## Course Evaluation Institute 2023 - Report Showcase

The UBC Student Experience of Instruction (SEI) Instructor Report includes the following components:

- Response rate
- Information on Recommended Minimum Response Rates
- Survey results using the following metrics: interpolated median, percent favourable, and dispersion index
- Open-ended comments
- Explanatory note on reported metrics

This sample report includes university-wide questions, as well as faculty-level questions.

Note: Open-ended questions results are excluded in the sample report.
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## Course Evaluation Institute

Course Audience: 211
Responses Received: 44
Response Ratio: 21\%

## Report Comments

## Recommended Minimum Response Rates

| Class Size | Recommended Minimum Response Rates <br> based on 80\% confidence \& $\pm 10 \%$ margin |
| :---: | :---: |
| $<10$ | $75 \%$ |
| $11-19$ | $65 \%$ |
| $20-34$ | $55 \%$ |
| $35-49$ | $30 \%$ |
| $50-74$ | $25 \%$ |
| $75-99$ | $20 \%$ |
| $100-149$ | $15 \%$ |
| $150-299$ | $10 \%$ |
| $300-499$ | $5 \%$ |
| $>500$ |  |

## University Module Questions

## University Module Questions

| Question | N | n SD |  | D | N | A | SA | N/A | IM | DI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Throughout the term, the instructor explained course requirements so it was clear to me what I was expected to learn. | 211 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 33 | 0 | 4.8 | 0.2 |
| The instructor conducted this course in such a way that I was motivated to learn. | 211 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 34 | 0 | 4.9 | 0.2 |
| The instructor presented the course material in a way that I could understand. | 211 | 44 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 17 | 23 | 0 | 4.5 | 0.4 |
| Considering the type of class (e.g., large lecture, seminar, studio), the instructor provided useful feedback that helped me understand how my learning progressed during this course. | 211 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 24 | 0 | 4.6 | 0.3 |
| The instructor showed genuine interest in supporting my learning throughout this course. | 211 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 35 | 0 | 4.9 | 0.2 |
| Overall, I learned a great deal from this instructor. | 211 | 44 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 32 | 0 | 4.8 | 0.3 |


| Question | \%Favourable |
| :---: | :---: |
| Throughout the term, the instructor explained course requirements so it was clear to me what I was expected to learn. | 98\% |
| The instructor conducted this course in such a way that I was motivated to learn. | 98\% |
| The instructor presented the course material in a way that I could understand. | 91\% |
| Considering the type of class (e.g., large lecture, seminar, studio), the instructor provided useful feedback that helped me understand how my learning progressed during this course. | 89\% |
| The instructor showed genuine interest in supporting my learning throughout this course. | 100\% |
| Overall, I learned a great deal from this instructor. | 95\% |
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## Faculty Questions

## Course Questions

| Question | N | n | SD | D | N | A | SA | N/A | IM | DI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| My academic background provided sufficient preparation for this course. | 211 | 44 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 23 | 13 | 0 | 4.1 | 0.4 |
| In this class, I applied facts, theories, or methods to new problems or situations. | 211 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 17 | 22 | 0 | 4.5 | 0.4 |

## Question

My academic background provided sufficient preparation for this course. 82\%
In this class, I applied facts, theories, or methods to new problems or situations. 89\%

## Instructor Questions

| Question | $\mathrm{N} \quad \mathrm{n}$ SD D N A SA N/A 1 M DI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The instructor treated students with respect. | 211 | 44 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 39 | 0 | 4.9 | 0.2 |
| The ways the instructor implemented the course activities (e.g., in-class activities, labs, tutorials, field trips, online components, assignments) helped me achieve the learning objectives. | 211 | 43 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 24 | 3 | 4.7 | 0.4 |
| The instructor was intentional about cultivating a welcoming and inclusive environment that supports all students and encourages all students to participate. | 211 | 44 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 34 | 1 | 4.9 | 0.2 |


| Question |
| :--- |
| The instructor treated students with respect. |
| The ways the instructor implemented the course activities (e.g., in-class activities, labs, tutorials, field trips, online components, assignments) helped me achieve <br> the learning objectives. |
| The instructor was intentional about cultivating a welcoming and inclusive environment that supports all students and encourages all students to participate. |

## Explanatory Note

## Percent Favourable Rating

This is the percentage of respondents who rated the instructor a 4 or 5 (Agree or Strongly Agree).

## Interpolated Median

The data collected for Student Experience of Instruction (SEI) are ordinal in nature, with a natural order (from 1 to 5 ). While the mean may be used as a measure of central tendency for such data, it is not an appropriate or accurate representation of SEI data (cf. Stark \& Freishtat, 2014). The usual measure of central tendency for ordinal data is the median. As a result, we have been reporting the mean and the median for the last several years. After considerable thought and data modeling, we now believe that the interpolated median is the best representation of the data, since it takes the frequency distribution into account.

Consider the following example from 2015W, the two course sections have identical mean (3.8). However, the instructor in section 2 received $77 \%$ favourable (4-5) ratings, compared to $53 \%$ for the instructor in section 1. The Interpolated median values of ( 3.7 and 4.2), much better reflects the distribution of the scores above and below their respective median. Furthermore, the interpolated median is better correlated with percent favourable rating; such that an interpolated median of 3.5 on a Likert scale of 1 to 5 , corresponds to $50 \%$ favourable rating.

Frequency Distribution

| Response for University Module Item | Section 1 | Section 2 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 5 = Strongly agree | 5 | 5 |
| 4 = Agree | 3 | 5 |
| 3 = Neither agree nor disagree | 6 | 0 |
| 2 = Disagree | 1 | 2 |
| 1 = Strongly disagree | 0 | 1 |
|  | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| Mean | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Median |  |  |
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| Interpolated Median | 3.7 | 4.2 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Percent favourable rating | $53 \%$ | $77 \%$ |

## Dispersion Index

The dispersion index is a measure of variability suitable for ordinal data (Rampichini, Grilli \& Petrucci 2004). This dispersion index has values between zero and 1 . A zero dispersion index indicates that all respondents in the section rated their experience of instruction the same. An index value of 1.0 is obtained when the respondents are split evenly between the two extreme values (Strongly Disagree \& Strongly Agree), a very rare occurrence. In SEI data at UBC, the index rarely exceeds 0.85 , and mostly for evaluations not meeting the minimum recommended response rate.

