IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction

Note: Throughout the report, results for the Group are compared to the Institution and to the IDEA database.

The following provides information about the degree to which
various learning objectives are emphasized in courses. The
percent of classes for which each objective was chosen
   e   r   c   e   n   t

The quality of instruction in this
unit is shown as judged by the
four overall outcomes.
"A. Progress on

Part 1: Distribution of Converted Scores
Compared to <u>This Institution</u>

This section compares the quality of instruction in this Group to your entire Institution in the same way as it was compared to all classes in the IDEA database (Section II, page 3).

Part 1 shows the **percentage of classes** in each of five categories.
- Is the distribution of this Group's classes similar to the expected distribution when compared to the Institution?

Part 2 provides the **averages** for the Group and for Institutional norms.
- Are the Group's averages higher or lower than the Institution?
- Is the Institution (compared to IDEA) higher or lower than the IDEA system average? (See page 3 for IDEA System averages.)

Note: Institutional norms are based on courses rated in the previous five years.

Converted Score Category	Expected Distribution

Tables in this section compare ratings of progress and "relevance" for the 12 objectives for this Group, with ratings for other classes at your institution and for all classes in the IDEA database. The tables on the left side of the page report averages (raw and adjusted) for the Group and the two comparison groups; they also display the number of classes for which the objective was selected as "relevant" (Important or Essential). For each of these groups, progress ratings are reported only for "relevant" classes.

By comparing progress ratings across the 12 learning objectives, you can determine if there are significant differences in how well various objectives were achieved. Since students rate their progress higher on some objectives than on others, conclusions may need to be modified by comparing the Group's results with those for the Institution and/or IDEA. Results in this section should help you determine if special attention should be given to improving learning on one or more objective(s). Results in the section are of special value to accrediting agencies and assessment programs.

Raw Average: Answers accreditation/assessment questions related to how well each objective was achieved; these are indicators of self–assessed learning.

Adjusted Average: Useful primarily in comparing instructors or classes; they "level the playing field" by taking into

Percent of classes

Percent of classes

This section is intended to support teaching improvement
efforts. The 20 teaching methods assessed in the IDEA
system (grouped into five "approaches" to teaching) are listed.
The number of classes for which a for 44bfor

Part A describes student motivation, work habits, and academic effort, all of which affect student learning. The table gives averages for this Group, your Institution, and the IDEA database. It also shows the percentage of classes with averages below 3.0 and 4.0 or above. Although the information in this section is largely descriptive, it can be used to explore such important questions as:

• Is there a need to make a special effort to improve student motivation and conscientiousness?

• Are these results consistent with expectations?

• Does the percent of classes below 3.0 or 4.0 or above raise concerns or suggest strengths?

Averages for classes in this report are considered "similar" to the comparison group if they are within ± .3 of the Institution or the IDEA average, respectively.

A. Student Self–ratings

Diagnostic Form (Short Form) Item Number and Item		Average	% of Classes Below 3.0	% of Classes 4.0 or Above
36. I had a strong desire to take this course.	This report	NA	NA	NA

A. Primary and Secondary Instructional Approaches