

## Description of Your Report

Your Course Evaluation Report contains up to four sets of items, represented in up to four sections in your report, described below.

### Sets of Items

#### Institutional Items

These eight items are consistent across the University of Toronto. They are comprised of:

- Five rating-scale items which represent institution-wide teaching and learning priorities.
  - ◊ **The institutional composite mean, a mathematical average of these first five items.**
- One rating-scale item on the overall quality of a student's learning experience.
- Two qualitative comment items.

#### Divisional Items

These items are consistent across your division. They represent division-wide priorities for teaching and learning.

#### Departmental/Program/Course-Type Items

These items (when applicable) represent further levels of granularity and specificity for teaching and learning priorities within your division (e.g., department, program, course type).

#### Instructor-Selected Items

These items are optional items which may be selected from the item bank by instructors during the question personalization period.

- **Note that the results from these items are only reported to instructors, as they are primarily intended to function as personal formative feedback.**

## Report Sections

The following provide different statistical summaries and representations for your institutional, divisional, and departmental/programmatic items (where appropriate).

### Section 1: Course Evaluation Overview

Provides all course evaluation data except instructor-selected items.

### Section 2: Response Distributions and Additional Statistics

Provides detailed response distributions.

- The number and relative percentage of respondents providing a given answer is provided, along with a graphical representation.
- This section also reports further statistics for each set of items relative to Section 1.

### Section 3: Comparative Data

Provides comparative means for your course as compared to the relevant means across *all other evaluated courses at a particular level of comparison (e.g. division, program)* for each set of items.

### Section 4: Instructor-Selected Items

Provides data for optional items that instructors can select from the item bank during the question personalization period. This section is formatted identically to Section 2.

## Statistical Terms Used in this Report

**Mean:** The mathematical average. This measure is the most sensitive, and can be greatly affected by extreme and/or divergent scores.

**Median:** The middle value when all responses are ordered. This measure is less affected by extreme and/or divergent scores.

**Mode:** The most frequently occurring score.

**Standard deviation:** A measure of the "spread" of the data.

Course Name: DATA SCIENCE FOUNDATIONS INF3104H-F-LEC0101 (INPER)	Instructor: Rohan Alexander
Division: SGS	Section: LEC0101
Session: F	Delivery Mode: INPER
Session Codes: F = First/Fall, S = Second/Winter	

Raters	Students
Responded	3
Invited	6

Section 1: Course Evaluation Overview

Part A. Core Institutional Items

Scale: 1 - Not At All 2 - Somewhat 3 - Moderately 4 - Mostly 5 - A Great Deal

Question	Summary	
	Mean	Median
I found the course intellectually stimulating.	4.7	5.0
The course provided me with a deeper understanding of the subject matter.	4.7	5.0
The instructor (Rohan Alexander) created an atmosphere that was conducive to my learning.	5.0	5.0
Course projects, assignments, tests, and/or exams improved my understanding of the course material.	5.0	5.0
Course projects, assignments, tests and/or exams provided opportunity for me to demonstrate an understanding of the course material.	5.0	5.0
Institutional Composite Mean	4.9	-

Scale: 1 - Poor 2 - Fair 3 - Good 4 - Very Good 5 - Excellent

Question	Summary	
	Mean	Median
6. Overall, the quality of my learning experience in this course was....	4.7	5.0

**7. Please comment on the overall quality of the instruction in this course.**

Comments
Rohan tailored the course to each individual. His instruction was clear and effective.
Prof. Alexander provides targeted instruction to meet the needs of individual students, including myself.

**8. Please comment on any assistance that was available to support your learning in this course.**

Comments
Everything, he cares about his students.
Prof. Alexander provided the flexibility necessary so that everyone in the class had the opportunity to succeed in the course.

Part B. Divisional Items

Scale: 1 - Not At All 2 - Somewhat 3 - Moderately 4 - Mostly 5 - A Great Deal

Question	Summary	
	Mean	Median
9. The course instructor ( <a href="#">Rohan Alexander</a> ) encouraged students to think about the subject matter from multiple perspectives.	4.7	5.0
10. The course instructor ( <a href="#">Rohan Alexander</a> ) encouraged me to explore alternative approaches when problem-solving.	5.0	5.0
11. The course drew attention to ethical and social issues related to the field of study.	5.0	5.0
12. The course instructor ( <a href="#">Rohan Alexander</a> ) encouraged students to reflect critically on the course material.	4.7	5.0
13. The course instructor ( <a href="#">Rohan Alexander</a> ) explained how course topics contributed to an overall understanding of the field.	4.3	5.0

Section 2: Response Distributions and Additional Statistics

This section provides detailed response distributions.

**Mean:** The mathematical average. This measure is the most sensitive, and can be greatly affected by extreme and/or divergent scores.


**Median:** The middle value when all responses are ordered. This measure is less affected by extreme and/or divergent scores.

**Mode:** The most frequently occurring score.


**Standard deviation:** A measure of the "spread" of the data.

Part A: Core Institutional Items


1. I found the course intellectually stimulating.




2. The course provided me with a deeper understanding of the subject matter.




3. The instructor (Rohan Alexander) created a course atmosphere that was conducive to my learning.




4. Course projects, assignments, tests and/or exams improved my understanding of the course material.



5. Course projects, assignments, tests and/or exams provided opportunity for me to demonstrate an understanding of the course material.




6. Overall, the quality of my learning experience in this course was....






Part B. Divisional Items


9. The course instructor (**Rohan Alexander**) encouraged students to think about the subject matter from multiple perspectives.




10. The course instructor (**Rohan Alexander**) encouraged me to explore alternative approaches when problem-solving.




11. The course drew attention to ethical and social issues related to the field of study.



12. The course instructor ([Rohan Alexander](#)) encouraged students to reflect critically on the course material.



13. The course instructor ([Rohan Alexander](#)) explained how course topics contributed to an overall understanding of the field.





Section 3. Comparative Data

This section provides overall means for given comparators (e.g., division, department) alongside the mean values for a given course. Note that the comparators are calculated by pooling together all individual student survey responses (e.g., student responses for all of the courses in a department are pooled together and the departmental mean responses calculated from that). The provided comparators are thus a measure of the 'average' student experience for a unit or division; they are not a measure of the 'average' course in a unit or division. This calculation has the effect of giving large courses more 'weight' in the calculation of the comparator means. The effect of this on the calculated comparator varies depending on the relative proportion of large or small courses within a unit or division. As such, the departmental and divisional comparative mean values provided on course evaluations should not be regarded as an absolute and definitive benchmark.


*For example, if a department offered only two courses, one with 1000 students who all answered 3.5 and the other with 10 students who all answered 4.5 (so that the means would be 3.5 and 4.5 respectively), then the departmental mean provided on the course evaluations would be 3.51 since the calculation would be  $[(3.5 \times 1000) + (4.5 \times 10)] / 1010 = 3.51$  and not  $(3.5 + 4.5) / 2 = 4$ .*

Part A. Core Institutional Items

Scale: 1 - Not At All 2 - Somewhat 3 - Moderately 4 - Mostly 5 - A Great Deal



3. The instructor ([Rohan Alexander](#)) created an atmosphere that was conducive to my learning.




Part A. Core Institutional Items


Scale: 1 - Not At All 2 - Somewhat 3 - Moderately 4 - Mostly 5 - A Great Deal

(continued)

4. Course projects, assignments, tests, and/or exams improved my understanding of the course material.




5. Course projects, assignments, tests and/or exams provided opportunity for me to demonstrate an understanding of the course material.




Scale: 1 - Poor 2 - Fair 3 - Good 4 - Very Good 5 - Excellent

6. Overall, the quality of my learning experience in this course was:




Part B. Divisional Items


Scale: 1 - Not At All 2 - Somewhat 3 - Moderately 4 - Mostly 5 - A Great Deal




Scale: 1 - Not At All 2 - Somewhat 3 - Moderately 4 - Mostly 5 - A Great Deal



Scale: 1 - Not At All 2 - Somewhat 3 - Moderately 4 - Mostly 5 - A Great Deal



Scale: 1 - Not At All 2 - Somewhat 3 - Moderately 4 - Mostly 5 - A Great Deal



Scale: 1 - Not At All 2 - Somewhat 3 - Moderately 4 - Mostly 5 - A Great Deal

13. The course instructor ([Rohan Alexander](#)) explained how course topics contributed to an overall understanding of the field.

