2021W2 UBC Individual Instructor Report for GEOS 270 202 - Geographic Information Science (June Skeeter)

Project Title: **2021W2 UBC Instructor SEI Surveys**

Course Audience: **45**
Responses Received: **11**
Response Ratio: **24%**

Report Comments

Recommended Minimum Response Rates

Class Size	Recommended Minimum Response Rates based on 80% confidence & ± 10% margin
< 10	75%
11 - 19	65%
20 - 34	55%
35 - 49	40%
50 - 74	35%
75 - 99	25%
100 - 149	20%
150 - 299	15%
300 - 499	10%
> 500	5%

Creation Date: **Tuesday, August 2, 2022**

University Module Questions

Question	N	n	SD	D	N	A	SA	N/A	IM	DI
Throughout the term, the instructor explained course requirements so it was clear to me what I was expected to learn.	45	11	0	0	1	4	6	0	4.6	0.3
The instructor conducted this course in such a way that I was motivated to learn.	45	11	0	2	1	3	5	0	4.3	0.6
The instructor presented the course material in a way that I could understand.	45	11	0	0	2	5	4	0	4.2	0.4
Considering the type of class (e.g., large lecture, seminar, studio), the instructor provided useful feedback that helped me understand how my learning progressed during this course.	45	11	0	1	4	4	2	0	3.6	0.5
The instructor showed genuine interest in supporting my learning throughout this course.	45	11	0	2	1	4	4	0	4.1	0.6
Overall, I learned a great deal from this instructor.	45	11	0	1	1	3	6	0	4.6	0.5

Question	%Favourable
Throughout the term, the instructor explained course requirements so it was clear to me what I was expected to learn.	91%
The instructor conducted this course in such a way that I was motivated to learn.	73%
The instructor presented the course material in a way that I could understand.	82%
Considering the type of class (e.g., large lecture, seminar, studio), the instructor provided useful feedback that helped me understand how my learning progressed during this course.	55%
The instructor showed genuine interest in supporting my learning throughout this course.	73%
Overall, I learned a great deal from this instructor.	82%

Faculty Questions

Considering everything, how would you rate this course?

N	n	Very Poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Very Good	IM	DI
45	11	0	0	1	6	4	4.3	0.3

	%Favourable
	91%

For courses that had discussion groups or labs, the discussion groups or labs made an important contribution to the course.

N	n	SD	D	N	A	SA	IM	DI
45	11	0	0	2	4	5	4.4	0.4

	%Favourable
	82%

Instructor Questions

Question	N	n	SD	D	N	A	SA	N/A	IM	DI
In classes where the size of the class and content of the course were appropriate, student participation in class was encouraged by the instructor.	45	11	0	0	4	5	1	1	3.7	0.3
High standards of achievement were set.	45	11	0	0	2	6	3	0	4.1	0.3
The instructor was generally well prepared for class.	45	11	0	0	0	5	6	0	4.6	0.2
The instructor was readily available to students outside of class (e.g., through email, office hours, or by appointment).	45	11	0	0	0	6	5	0	4.4	0.2
The instructor treated students with respect.	45	11	0	0	0	6	5	0	4.4	0.2
The instructor was responsive when needed.	45	11	0	0	2	4	5	0	4.4	0.4
The instructor's feedback and comments contributed positively to my learning.	45	11	0	0	1	5	5	0	4.4	0.3
The instructor attempted to provide satisfactory answers to all questions in class.	45	11	0	0	0	7	4	0	4.3	0.2
The instructor established effective communication with students in the classroom.	45	11	0	0	0	9	2	0	4.1	0.1
The instructor was helpful when students requested course related assistance outside of class.	45	10	0	0	1	6	3	0	4.2	0.3
Assignments and tests were returned within a reasonable time.	45	11	0	0	1	4	6	0	4.6	0.3

Question	%Favourable
In classes where the size of the class and content of the course were appropriate, student participation in class was encouraged by the instructor.	60%
High standards of achievement were set.	82%
The instructor was generally well prepared for class.	100%
The instructor was readily available to students outside of class (e.g., through email, office hours, or by appointment).	100%
The instructor treated students with respect.	100%
The instructor was responsive when needed.	82%
The instructor's feedback and comments contributed positively to my learning.	91%
The instructor attempted to provide satisfactory answers to all questions in class.	100%
The instructor established effective communication with students in the classroom.	100%
The instructor was helpful when students requested course related assistance outside of class.	90%
Assignments and tests were returned within a reasonable time.	91%

Open ended feedback

Do you have any suggestions for what the instructor could have done differently to further support your learning?

Comments
No, the instructor taught the material very clearly and they provided the students with a lot of supplemental asynchronous content to support our learning and lab assignments. Their flexible assignment submission policy was also greatly appreciated and reduced my overall stress this term. I cannot think of anything they could have improved because they ran the course so well.
Would appreciate having more support on the assignments.
I really liked the structure of the coure overall. One piece of feedback I would add is I personally prefer canvas over github. I find Github UI is harder to use.
I think going over the labs a bit might help students understand the modules more.
It is a weird class to judge. There isn't much that June could do the way he set up the course. I wish he had come to labs. i would've appreciated taking in his knowledge.

Please identify what you consider to be the strengths of this course.

Comments
The biggest strength of this course was it's flexibility due to online videos, zoom & recordings, very generous deadlines for assignments. Also great feedback during the project and helpful advice!
Organizing the course material into modules helped me stay on top of the content and assignments.   I did not expect to learn about the history and the ethics surrounding GIS and I'm grateful that this course touched on both social and technical aspects of GIS.   The detailed instructions for each lab were easy to follow and saved me a lot of frustration and time.
Recorded lectures were super helpful to go back and watch. I like the structure of weekly modules, makes it easier to know what to expect each week from this course. Videos in each of the modules are also super helpful – saves me from searching on youtube for the same content!
I think the deadlines are fair and the combination of the labs and the assessment is appropriate.
The format is easy and the material is always available. Easy access site.
It's great having the zoom lectures recorded to review!

Please provide suggestions on how this course might be improved.

Comments
I found this course to be pretty cool.
I want June in the labs!

Please comment on course content, or any aspects, positive or negative, of your instructor's teaching, attitudes to students, class atmosphere, or any other matters affecting the quality of instruction that you consider worthy of note.

Comments
Content was good, prof's attitude was great :)
One piece of feedback I'd provide is that classes sometimes felt one–sided, not much participation other than to ask questions.
I think the instructor's attitude towards the students is helpful in creating a comfortable atmosphere.
Dr June is really kindness and patient in answering my questions. Besides, he gave me a lot of experience and help in other aspects, such as the development direction of this discipline.

Please share any feedback on your experience with the technologies used in this course.

Comments
Most course concepts were related to the ArcGIS Pro software. ArcGIS Pro was very confusing at first but over time I became more comfortable with it.
Having a slightly longer explanation of the Github portion of the course content would shorten the learning curve at the beginning of the course.
I hated that ArcGIS only gives license for 1 device. I used the activation key on my desktop tower, but I would really like to also access the software on my laptops :((
ARC GIS is a pain to use if you have a Mac but works wonderfully on windows. The lab computers need to be open on the weekend though!

Explanatory Note

Percent Favourable Rating

This is the percentage of respondents who rated the instructor a 4 or 5 (Agree or Strongly Agree).

Interpolated Median

The data collected for Student Experience of Instruction (SEI) are ordinal in nature, with a natural order (from 1 to 5). While the mean may be used as a measure of central tendency for such data, it is not an appropriate or accurate representation of SEI data (cf. Stark & Freishtat, 2014). The usual measure of central tendency for ordinal data is the median. As a result, we have been reporting the mean and the median for the last several years. After considerable thought and data modeling, we now believe that the interpolated median is the best representation of the data, since it takes the frequency distribution into account.

Consider the following example from 2015W, the two course sections have identical mean (3.8). However, the instructor in section 2 received 77% favourable (4-5) ratings, compared to 53% for the instructor in section 1. The Interpolated median values of (3.7 and 4.2), much better reflects the distribution of the scores above and below their respective median. Furthermore, the interpolated median is better correlated with percent favourable rating; such that an interpolated median of 3.5 on a Likert scale of 1 to 5, corresponds to 50% favourable rating.

Frequency Distribution

Response for University Module Item	Section 1	Section 2
5 = Strongly agree	5	5
4 = Agree	3	5
3 = Neither agree nor disagree	6	0
2 = Disagree	1	2
1 = Strongly disagree	0	1
Mean	3.8	3.8
Median	4.0	4.0
Interpolated Median	3.7	4.2
Percent favourable rating	53%	77%

Dispersion Index

The dispersion index is a measure of variability suitable for ordinal data (Rampichini, Grilli & Petrucci 2004). This dispersion index has values between zero and 1. A zero dispersion index indicates that all respondents in the section rated their experience of instruction the same. An index value of 1.0 is obtained when the respondents are split evenly between the two extreme values (Strongly Disagree & Strongly Agree), a very rare occurrence. In SEI data at UBC, the index rarely exceeds 0.85, and mostly for evaluations not meeting the minimum recommended response rate.