

Concepts and Techniques in Spatial and Movement Ecology (EFB 797; Fall 2025)

Course Evaluation Summary

All questions are scored as the average on a 5 point Likert scale.

The instructor is knowledgeable about the material: **4.9**

The instructor explains things well: **4.5**

The instructor communicates a sense of enthusiasm and excitement toward the content: **4.4**

The instructor admits not knowing the answer to a question and/or making an error: **4.5**

I am learning from this instructor: **4.4**

The instructor begins class on time in an orderly, organized manner: **4.7**

The instructor appears well prepared for class: **4.8**

The instructor encourages student questions and participation: **4.5**

The instructor encouraged development of new viewpoints: **4.5**

The instructor knows and uses student names and responds to students as individuals: **4.8**

If given the opportunity, I would enroll in another course led by the instructor: **4.8**

The co-instructed nature of this course was beneficial: **4.1**

Positive comments:

“Both Dr. Wehr and Dr. Ellie are extremely knowledgeable and passionate about the subject. On multiple occasions the professors took the time to go into detail about concepts students had questions about or found confusing. Dr. Wehr especially was willing to offer insight and provide examples for spatial analysis from both theory and his personal experience.”

“I liked how the course required student interaction beyond just commenting on each seminar. By having the students host multiple of the seminars it forced them to get involved in the subject and became invested in it, without being overly complicated or confusing.”

“I really like that Nate lets us run the discussions on our own, but will also step in if something needs clarifying. I think Nate's balance between teaching us about concepts/techniques while also letting us guide the discussion of the papers was really good.”

“I liked that it was primarily student led, this definitely pushed me to learn the material more thoroughly. I think if it was just Nate and Dr. Gurarie talking at us, that I would not have learned as much.”

“I think the way the course is laid out allows for continued involvement and participation from the students. The requirements were reasonable for the seminar as well. The question requirement on BB allowed for an involvement from the students to make sure the readings were done before class.”

“The choice of papers was something I liked, not a paper in particular, but the pattern where we have a paper that first introduced a concept, then a paper that made some methodological advancement, followed by a recent paper that has applied the concept. This pattern really helped to have some idea of the topic even without very intense reading”

“He is very organised and great in communication. He gave nice perspectives during discussion”

“I feel Nate did a good job explaining the concepts in a simple way when it started to become too technical for me.”

“Nate is very prompt in answering emails and is always very organized in class.”

“Explanations from the instructors regarding content in papers that were difficult to absorb was most helpful.”

“I think that the base knowledge and experience from the instructor also majorly helped relate the material and explain where necessary for understanding.”

“I enjoyed exploring a lot of new methods of research I had not heard of or understood before this class. Those were beneficial when thinking of methods for my own research.”

“I really liked how he would guide our discussion and add thoughtful, relevant information when applicable.”

Negative Comments:

“I think in the future, there could be more transparency about what is going to be expected for the presentation itself. I also think having materials available ahead of time, especially for the presenters, would allow for more flexibility in timing getting work done for the students. A requirement to include the BB questions somewhere in the associated class discussion would make the question requirement feel more useful.”

“I personally felt a little in over my head with some papers we read but that's not exactly the course's fault, but maybe more input from the instructor about applicability of methods and such each week even if it is a student led discussion.”

“A little greater clarification about the courses required work would be useful, but mainly more detail regarding how the seminar and lab are connected during enrollment would be extremely helpful.”

“I don't think the discussion posts were very helpful, especially since we tended to go over the same questions in class. I also think that we could have had some weeks where we only covered 2 papers instead of 3. Sometimes the 3 papers were a little repetitive.”

“I feel like the content in the papers was difficult to understand without a spatial ecology background. I think it would have been helpful to have a class where a topic was covered in a more lecture style by the instructor and then readings based on that content for homework, with the following class being discussion. I think this would better facilitate discussion. I think the presentation style ended up limiting a more engaging discussion as well as a lack of understanding of the material.”

“The online discussion board rarely added to the discourse; the in-class conversations lent better engagement and conversation about topics.”

“I wish Nate and Dr. Gurarie added *more* info, they're incredibly knowledgeable and I wanted to get more from that. (This is nitpicking, I got plenty out of the course)”

“There were a lot of papers to read each week, it seemed like too much for a 1 credit class”

“I think it could be improved by giving students a bit more time to prepare to lead their class session.”