

IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction

Unit Summary Report Interpretive Guide



Overview:

The newly updated Unit Summary Report provides the same information as the previous version, but we have made enhancements to the user experience to make the information in the report more tangible and action-oriented.

Each report tab is a call to action that has been intentionally designed to provide necessary information to support targeted professional development, unit analysis of relevant objectives selection and student learning, and understanding your unit's learning environment and contextual factors that influence student ratings on learning

The screenshot shows the 'Unit Summary Report' interface. At the top, it displays the user's role as 'Course Evaluation Administrator, IDEA Center', the data version as 'IDEA 1', and the term as '2016-2017'. Below this, there are three main sections: 'Teaching Method Priorities' (with the question 'Where should you focus your unit's professional development?'), 'Optimization of Relevant Learning' (with the question 'Are you targeting the right learning objectives?'), and 'Learning Environment and Context' (with the question 'Understanding your courses and students'). A section titled 'High Priority Methods and Styles' includes a note: '* These teaching methods are correlated with student achievement of learning objectives that were selected by more than two-thirds of course sections in this group as Important or Essential. However, these teaching methods are used infrequently in this group compared to the IDEA database. Increasing use of these teaching method is recommended.' Below this, a table lists 'Establishing Rapport' with 2 sections and an average rating of 3.7.

Method	# of Sections	Average (1-5)
Establishing Rapport Found ways to help students answer their own questions	2	3.7

Important information regarding the data used in this report:

- The USR uses data from the Diagnostic Feedback and Learning Essentials instruments (Teaching Essentials data are not included in the USR values)
- The ratings in this report use Raw Scores only; Adjusted Scores factor in unique student and course characteristics and are not used for group analysis. The impact of student and course characteristics ratings in a unit analysis are addressed in the Learning Environment and Context tab.
- The Response Rate that was previously provided in the USR is now available in much greater detail in the Response Rate Report (<http://courseevaluationsupport.campuslabs.com/hc/en-us/articles/204024798-Reporting-Guide-for-Deans-and-Chairs>)
- The USR is available to academic leaders as defined in the Institutional Unit Chart created as part of the IDEA-Campus Labs implementation process.

Teaching Method Priorities Tab

Where should you focus your unit's professional development?

This tab provides data and analysis to guide unit leaders on where to focus professional development efforts. Information is organized around the unit's relevant objectives and also shows student ratings of progress for each of the objectives. [This information was found on page 5 of the previous version of the USR.]

High Priority Methods and Styles		
<p><i>* These teaching methods are correlated with student achievement of learning objectives that were selected by more than two-thirds of course sections in this group as Important or Essential. However, these teaching methods are used infrequently in this group compared to the IDEA database. Increasing use of these teaching method is recommended.</i></p>		
Stimulating Student Interest	# of Sections	Average (1-5)
Introduced stimulating ideas about the subject	96	3.91
Inspired students to set and achieve goals which really challenged them	96	3.78
Establishing Rapport	# of Sections	Average (1-5)
Displayed a personal interest in students and their learning	96	4.2

High Priority Teaching Methods

These teaching methods are high priority because they were used infrequently in this unit compared to the IDEA database. Increasing use is recommended because the methods are correlated with student achievement on learning objectives that were selected as Important or Essential by more than two-thirds of courses in this unit.

Moderate Priority Teaching Methods

These teaching methods are of moderate priority they were used infrequently in this group compared to the IDEA database and were selected as Important or Essential in a significant number of courses (more than half but less than two-thirds). Increasing use of these teaching methods should be considered.

Low Priority Teaching Methods

These teaching methods are of lower priority because they are either used frequently or are correlated with student achievement of learning objectives that were selected as relevant in a relatively small number of course (less than one-third).

Specific information on this tab includes:

- Teaching Methods (organized according to priority for professional development as described above)
- The number of course sections in the unit that identified Teaching Methods as Relevant (important or essential)
- The average mean rating from students in the unit

Optimization of Relevant Learning Tab

Are you targeting the right learning objectives?

Information in this tab is designed to assist unit leaders in determining if the course emphasis and student progress on learning objectives is targeted and specific to learning outcomes for the unit.

The first table focuses on the percent of classes for which each objective is emphasized in the unit and provides comparative data with the IDEA database. [*This information was found on page 1 of the previous version of the USR*]

Relevant Course Objectives	Average number of Objectives selected as Important or Essential in this unit: 4.8	
Faculty Selection of Objectives	Sections Selecting Objective as Relevant	IDEA Courses Selecting Objective as Relevant
Obj. 1: Gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classifications, methods, trends)	73%	78%
Obj. 2: Learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories	68%	75%
Obj. 3: Learning to <i>apply</i> course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions)	88%	75%
Obj. 4: Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course	61%	55%
Obj. 5: Acquiring skills in working with others as a member of a team	33%	32%

Questions to consider:

1. What is the average number of objectives being chosen by this unit?
2. Which objectives are emphasized in this unit?
3. Are the learning objectives appropriately emphasized and in alignment with the unit goals and mission? Are any of the objectives under- or over- emphasized?
4. How does this unit compare with the IDEA database?

Specific Information includes:

- Average number of objectives selected as Important or Essential
- Percent of sections selecting each objective as relevant for this unit
- Percent of sections selecting each objective as relevant in the IDEA database

The second table compares ratings of progress on relevant objectives for this unit with the IDEA database. Results in this section should help you determine if special attention should be given to improving learning on one or more objective(s). This section is of particular value to accrediting agencies and assessment programs. **[This information was found on page 2 of the previous version of the USR]**

Student Ratings of Progress on Relevant Objectives

Relevant Objectives (Important or Essential)	# of Sections	Unit Average (1-5)	IDEA Average
Obj. 1 Gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classifications, methods, trends)	0	0	4
Obj. 2 Learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories	2	3.8	3.9
Obj. 3 Learning to <i>apply</i> course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions)	2	4	4

Questions to consider:

1. When comparing progress ratings across all of the learning objectives, is there a significant difference in how well various objectives were achieved?
2. How do the ratings of your group or unit compare with the IDEA database? Since students rate their progress higher on some objectives than on others, conclusions may need to be modified by comparing the Unit results with IDEA.

Specific information includes:

- # of sections in which the objective was identified as Relevant (important or essential)
- Unit average student rating (Raw Score) for each objective
- IDEA Database average student rating in the IDEA database

This table is helpful in determining to what degree minimum standards have been met by identifying the % of class sections where the raw average for each relevant objective was at least 3.5.

% of Classes where Raw Average was at least 3.5

Relevant Objectives	# of Sections	Unit	IDEA
Obj. 1: Gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classifications, methods, trends)	0	100%	85%
Obj. 2: Learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories	2	100%	83%
Obj. 3: Learning to <i>apply</i> course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions)	2	100%	84%

Questions to consider:

1. What percent of courses in your group had a raw average of at least 3.5 on each of the objectives?
2. How does this compare with the IDEA Database?
3. Is there a large number of course for which an objective was determined to be relevant yet did not meet a minimum average student rating threshold of 3.5?

Specific information includes:

- # of sections in which the objective was identified as Relevant (important or essential)
- % of these courses where the raw average for each objective was at least 3.5
- % of courses in the IDEA database where the average for each objective was at least 3.5

Learning Environment and Context Tab

Understanding Your Courses and Students

This tab provides specific details related to summative measures, course characteristics, and student characteristics to help leaders better understand the context of courses and students in their unit. **[This information was found on page 3 of the previous version of the USR.]**

Section 1—Overall Outcomes

The information in this section of the report is related to the Overall Outcomes data for the Unit, which includes Excellence of Teacher, Excellence of Course, Progress on Relevant Objectives (PRO) and the Summary Evaluation (average of PRO, course and instructor excellence, with the PRO score double weighted.)

- 1) This table provides side-by-side comparison of average Converted** Scores for the unit with average Converted Scores in the IDEA database.

Overall Outcomes		
Converted Scores		
Overall Outcomes	Unit Score	IDEA Score
Progress on Relevant Objectives	51	51
Excellence of Teacher	49	50
Excellence of Course	44	50
Summary Evaluation	49	50

Specific information includes:

Overall Outcomes

- Unit averages of Converted Scores for each of the four measures of overall outcomes
- IDEA Database average of Converted Scores for overall outcomes
- Unit distribution of Converted Scores for overall outcomes
- Unit average student rating (Raw Score) for each of the four measures of overall outcomes
- IDEA Database average student rating for overall outcomes

**Converted scores compare your ratings with those of all classes in the IDEA database. They express your ratings relative to a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. So, a converted score of 50 is “average,” a score of 63 is in the upper 10% of all classes, while a score of 37 is in the lowest 10%. Converted scores are not percentiles.

2) The second table shows the distribution of the converted scores from much lower to much higher. The standard chart shows the percentage of classes in each of the five performance categories.

Distribution of Converted Scores					
Overall Outcomes	Much Lower	Lower	Similar	Higher	Much Higher
Expected Distributions	10%	20%	40%	20%	10%
Progress on Relevant Objectives	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
Excellence of Teacher	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
Excellence of Course	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%
Summary Evaluation	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
	-2 SD	-1 SD	Mean Score	+1 SD	+2 SD

** Converted scores compare your ratings with those of all classes in the IDEA database. They express your ratings relative to a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. So, a converted score of 50 is "average", a score of 63 is in the upper 10% of all classes, while a score of 37 is in the lowest 10%. Converted scores are not percentiles.*

3) The third table provides side-by-side comparison of average Raw scores for the Unit and the average Raw scores for IDEA.

5-Point Scale		
Overall Outcomes	Unit Average	IDEA Average
Progress on Relevant Objectives	4	3.8
Excellence of Teacher	4.1	4.2
Excellence of Course	3.6	3.9
Summary Evaluation	4	3.9

- How do the average raw scores in your unit compare to the IDEA Database progress on relevant objectives, excellence of teacher, excellence of course, and summary evaluation?
- Is the distribution of this unit's classes similar to the expected distribution when compared to IDEA?
- Are the group's averages higher or lower than IDEA?
- What judgements can be made of the courses in the unit for this term, overall? Is the comparison with IDEA data expected or not? Are the converted average scores, and their distribution compared to the IDEA data acceptable or do they target areas of improvement?

Section 2—Student Self-Ratings and Course Characteristics

This section describes student motivation, work habits, and academic effort, all of which affect student learning. The table gives averages for this Unit and the IDEA database. [*This information was found on page 4 of the previous version of the USR.*]

Student Self Ratings		
Amount of reading	2.9	3.2
Amount of coursework	0	3.4
Difficulty of subject matter	0	3.4
Amount of work in other (non-reading) assignments	3.4	3.4
Difficulty of subject matter	3.3	3.4

The Student Ratings of Course Characteristics section provides information about course characteristics and prompts the following questions:

- When compared to the IDEA database, is the amount of reading, work other than reading, or difficulty for courses included in this summary report unusual?
- Are the results consistent with expectations? 3. Does the percent of classes below 3.0 raise concerns? Does the percent of classes above 4.0 suggest strengths?
- Is the distribution of this group's classes similar to the expected distribution when compared to IDEA? 2. Are the group's averages higher or lower than IDEA?

Sections above 4.0:

% of Sections 4.0 or Above		
Course Characteristics	Unit Average	IDEA Average
Amount of reading	0%	15%
Amount of work in other (non-reading) assignments	0%	18%
Difficulty of subject matter	0%	18%
Student Self Ratings		
I really wanted to take this course regardless of who taught it.	0%	13%
As a rule, I put forth more effort than other students on academic work.	0%	15%

Sections under 3.0:

% of Sections 3.0 or Below		
Course Characteristics	Unit Average	IDEA Average
As a rule, I put forth more effort than other students on academic work.	0%	1%
I really wanted to take this course regardless of who taught it.	0%	9%
I really wanted to take this course regardless of who taught it.	46%	25%
As a rule, I put forth more effort than other students on academic work.	0%	10%
When this course began I believed I could master its content.	0%	2%
My background prepared me well for this course's requirements.	0%	6%

Questions to consider:

- Based on the results, is there a need to make a special effort to improve student motivation and conscientiousness?
- Are the results consistent with expectations?
- Does the percent of classes below 3.0 raise concerns? Does the percent of classes above 4.0 suggest strengths?

Specific information includes:

Student Self-Ratings and Course Characteristics

- Unit average of student ratings for student and course characteristics
- IDEA Database average of student ratings for student and course characteristics
- Percent of course sections in the Unit and in the IDEA Database with a student rating of 4.0 or higher for student and course characteristics
- Percent of course sections in the Unit and in the IDEA Database with a student rating of 3.0 or lower for student and course characteristics