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## What we expect to achieve

> At the end of this session, You will:
> have a better understanding of the reported metrics in instructors reports.
> explain how two of the measures (IM \& \% Fav) work in tandem and how the third metric (Dispersion) could be used to explain differences in ratings.
$>$ Use simple graphics (scatter plot) to explain these concepts.

## Changes to Instructor Reports

> Transition to the new metrics in instructor reports started in 2018 and was completed in 2019/2020.
> Key reported statistics include:
> Response Rate
$>$ Interpolated Median
> Percent Favourable
> Dispersion Index
> In 2021, changes were made to the 6 University Module Items (UMI) and the modified/new questions were implemented in 2021 Winter term 1.

## About SEI data

> SEI data is categorical, but ordinal in nature.
> Ordinal means that it has a sense of order e.g. Strongly Agree is higher (better) than Agree, higher than neutral...etc.
> UBC collects SEI data using a balanced (odd-numbered) Likert scale
> UMI questions use a 5 -point Likert scale
(Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree)
> Some Faculty questions use a 7 -point Likert scale
(Entirely Disagree, Mostly Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Somewhat Agree, Mostly Agree, Entirely Agree)


## Instructor Report

## Response Rate

THE UNIVERSITY
OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

## 2022S UBC Individual Instructor Reports (TEST) for BIOL 111101 (TEST) - Introduction to Modern Biology (Bluetest Two) <br> Project Titte: 2022S UBC Instructor SEl Surveys (TEST)

Course Audience: 2
Responses Received: 2
Response Ratio: 100\%

## Report Comments

Recommended Minimum Response Rates

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

## UMI Questions \& Reported Stats

## University Module Questions

## University Module Questions

| Question | N $n$ SD D N A SA NA M Dl |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Throughout the term, the instructor explained course requirements so it was clear to me what I was expected to learn. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5.0 | 0.0 |
| The instructor conducted this course in such a way that I was motivated to learn. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.0 | 0.5 |
| The instructor presented the course material in a way that I could understand. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4.5 | 0.3 |
| 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. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.5 | 0.3 |
| The instructor showed genuine interest in supporting my learning throughout this course. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5.0 | 0.0 |
| Overall, I learned a great deal from this instructor. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.0 | 0.5 |


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

## Percent Favourable

> Favourable responses are those higher than "Neutral" e.g. "Agree" and "Strongly Agree" on a 5-point Likert-type scale
> Percent favourable is the proportion of responses higher than neutral, expressed as a percentage of total received responses.
> It is simple, intuitive, informative and easy to calculate.


## Dispersion Index

$>$ A measure of data spread that ranges from 0 to 1 .
$>$ A value of zero indicates that all respondent students rated their experience of instruction the same.
$>$ A value of 1 is obtained when respondents split evenly between the two extreme values (Strongly Disagree \& Strongly Agree on a 5 -point scale).
> In UBC SEI data, Dispersion Index rarely exceeds 0.8, and such high dispersion is often associated with surveys that did not meet the minimum recommended response rate.

## Dispersion Index: Examples

## Low Dispersion

| Response | Count | proportion (P) | cum Proportion (F) | $1.0-F$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Disagree | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Neutral | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Agree | 40 | 0.666666667 | 0.666666667 | 0.333333333 | 0.22222222 |
| Strongly Agree | 20 | 0.333333333 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Responses | 60 |  |  | Dispersion Index | 0.22 |

## High Dispersion

| Response | Count | proportion (P) | cum Proportion (F) | $1.0-F$ | $F^{*}(1.0-F)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strongly Disagree | 22 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.78 | 0.1716 |
| Disagree | 27 | 0.27 | 0.49 | 0.51 | 0.2499 |
| Neutral | 16 | 0.16 | 0.65 | 0.35 | 0.2275 |
| Agree | 18 | 0.18 | 0.83 | 0.17 | 0.1411 |
| Strongly Agree | 17 | 0.17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Responses | 100 |  |  | Dispersion Index | 0.79 |

Maximum Dispersion

| Response | Count | proportion (P) | cum Proportion (F) | $1.0-F$ | $F^{*}(1.0-F)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strongly Disagree | 30 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| Disagree | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| Neutral | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| Agree | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| Strongly Agree | 30 | 0.5 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Responses | 60 |  |  | Dispersion Index | 1.0 |
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## Medians and Distribution



## Median $=3$



Median $=4$

## Of the 15 responses:

Four responses are less than the median
Two responses are greater than the median
Nine responses are equal to the median

## Interpolated Median

$$
I M=M+\left(n_{+}-n_{-}\right) / 2 n
$$

The interpolated median is an "Adjusted median" which considers:
Number of responses < Median Number of responses > Median Number of responses $=$ Median.

Where:

- $\mathrm{IM}=$ the Interpolated Median
- $\mathrm{M}=$ the Median
- $\mathrm{n}=$ number of data points equal to the median
- $\mathrm{n}_{+}=$number of data points greater than the median
- $\mathrm{n}_{-}=$number of data points less than the median

If $n$ is zero: $\quad I M=M$
A
B



## Interpolated Median

(a)

(b)


| Score | Frequency |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3 |
| 2 | 1 |
| 3 | 0 |
| 4 | 9 |
| 5 | 2 |
| 3.4 | \%Fav $73 \%$ |
| I Median 3.9 |  |

## Interpolated Median

Given that students tend to rate their experience of instruction favourably more often than not, the Interpolated Median is preferred to the mean because:
> Interpolated Median better reflects the distribution of students' responses than does the Mean or the Median.
> In particular, the Interpolated Median is closely associated with percent favourable ratings.

2020W1 UMI 5


## The Relationship for a 7-point Scale



## Academic Unit (Red

 Dot)IM=4.2 \% Fav.=76\% $\mathrm{DI}=0.52$

## Case A

IM=3.9 \% Fav.=80\% DI=0.35

## Case B

IM=4.6 \% Fav.=73\% $\mathrm{DI}=0.57$

## Case C

IM=4.3 \% Fav. =100\% DI=0.24

## Case D



IM=4.5 \% Fav.=100\% DI $=0.25$

## Activity

## Room 1

UMI_5: The instructor showed genuine interest in supporting my learning throughout this course.

The figure on the left is a graphical depiction of about 2,000 SEI reports from 2020W1, plotting IM against PF. The figure on the right is a closer look at the ratings in the upper right quadrant. The \% of evaluations in each sub-quadrant is given along with the mean DI (in red).
Q1: What is the percentage of evaluations in which $50 \%$ or more student respondents did not rate their experience favourably?
Q2: Fill in the blank: In about four-fifths of all evaluations in 2020W1, $\qquad$ \% or more student respondents 'agree' or 'strongly agree' that the instructor showed concern for student learning


## Room 2

UMI_5: The instructor showed genuine interest in supporting my learning throughout this course.

| IM | \%Fav | DI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.8 | $95 \%$ | 0.27 |
| 4.8 | $67 \%$ | 0.44 |
| 4.2 | $86 \%$ | 0.37 |
| 4.2 | $66 \%$ | 0.51 |
| 3.9 | $90 \%$ | 0.09 |

Q1: How would you describe the SEI ratings for the five instructors considering:

a) The interpolated Median (IM) only
b) \% Favorable only
c) Both IM and \% Favourable

Q2: What effect does Dispersion Index (DI) seem to have?

## Room 3

UMI_5: Instructor showed genuine interest in supporting my learning throughout this course.

| $\frac{\mathrm{IM}}{}$ | $\underline{\mathrm{PF}}$ | $\underline{\text { DI }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.9 | $12 \%$ | 0.59 |
| 1.9 | $21 \%$ | 0.66 |
| 2.1 | $0 \%$ | 0.43 |
| 2.1 | $24 \%$ | 0.51 |
| 3.0 | $44 \%$ | 0.65 |
| 3.0 | $35 \%$ | 0.56 |
| 3.2 | $37 \%$ | 0.50 |
| 3.2 | $41 \%$ | 0.62 |
| 3.5 | $50 \%$ | 0.45 |
| 3.5 | $50 \%$ | 0.71 |



Consider these stats from 10 SEI reports in 2021W (plotted on the right): Q1) For $\mathrm{IM}<3.5$, what effect does Dispersion Index (DI) seem to have for a given IM? Q2) Does the answer to Q1 apply to an IM of 3.5 ? Why or why not?

# Questions? 

More information on SEI new metrics
https://seoi.ubc.ca/metrics/

# Thank You 

Abdel Azim Zumrawi
Planning \& Institutional Research (PAIR)
Email: abdel.azim.Zumrawi@ubc.ca
Or contact The SEl support team
sei.support@ubc.ca
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