

Project Title: 2019W1 UBC TA Evaluations

Course Audience: 114

Responses Received: 15

Response Ratio: 13.16%

---

**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: **Thursday, September 3, 2020**

## TA Questions

Question	N	n	SD	D	N	A	SA	N/A	IM	DI	Mean	STDEV
The TA was helpful when I requested course-related assistance.	114	15	0	0	3	3	3	6	4.00	0.44	4.00	0.87
The TA was well-prepared for their duties.	114	15	0	1	1	3	3	7	4.17	0.53	4.00	1.07
The TA was readily available to me either through office hours or by appointment.	114	15	0	0	1	4	4	6	4.38	0.35	4.33	0.71
The TA communicated at an appropriate level for me.	114	15	0	0	4	2	5	4	4.25	0.48	4.09	0.94
The TA exhibited interest in the subject matter.	114	15	0	0	3	2	3	7	4.00	0.47	4.00	0.93
The TA showed knowledge of the subject matter.	114	15	0	0	3	3	3	6	4.00	0.44	4.00	0.87
The TA presented information clearly.	114	15	0	1	2	3	3	6	4.00	0.54	3.89	1.05
The TA was effective at stimulating interest in the subject matter.	114	15	0	1	1	3	3	7	4.17	0.53	4.00	1.07
The TA was receptive to a variety of perspectives and ideas.	114	15	0	0	2	3	4	6	4.33	0.42	4.22	0.83
The TA treated me and other students with equal respect.	114	15	0	0	2	3	4	6	4.33	0.42	4.22	0.83
The TA's comments on my written work were helpful.	114	14	0	0	2	4	3	5	4.13	0.40	4.11	0.78
The TA encouraged intelligent and independent thought.	114	14	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.63	0.37	4.43	0.79
The TA's evaluation of my work was fair and reasonable.	114	15	0	1	2	4	4	4	4.13	0.51	4.00	1.00
The TA made a very positive contribution to this course.	114	15	0	0	2	4	4	5	4.25	0.40	4.20	0.79

Question	%Favourable
The TA was helpful when I requested course-related assistance.	66.67%
The TA was well-prepared for their duties.	75.00%
The TA was readily available to me either through office hours or by appointment.	88.89%
The TA communicated at an appropriate level for me.	63.64%
The TA exhibited interest in the subject matter.	62.50%
The TA showed knowledge of the subject matter.	66.67%
The TA presented information clearly.	66.67%
The TA was effective at stimulating interest in the subject matter.	75.00%
The TA was receptive to a variety of perspectives and ideas.	77.78%
The TA treated me and other students with equal respect.	77.78%
The TA's comments on my written work were helpful.	77.78%
The TA encouraged intelligent and independent thought.	85.71%
The TA's evaluation of my work was fair and reasonable.	72.73%
The TA made a very positive contribution to this course.	80.00%

### How would you rate the overall contribution of the TA to the course?

N	n	Very poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Very Good	N/A	IM	DI	Mean	STDEV
114	15	0	1	1	5	5	3	4.30	0.46	4.17	0.94

Question	%Favourable
How would you rate the overall contribution of the TA to the course?	83.33%

### Of the sessions in which the Teaching Assistant was involved, how often did you attend?

Of the sessions in which the Teaching Assistant was involved, how often did you attend?		
Options	Count	Percentage
None	6	46.15%
Less than 25%	2	15.38%
25-50%	1	7.69%
51-75%	0	0.00%
Greater than 75%	4	30.77%

**Which, if any, of the following did your Teaching Assistant do? (Please mark each element that is appropriate)**

Options	Count
Led discussion-tutorial groups	1
Held office hours	10
marked examination(s)	10
marked essay(s)-assignment(s)	10
gave classroom lectures	0
conducted labs	0
responded to email	5
Respondent(s)	13

**Considering everything, how would you rate this course?**

N	n	Very poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Very good	N/A	IM	DI	Mean	STDEV
114	15	1	0	0	7	6	1	4.36	0.44	4.21	1.05

Question	%Favourable
Considering everything, how would you rate this course?	92.86%

**Please comment on any aspects, positive or negative, of your teaching assistant's (TA's) teaching, attitudes to students, class atmosphere, or any other matters affecting the quality of instruction that you consider worthy of note.**

Comments
No comments.
For the most part she was able to answer specific questions If I had them, but she did not appear to know what we were being taught in the course specifically and acted more as a general econ adviser. It would have been more helpful if she had a better idea of what we were actually being taught and with what methods, so that when she answered questions about assignments it was clearer and using the info we have actually been taught and not new concepts
quick at marking
More office hours would be nice

**Please comment on any aspects, positive or negative, of the format and content of the course as they may have affected the teaching assistant's performance.**

Comments
No comments.
I think that I would have liked to potentially have discussion sections for the course so we could be going over the material again every week.
nothing
Overall, good job.



## 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.