

Project Title: 2018W2 UBC Student Evaluation of Teaching

Course Audience: 22
Responses Received: 20
Response Ratio: 90.91%Assessee Audience: 22
Responses Received: 20
Response Ratio: 90.91%

Report Comments**Recommended Minimum Response Rates**

Class Size	Recommended Minimum Response Rates based on 80% confidence & $\pm 10\%$ margin
< 10	75%
11 - 19	65%
20 - 34	55%
35 - 49	40%
50 - 74	35%
75 - 99	25%
100 - 149	20%
150 - 299	15%
300 - 499	10%
> 500	5%

Creation Date: **Wednesday, May 29, 2019**

University Module Questions

University Module Questions

Question	N	n	SD	D	N	A	SA	N/A	IM	DI	Mean	STDEV
The instructor made it clear what students were expected to learn.	22	20	0	0	0	6	14	0	4.79	0.21	4.70	0.47
The instructor communicated the subject matter effectively.	22	20	0	0	0	9	11	0	4.59	0.25	4.55	0.51
The instructor helped inspire interest in learning the subject matter.	22	19	0	0	1	12	6	0	4.21	0.27	4.26	0.56
Overall, evaluation of student learning (through exams, essays, presentations, etc.) was fair.	22	20	0	0	0	5	13	2	4.81	0.20	4.72	0.46
The instructor showed concern for student learning.	22	20	0	0	2	4	14	0	4.79	0.30	4.60	0.68
Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.	22	20	0	0	0	10	10	0	4.50	0.25	4.50	0.51

Question	%Favourable
The instructor made it clear what students were expected to learn.	100.00%
The instructor communicated the subject matter effectively.	100.00%
The instructor helped inspire interest in learning the subject matter.	94.74%
Overall, evaluation of student learning (through exams, essays, presentations, etc.) was fair.	100.00%
The instructor showed concern for student learning.	90.00%
Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.	100.00%

Faculty Questions

Course Questions

Question	N	n	SD	D	N	A	SA	N/A	IM	DI	Mean	STDEV
The course was well organized.	22	19	0	0	1	8	10	0	4.55	0.30	4.47	0.61

Question	%Favourable
The course was well organized.	94.74%

Instructor Questions

Question	N	n	SD	D	N	A	SA	N/A	IM	DI	Mean	STDEV
The learning experiences were useful.	22	20	0	0	0	7	13	0	4.73	0.23	4.65	0.49
The instructor provided useful feedback.	22	20	0	0	1	6	13	0	4.73	0.28	4.60	0.60
The instructor was available for help.	22	20	0	0	1	7	12	0	4.67	0.29	4.55	0.60
The instructor created an environment that supported learning.	22	20	0	0	0	11	9	0	4.41	0.25	4.45	0.51
Course materials supported achievement of the course objectives.	22	20	0	0	0	7	13	0	4.73	0.23	4.65	0.49
Student responsibilities were made clear.	22	19	0	0	0	9	10	0	4.55	0.25	4.53	0.51
Students were treated with respect.	22	19	0	0	0	6	13	0	4.77	0.22	4.68	0.48

Question	%Favourable
The learning experiences were useful.	100.00%
The instructor provided useful feedback.	95.00%
The instructor was available for help.	95.00%
The instructor created an environment that supported learning.	100.00%
Course materials supported achievement of the course objectives.	100.00%
Student responsibilities were made clear.	100.00%
Students were treated with respect.	100.00%

What device did you use to complete this survey?

What device did you use to complete this survey?		
Options	Count	Percentage
Mobile	3	15.00%
Tablet	1	5.00%
Laptop	16	80.00%

Open ended feedback

Please provide any comments about your experience in this course and/or with the instructor.

Comments
Great experience overall. I really enjoyed learning how to maneuver the UBC library database and Ref Works. It will definitely help me in my courses moving forward. Sunah is a very strong, fair and helpful instructor. It is my second course with her and I am pleased with her communication skills.
My greatest challenge was the software that was used to deliver and manage the course work. As a new student to the MET program and having been out of the University setting for 15 years, I was somewhat surprised that the software in use was not more effective or flexible by now.
This course was well paced and the work load was well timed. The instructor was so helpful and responsive. She is very knowledgeable, and able to communicate effectively.
Dr. Cho is an amazing professor. She is always willing to help students and providing lots of feedback. Wish she could teach more courses.
The timely and detailed feedback provided throughout this course was very useful. The assignments were well laid out and the expectations were clearly set. I feel that having more interactive group discussions, instead of optional discussions would have created deeper understanding and developed relationships amongst students. I found that this course felt a little bit isolating with only a few students participating in the Assignment discussions. Sunah was a great instructor and ran this course well.
This is my second MET course with Sunah and I am sincerely hoping it is not my last! She is very kind and helpful when needed. I do wish she would interact more on the discussion board but I do trust that she reads every post and interacts when she feels it is necessary. Overall – I have had a positive experience in ETEC 500 and strongly agree that the course structure and instruction was of a high standard.
Although this course was well organized and had a great textbook to go along with it– the little amount of student to student interaction was disappointing. I wish there was more expectation to engage with classmates on the course material.
Professor Cho is the best teacher who cares about students' learning itself and helps in every way for students to keep up the good work. Thank you so much! I really appreciate it!!
I appreciate the weekly email the instructor sent out to the class and it does make me feel the distance course isn't so distant anymore. The workload for each week is at the right amount too.
Everything was great. I only wish the instructor would've given her views more often

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 Evaluations of Teaching (SEoT) 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 SEoT 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 classes have identical mean (3.8). However, the instructor in class 2 received 77% favourable (4-5) ratings, compared to 53% for the instructor in class 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 UMI	Class 1	Class 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
Mean	3.8	3.8
Median	4.0	4.0

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 students in the section gave the same rating to the instructor. An index value of 1.0 is obtained when the class splits evenly between the two extreme values (Strongly Disagree & Strongly Agree), a very rare occurrence. In SEoT data at UBC, the index rarely exceeds 0.85, and mostly for evaluations not meeting the minimum recommended response rate.