# INITIAL REVIEW OF THE PROPOSED NEW TEACHING FORM

New Instructor and Course Items

## ABSTRACT

These results suggest the new course and instructor items function as desired, and will provide reasonable continuity with previous items should implementation be pursued. If reporting trends which include old and new item results, conservatively adding about 0.4 points to each mean score obtained from the new instructor and course is suggested. As always, the need for ongoing review and continued research is encouraged.

*Pietrzak, Dale
(dalepietrzak@uidaho.edu)*
*Director, IEA*

# Executive Review:

**Review:**

The initial review of the suggested changes to the student feedback on teaching and course was done using results from the Fall of 2016 and Spring of 2017 semesters.  This represented 4,718 courses with responses from 33,186 students.  Of these. 2,353 courses had 5 or more respondents (28,028 student responses).  The numbers for each analysis may vary somewhat based on missing data (i.e., student not responding to items, etc.).

The examination was informed by the general philosophy of the nomological network https://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/nomonet.php.  This is an established approach. It was enacted using one of many variations on Multitrait-Multimethod modeling approach (https://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/mtmmmat.php).  Additionally the model for alternate form reliability approach was also employed.

The findings suggest that the new form displays reasonable continuity with the old form.  The new instructor and course scores are on average slightly lower than the old form.  When reporting trends that include old and new form results, conservatively adding about 0.4 points to each mean score from the new form is suggested.  However, the distributions of the scores allows the continued reporting using the same general process as was done previously.  These data suggest there is little discriminative power of the course and instructor scores. There was support for reporting only courses with 5 or more respondents.

| **Alternate Form Reliability** <br> The generally accepted guideline (bold text): <br> .90 > excellent <br> .80 -.89 good <br> .70 -.79 adequate <br> Below .70 limited applicability <br> (*http://www.hr-guide.com/data/G362.htm*) | 16. (Old) Course | 17. (Old) Instructor | 4. (New) Course | 5. (New) Instructor |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16. (Old) Overall, how would you rate the quality of this course? | 1.00 | | | |
| 17. (Old) Overall, how would you rate the instructor's performance in teaching this course? | 0.92 | 1.00 | | |
| 4. (New) Overall, the content and organization of this course contributed to your understanding of this subject | **0.91** | 0.88 | 1.00 | |
| 5. (New) Overall, the instructor's delivery and efforts contributed to your understanding of the course material. | 0.90 | **0.93** | 0.93 | 1.00 |

Examination of the relationship of the instructor and course scores (old and new) to class size, number of respondents and response rate was examined.  There was a slight decline in scores as class size increased (less than 2% shared variance), as was theoretically expected.  There was a slight increase in scores as response rate increased (about 1% shared variance).

Examination of the instructor and course scores with instructor gender, citizenship and minority status found no relationship to gender or minority status. A slight decrease in scores was noted for instructors who were not US citizens (about 1.5% shared variance).

The examination of the relationship of undergraduate academic was undertaken. Course GPA, DFWI percent and Percent of A's was used. Of the 1,827 courses with 5 or more responses examined there were small relationships in the theoretically expected direction for the instructor score with Course GPA (positive, 6.7% shared variance), percent A's (positive, 5.9% shared variance) and DFWI percent (negative, 5.1% shared variance). Course scores saw similar relationships with Course GPA (positive, 5.1% shared variance), DFWI percent (negative, 4.2% shared variance) and percent A's (positive, 4.3% shared variance. These were consistent with the relationships with the prior course and instructor items.

The relationships of the instructor items was examined across 11 additional items to clarify the construct being evaluated. This was done using correlation, exploratory factor analysis and multiple regression. There was 91% shared variance between the instructor item and instructor presentation, instructor recommendation to others, clarity of instructor explanations, clarity of instructor's expectation, course value, and instructor's ability to stimulate interest. The least influential items were how many hours the student work on the course outside of class, self-reported class attendance, and instructor helpfulness outside of class. There was relative consistency between this and the old instructor item.

The relationships of the course items was examined across 11 additional items to clarify the construct being evaluated. This was done using correlation, exploratory factor analysis and multiple regression. There was 89% shared variance between the course item and course's value in gaining understanding of the subject matter, instructor presentation, appropriateness of level of presented material, and clarity of instructor expectations. The least influential items were how many hours the student worked on the course outside of class, self-reported class attendance, and instructor helpfulness outside of class. There was relative consistency between this and the old instructor item.

### Conclusion:

These results suggest the new items function as desired and will provide reasonable continuity with previous items should implementation be desired. If reporting trends which include old and new item results conservatively adding about 0.4 points to each mean score obtained from the new instructor and course is suggested. As always, the need for ongoing review and continued research is encouraged. Additional information regarding this examination is available in a PowerPoint presentation.

*Dale Pietrzak, Ed.D., CCMHC, LPCMH*
*Director, Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation*
*dalepietrzak@uidaho.edu*