2019W1 UBC Individual Instructor Report for EOSC 111 L1C (TA) - Laboratory Exploration of Planet Earth (Yulia Egorova)

Project Title: **2019W1 UBC Instructor Evaluations**

Course Audience: **27**
Responses Received: **20**
Response Ratio: **74.07%**

Report Comments

Recommended Minimum Response Rates

Class Size	Recommended Minimum Response Rates based on 80% confidence & ± 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, January 22, 2020**

Powered by
blue

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.	27	20	0	0	0	6	14	0	4.79	0.21	4.70	0.47
The instructor communicated the subject matter effectively.	27	20	0	0	0	5	15	0	4.83	0.19	4.75	0.44
The instructor helped inspire interest in learning the subject matter.	27	20	0	0	2	6	12	0	4.67	0.33	4.50	0.69
Overall, evaluation of student learning (through exams, essays, presentations, etc.) was fair.	27	20	0	0	0	5	13	2	4.81	0.20	4.72	0.46
The instructor showed concern for student learning.	27	20	0	0	2	7	11	0	4.59	0.34	4.45	0.69
Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.	27	20	0	0	0	4	16	0	4.88	0.16	4.80	0.41

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.	90.00%
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
My academic background provided sufficient preparation for this course.	27	20	0	4	1	11	4	0	3.95	0.51	3.75	1.02
This course promoted conceptual understanding.	27	20	0	0	2	11	7	0	4.23	0.32	4.25	0.64
The learning activities helped me to succeed in this course.	27	20	0	0	0	14	6	0	4.21	0.21	4.30	0.47
The workload for this course was appropriate.	27	20	0	0	2	9	9	0	4.39	0.34	4.35	0.67
I received sufficient feedback on my progress during this course.	27	20	0	1	1	10	8	0	4.30	0.38	4.25	0.79

Question	%Favourable
My academic background provided sufficient preparation for this course.	75.00%
This course promoted conceptual understanding.	90.00%
The learning activities helped me to succeed in this course.	100.00%
The workload for this course was appropriate.	90.00%
I received sufficient feedback on my progress during this course.	90.00%

Open ended feedback

Enter comments below

Comments
One of the best TAs.
I think Yulia was a really good instructor. She made the course really interesting. EOSC 111 was a 3 hour lab after I had a long day of classes and I was still always pretty excited to go to class even though Im only taking this as an elective to graduate. She has her own effective style of teaching that I think others should adopt. At first I thought her accent would make it hard for me to follow her class but it was no problem at all.
One of the best TA I had so far!
Yulia was very knowledgeable about all activities we did and all subject matter. She was very helpful when we had questions.
Super nice and helpful!
excellent teacher, very concern about students' study, care about the student who seldomly speaks in a group. And a very cute person:) advice: be more patient...
n/a
Yulia was helpful with lab activities and provided quality suggestions for improvement in the lab. She also allowed us an opportunity to show our improvement throughout the course for a better grade.
Yulia was always helpful with answering any questions the groups had
Yulia was very knowledgeable and prepared on every subject we covered in the course. She provided explanations when needed and made the concepts interesting. Overall she did a fantastic job.
she was a helpful and effective TA
Yulia was a great TA over the course! She explained everything well in detail and was very helpful in the lab sections!
Did everything well, no suggestions come to mind.
N/A
She was very helpful when explaining parts of the lab which we didn't understand, but didn't just give us the answer straight away most times, instead she gave hints etc. to help us work our way to the answer
She is very patient and always inspire us when we are questioning. She's great.
Yulia is very helpful and knowledgeable. She cares about student learning and about answering all of our questions and concerns. She makes it clear what we have to do and explains things very well. She is also quite patient with the class.
She asked leading questions to help us understand the course material better. She was always prepared and enthusiactic about the couse topics too.
Yulia was a great instructor. Pre–readings were organized well and in a manner that helped to achieve understanding. She was a considerate instructor and had made an effort to answer all questions to help her students succeed and get a better understanding of the material.

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

University of British Columbia Course Evaluation

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.