2021W1 UBC Individual TA Report for DSCI 512 001 - Algorithms and Data Structures (Colby Delisle)

Project Title: **2021W1 UBC TA Evaluations**

Course Audience: **151**
Responses Received: **20**
Response Ratio: **13%**

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, February 9, 2022**

blue®

TA Questions

Question	N	n	SD	D	N	A	SA	N/A	IM	DI
The teaching assistant was well prepared.	151	18	1	0	0	5	12	0	4.8	0.4
The teaching assistant was helpful.	151	18	1	0	0	3	14	0	4.9	0.3
The teaching assistant was considerate of students.	151	18	1	0	0	3	14	0	4.9	0.3
The teaching assistant was easily understood.	151	18	1	0	0	3	14	0	4.9	0.3
The teaching assistant was an effective instructor.	151	18	1	0	0	5	12	0	4.8	0.4

Question	%Favourable
The teaching assistant was well prepared.	94%
The teaching assistant was helpful.	94%
The teaching assistant was considerate of students.	94%
The teaching assistant was easily understood.	94%
The teaching assistant was an effective instructor.	94%

Enter comments below

Comments
Colby is always easy to approach and helpful. Never feel embarrassed to ask for clarifications from him.
MINDBLOWINGLY GREAT SUPPORT. Excellent teacher, great energy and encouragement.
Great!
The TA showed up in classes on time, and well–prepared. Showed genuine interest to the course.
Colby has all the amazing qualities that TA should have. He is extremely helpful, kind, and always understanding of lab issues. It is obvious that he takes the time to prepare for lab questions beforehand. He has been one of my go–to TAs since the first block because he is always willing to go the extra mile to help students out.
very helpful

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 Experience of Instruction (SEI) 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 SEI 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 course sections have identical mean (3.8). However, the instructor in section 2 received 77% favourable (4-5) ratings, compared to 53% for the instructor in section 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 University Module Item	Section 1	Section 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 respondents in the section rated their experience of instruction the same. An index value of 1.0 is obtained when the respondents are split evenly between the two extreme values (Strongly Disagree & Strongly Agree), a very rare occurrence. In SEI data at UBC, the index rarely exceeds 0.85, and mostly for evaluations not meeting the minimum recommended response rate.