2019 S UBCO Individual TA Reports for COSC 221 S01 (TA) Introduction to Discrete Structures (Parsa Rajabi)

Report Comments

## Recommended Minimum Response Rates

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

## Legend

N: Expected
n : Responded
Frequency Distribution
SD: Strongly Disagree
D: Disagree
N: Neutral
A: Agree
SA: Strongly Agree
N/A: Not applicable

## Statistics

IM: Interpolated Median

## Detailed Results

## TA Questions



| Question | N | n | SD | D | N | A | SA | N/A | IM | DI | Mean | STDEV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The TA treats students with respect. | 19 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4.50 | 0.25 | 4.50 | 0.71 |
| The TA communicates clearly and effectively. | 19 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 0.50 | 4.00 | 1.41 |
| The TA facilitates discussion of the course material and course concepts. | 19 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 0.50 | 4.00 | 1.41 |
| The TA helps me better understand course content. | 19 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | 0.00 | 4.00 | 0.00 |
| The TA responds effectively to questions. | 19 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | 0.00 | 4.00 | 0.00 |
| The TA is well prepared. | 19 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 0.50 | 3.00 | 1.41 |
| The TA has appropriate knowledge of the subject. | 19 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | 0.00 | 4.00 | 0.00 |
| The TA is available to discuss matters outside of class time. | 19 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 0.00 | 4.00 | N/A |
| The TA provides helpful feedback on student work. | 19 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | 0.00 | 4.00 | 0.00 |
| The TA marks assignments fairly. | 19 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | 0.00 | 4.00 | 0.00 |
| The TA returns assignments in a timely manner. | 19 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 0.50 | 3.00 | 1.41 |
| Overall, the TA is effective in helping students learn. | 19 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.50 | 0.25 | 3.50 | 0.71 |


| Question | \%Favourable |
| :--- | ---: |
| The TA treats students with respect. | $100.00 \%$ |
| The TA communicates clearly and effectively. | $50.00 \%$ |
| The TA facilitates discussion of the course material and course concepts. | $50.00 \%$ |
| The TA helps me better understand course content. | $100.00 \%$ |
| The TA responds effectively to questions. | $100.00 \%$ |
| The TA is well prepared. | $50.00 \%$ |
| The TA has appropriate knowledge of the subject. | $100.00 \%$ |
| The TA is available to discuss matters outside of class time. | $100.00 \%$ |
| The TA provides helpful feedback on student work. | $100.00 \%$ |
| The TA marks assignments fairly. | $100.00 \%$ |
| The TA returns assignments in a timely manner. | $50.00 \%$ |
| Overall, the TA is effective in helping students learn. | $50.00 \%$ |

## Open ended feedback

## What has the Teaching Assistant done well?

## Comments

They were respectful and open to questions.

## How could the Teaching Assistant improve?

## Comments

Reviewing and explaining the contents of previous seminars.

## 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 |
|  | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| Mean | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Median | 3.7 | 4.2 |
| Interpolated Median | $53 \%$ | $77 \%$ |
| Percent favourable rating |  |  |

## 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.

