first class that I have actually read the entire text book, and retained a lot of the information. I will recommend this class to other students interested in an IT career.
- The instructor is cool and i did learn how hackers think i guess. My only complaint is that the material is out dated. Its not useful if people arent using the same type of systems in the industry today. In class We are using windows xp pro and windows 7? Like really ? Nobody uses that software anymore because its obsolete, not even hackers. And on top of that we are also using backtrack 5. Backtrack 5!!!! that company no longer exists!!!!. The fact of the matter is we are learning with tools that are no longer prevalent or relevant in the work industry. My brother has a masters and he is a security analyst and he can back up the fact that nobody uses this crap anymore. Suggestion Cali linux would be nice wtf ?!. I feel like i got ripped off for jccc selling me an outdated education.