Course: MAE4010 – Constructing Measures

Semester: Autumn 2021 – Spring 2022

Number of respondents: 3 (out of 8 invitations)

Date: 2022-06-06

Summary of student viewpoints and suggestions

The evaluation was conducted anonymously via Nettskjema after the exam and after the exam results were given. The evaluation form consisted of the parts Information and material, Structure and time management, Content and teaching, and Overall impression. A questionnaire with response options from Strongly disagree to strongly agree was used. Most free response items providing some detailed feedback are given under Overall impression. Overall two of the students responded very positively in the closed Likert scale questions, while one student was somewhat less satisfied using the category disagree for some single items (but still mostly on the positive side).

Information and material:

- Two of three students agreed that the information provided on web and Canvas was clear and sufficient. One student disagreed that the information provided at Canvas was sufficient (but no details about this is avilable

Structure and time management

- Students found it hard to indicate how much time they had spent on this course as the schedule and workload is distributed very unevenly across the study year
- The six questionnaire items mostly were responded Strongly agree or Agree. One student disagreed that the number of sessions was adequate

Content and teaching

- The majority of the questions for this topic was responded with strongly agree, a large proportion with agree, and some single items were reported with disagree.

In the free response part the following statements where made:

- I liked the small labs with the teaching assistants
- The parts with overlap/repetition from Principles of Measurement were a bit boring
- One specific small exercise early in the course was identified as very interesting
- The help from the teachers when needed was appreciated
- The fact that the final product of the assignment is realistic and potentially useful is motivating

Overall impression

- Again, the overall Likert scale ratings were mostly agree/strongly agree, with one student indicating that he/she disagreed on the statement about enjoying participating in the course

In the free response section, a range of helpful statements were provided:

Positive aspects of the course:

- The connection to NOKUT in the assignment with real data collection and analysis
- It is nice to follow the whole development of a test
- Teachers positive attitude when asking for help
- That we can apply what we have learned in Principles of Measurement
- Clearly formulated expectations for the students

How the course could improve in the future:

- Sequencing with Measurement Model should be reconsidered so that MM is finished in April and exam in Constructing Measures is in June
- The content of the classes could go deeper, in particular about the specific meaning of the concept of Framework
- Overlapping deadlines with other courses
- Use the grading scale A-F from the beginning to the end

Topics that should be emphasized/de-emphasized:

- More details/technical content on Framework and specifics of item writing
- EFA analysis and CFA from Measurement Model is relevant for writing the report
- More tips on how to write a good discussion

Comments on the implementation and outcome of the course

This course is organized around a large and continuous assignment where students work in fixed groups throughout the study year. This is a real and authentic task where a measure potentially to be included in the NOKUT Student Survey is developed by the students – in cooperation with NOKUT. The exam consist of the students' individually written final report from this assignment. One implication of this is that the activity in the course is unevenly distributed throughout the study year. It further implies that a module of the course (constructing cognitive tests) is not included in the exam. The course is very much dependent on and builds on content taught in Principles of Measurement, and to a lesser extent to content taught in Measurement Models.

Although the main content of this course has been kept for the four years since it started, some changes have been made based on previous year's evaluations. These changes seems to be successful:

- Library sessions has been included in this course, and they are given early in the course
- The sessions on writing cognitive test items has been moved to January/February, a period where the students do not work on the continuous assignment
- There are more smaller and specific assignments (not related to the main continuous assignment) throughout the course
- The analytical requirements for the continuous assignment has been reduced by removing IRT analyses and parallel analysis
- A more close follow-up of the group dynamics and individual students' participation in the group work has been implemented.

It is not entirely easy to see how the course could/should change based on last year's students' feedback. However, the instructors have also made some reflections, and the following changes will be considered:

- Slightly rework the library sessions to become even more specific on formal aspects of APA and using Zotero
- Largely keep the assignment/exam format
- Revise the assessment criteria for the exam to be more in line with the criteria used for the final thesis where each section of the report is evaluated with a mark. Some of the current criteria are perceived to be somewhat overlapping, and there is a risk that the criteria produces a halo-effect
- Revisit the literature/lecture on Framework to see how this could be made even more detailed and specific.

Rolf V. Olsen, Responsible teacher