

# 2020W2 UBC Individual Instructor Report for GEOB 270 202 - Geographic Information Science (June Skeeter)

Project Title: **2020W2 UBC Instructor Evaluations**

Course Audience: **69**

Responses Received: **20**

Response Ratio: **29%**

## Report Comments

**This course took place during a period of significant disruption to normal university operations, due to the COVID-19 pandemic.**

## Recommended Minimum Response Rates

Class Size	Recommended Minimum Response Rates based on 80% confidence & $\pm 10\%$ 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: **Friday, September 10, 2021****University Module Questions****University Module Questions**

Question	N	n	SD	D	N	A	SA	N/A	IM	DI
The instructor made it clear what students were expected to learn.	69	20	0	2	4	6	8	0	4.2	0.5
The instructor communicated the subject matter effectively.	69	20	0	2	3	9	6	0	4.1	0.5
The instructor helped inspire interest in learning the subject matter.	69	20	0	1	4	7	8	0	4.2	0.5
Overall, evaluation of student learning (through exams, essays, presentations, etc.) was fair.	69	20	0	0	1	9	9	1	4.4	0.3
The instructor showed concern for student learning.	69	20	0	2	2	11	5	0	4.0	0.4
Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.	69	20	0	0	4	11	5	0	4.0	0.3

Question	%Favourable
The instructor made it clear what students were expected to learn.	70%
The instructor communicated the subject matter effectively.	75%
The instructor helped inspire interest in learning the subject matter.	75%
Overall, evaluation of student learning (through exams, essays, presentations, etc.) was fair.	95%
The instructor showed concern for student learning.	80%
Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.	80%

Faculty Questions

Considering everything, how would you rate this course?

N	n	Very Poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Very Good	IM	DI
69	20	0	1	3	9	7	4.2	0.4
								%Favourable
								80%

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
69	20	0	2	4	8	6	4.0	0.5
								%Favourable
								70%

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.	69	20	0	3	6	4	1	6	3.2	0.5
High standards of achievement were set.	69	20	0	1	4	9	6	0	4.1	0.4
The instructor was generally well prepared for class.	69	20	0	0	3	8	8	1	4.3	0.4
The instructor was readily available to students outside of class (e.g., through email, office hours, or by appointment).	69	20	0	0	1	7	9	3	4.6	0.3
The instructor treated students with respect.	69	20	0	0	1	5	13	1	4.8	0.3
The instructor attempted to provide satisfactory answers to all questions in class.	69	20	0	0	6	9	5	0	3.9	0.4
The instructor established effective communication with students in the classroom.	69	19	0	1	8	7	3	0	3.6	0.4
The instructor was helpful when students requested course related assistance outside of class.	69	20	0	1	3	10	6	0	4.1	0.4
Assignments and tests were returned within a reasonable time.	69	20	0	0	5	9	6	0	4.1	0.4

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.	36%
High standards of achievement were set.	75%
The instructor was generally well prepared for class.	84%
The instructor was readily available to students outside of class (e.g., through email, office hours, or by appointment).	94%
The instructor treated students with respect.	95%
The instructor attempted to provide satisfactory answers to all questions in class.	70%
The instructor established effective communication with students in the classroom.	53%
The instructor was helpful when students requested course related assistance outside of class.	80%
Assignments and tests were returned within a reasonable time.	75%

## Open ended feedback

**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
Professor June made this class highly enjoyable. I appreciate how fun and relevant the lab activities were, and June's availability and understanding when I was having difficulties during the term. Thanks for a great learning experience!
I think June was an effective instructor overall, and I appreciated the asynchronous format of the course. I like how they tried to incorporate GIS ethics into lectures often, I think that helped me connect with GIS more. I also liked the labs, however I felt a bit lost when doing the final project. I think there could have been a bit more support for the final project because I personally felt like I wasn't confident enough to do it.
great intro course with the perfect amount of course work, the instructor adjusted the course very well to online learning
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– good TA lab office hours, helped students with lab questions, I would recommend TA office hours to be available to all students instead of having one set time for each student</li> <li>– I enjoyed and did well in the quizzes, but some of the labs were difficult due to unclear instructions; more detailed step-by-step instructions as in Labs 1 and 2, or video style instructions as in Lab 5 are necessary for this technical beginner-level GIS course</li> <li>– the fully asynchronous format and recorded lecture videos made the course flexible, though not very engaging; instructor-student engagement was limited, however instructor and TAs were always available for office hours</li> </ul>
I am very appreciative of the level of detail that the lab instructions went into. It made labs clear to follow, which is very important given the asynchronous, online course format. I also think that June was very responsive to feedback, incorporating video instructions for Lab 5 when students showed interest in it. They often incorporated real-world examples into lecture material, and their research was interesting to hear about.
A great intro to GIS! June's videos were short, and instructive. Good for online learning. Workload was manageable. Labs were the best learning experiences.
Instructor was clear and communicative through emails. Since the structure was asynchronous, there wasn't a lot of time to communicate with the professor face to face, which is reflected in some of my 'neutral' answers.
I did like to have the option of labs! I wish there were more TA's available in one lab time because once one TA went into a breakout room, sometimes they would take over half an hour to talk to a single student. It would be nice to have a TA in the main room with the rest of the students to answer quick questions. I also generally enjoyed this course and the skills I gained. I was really worried to start the project as I didn't think I had sufficient knowledge to do a project on my own, but as I started going I realized that its really intuitive once I learned more!
<p>Very engaging</p> <p>Making the lab instructions video-based was immensely helpful</p> <p>Very thoughtful for including ethics of GIS in this course</p> <p>The labs were very interesting</p> <p>Office hours were very helpful</p>
The video asynchronous aspect of the class was convenient but didn't really help us learn effectively or connect with others in the class. The course content was for the most part informative, but there was too much emphasis on social justice. I understand that June wanted us to understand how GIS can help us display inequality for social justice purposes, but this goal was only minimally reflected in the work. For example, the week 12 quiz was entirely a video and an paper talking about how black people are marginalized and the effects of racism on black people's health. Aside from a flimsy connection to geographic areas (in that certain geographic areas have more racism than others and black people live in certain areas), I failed to see how this was relevant to learning GIS in any way, and to be frank, it felt like an ineffective use of time. It felt more like June wanting us to regurgitate one singular viewpoint that they were feeding to us, without even allowing us to have any critical thinking on the subject (not that this would make it more relevant to the course). To be completely honest, the mindless reading back of info and non-relevant indulgences into social issues made me wonder sometimes if June was teaching this because they thought it was an important aspect of GIS, or because they just like talking about it. If I wanted to sign up for a social justice style course, I would have.
Solid course, definitely will be coming out of it with some sound GIS skills. While I enjoyed the ethical concerns of GIS, I felt the points were a little belabored (for instance we talked about police violence many times, redlining was discussed at the beginning and end of the course, overall considerations of how GIS can intrude on individuals was frequently discussed). Some of these ethical concerns I already find quite intuitive and would have preferred more emphasis strictly on learning the software.

## Comments

Overall I quite enjoyed the course though, the asynchronous lectures were very accommodating, and I would recommend the course and June to friends in the future.

June did a fantastic job of delivering the GEOB 270 course content throughout the term. They were incredibly accommodating to student needs, particularly given the nature of the online-learning year. They frequently checked in with students, accounted for feedback, and altered components of the course to better suit student needs. It was sometimes difficult to engage with the course due to a lack of peer interaction and ability to engage during lectures (given that they were pre-recorded lessons), but this method did have the advantage of allowing me to view lectures on my own time and at my own pace, in addition to allowing for more concise lecture content.

June also was able to apply many contemporary real-world topics to the course, such as racial justice. I immensely appreciate this content, and I found it very useful to examine the history of abuse in GIS and the potential to use it for positive outcomes. In addition, June always presented evidence for these discussion points, which I found helped engage me with the topics and make strong connections between these contemporary topics and GIS. I would definitely take a course with June again!

June was a helpful instructor when things were challenging and responded to inquiries or issues quickly and effectively. Sometimes the contents of the labs were challenging and videos showing instructions would have been more helpful for learning, which June instituted towards the end of the course. The Final Project is a very stressful and challenging assignment, so more leniency or guidance would have been more effective. The labs were much more time-consuming than listed for me as well, often exponentially in terms of time. Obviously, much of this comes down to the asynchronous style of the course.

heavy workload

## 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 Evaluations of Teaching (SEoT) 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 SEoT 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 classes have identical mean (3.8). However, the instructor in class 2 received 77% favourable (4-5) ratings, compared to 53% for the instructor in class 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 UMI	Class 1	Class 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 students in the section gave the same rating to the instructor. An index value of 1.0 is obtained when the class splits evenly between the two extreme values (Strongly Disagree & Strongly Agree), a very rare occurrence. In SEoT data at UBC, the index rarely exceeds 0.85, and mostly for evaluations not meeting the minimum recommended response rate.