The within-course reliability suggested students provide consistent responses for most

P

1. RESPONDENTS PROFILE

Students

The overall pilot response rate is 36% (Table 2) whereas the SETC question set had a response

P

Q2   I found this course to be   Multiple

- One line of future inquiry may be to incorporate the piped question ("Please explain your response to the above question") in the case of negative category selection and analyze students' outlying experiences in more depth.

Table 6: Response distributions for Q1

Q1. esee eess0 eee 9 (b)-0.97.7 .nrs0.96 r<</0 eu.97.7 pefeser Q ft

Table12 Response distributions for Q7

- Positive correlations of Q2 (I found course to be ITj 0.001 TOrre

- A value of 0.7 or above is acceptable for internal consistency

The internal consistency coefficient across the multiple-choice questions was acceptable (alpha = 0.8). This suggests that the students provided reliable and consistent responses to the questions.

4.2 Within-course reliability

Student responses to the common core questions are often aggregated individual across courses to represent an average learning experience. To support this use, it is critical to understand to what extent students provide consistent responses when taking the same course. We examined the within-course reliability using intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC). ICC is commonly used to measure the degree of consistency among multiple raters (e.g., observers, coders, examiners). For example, if multiple teachers give a similar score to a student s assignment, then it would have a high ICC. We used this measure to examine the degree of consistency in the responses among the students in the same course.

The coefficient (ranging from 0 to 1) was interpreted based on the recommended cut off (Koo & Li, 2016)
- < 0.5 are poor
- 0.50 0.75 are moderate
- > 0.75 are excellent

The within-course reliability coefficient was acceptable for most multiple-choice questions (> 0.5). This suggests that the students were likely to provide consistent responses when taking the same course.

Students showed relatively lower consistency in Q1 (workload) and Q4 (comfort approaching the instructor).
- For Q1, this suggests that the number of hours spend on the course tends to slightly differ between students.
- For Q4, this suggests that students have different levels of comfort even though they have the same instructor.
- For these two questions, we provide the open-ended question to allow students to explain themselves. We will track the students responses for further investigation.

Table 16 Within-course reliability coefficients

	Question	Within-course reliability (ICC)
Q1	SFU defines 1 credit as comprising hours of a combination of class and self-study time per week. For example, if Physiology 101 is worth 3 credits, it would take hours, on average, of a student's time each week. I spent _____ time on [Course name] than expected based on its number of credits.	0.4
Q2	I found this course to be	0.8
Q3	How often did you understand [Instructor name]'s explanations course concepts?	0.9
Q4	How comfortable did you feel approaching [Instructor name] or online)?	0.4
Q5	I felt [instructor name] tried to support student learning.	0.8
Q6	I felt engaged by [instructor name]'s teaching approach	0.9
Q7	Was it clear to you how your work (i.e., assignments, essays, t would be graded?	0.7
Q8	Did the assessments reflect what you were taught (i.e., learn activities, concepts, materials)?	0.8

Psychometric properties of the New common core questions

P