



2021W1 UBC Individual Instructor Report for GEOS 270 101 - Geographic Information Science (June Skeeter)

Project Title: **2021W1 UBC Instructor Evaluations**

Course Audience: **97**

Responses Received: **46**

Response Ratio: **47%**

Report Comments

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: **Wednesday, May 25, 2022**

University Module Questions

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. | 97 | 46 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 21 | 0 | 4.4 | 0.4 |
| The instructor conducted this course in such a way that I was motivated to learn. | 97 | 46 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 18 | 13 | 0 | 3.9 | 0.6 |
| The instructor presented the course material in a way that I could understand. | 97 | 46 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 19 | 19 | 0 | 4.3 | 0.5 |
| 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. | 97 | 46 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 15 | 14 | 0 | 3.9 | 0.6 |
| The instructor showed genuine interest in supporting my learning throughout this course. | 97 | 46 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 10 | 22 | 0 | 4.4 | 0.6 |
| Overall, I learned a great deal from this instructor. | 97 | 45 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 19 | 17 | 0 | 4.2 | 0.6 |

| Question | %Favourable |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Throughout the term, the instructor explained course requirements so it was clear to me what I was expected to learn. | 80% |
| The instructor conducted this course in such a way that I was motivated to learn. | 67% |
| The instructor presented the course material in a way that I could understand. | 83% |
| 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. | 63% |
| The instructor showed genuine interest in supporting my learning throughout this course. | 70% |
| Overall, I learned a great deal from this instructor. | 80% |

Faculty Questions

Considering everything, how would you rate this course?

| N | n | Very Poor | Poor | Neutral | Good | Very Good | IM | DI |
|----|----|-----------|------|---------|------|-----------|-----|-----|
| 97 | 41 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 19 | 15 | 4.2 | 0.5 |

| %Favourable |
|-------------|
| 83% |

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 |
|----|----|----|---|---|----|----|-----|-----|
| 97 | 41 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 24 | 4.6 | 0.4 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------------|
| | | | | | | | | | %Favourable |
| | | | | | | | | | 83% |

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. | 97 | 41 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 3.5 | 0.5 |
| High standards of achievement were set. | 97 | 41 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 22 | 12 | 1 | 4.1 | 0.4 |
| The instructor was generally well prepared for class. | 97 | 41 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 25 | 1 | 4.7 | 0.3 |
| The instructor was readily available to students outside of class (e.g., through email, office hours, or by appointment). | 97 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 25 | 1 | 4.7 | 0.3 |
| The instructor treated students with respect. | 97 | 41 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 28 | 0 | 4.8 | 0.3 |
| The instructor was responsive when needed. | 97 | 41 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 24 | 0 | 4.6 | 0.4 |
| The instructor's feedback and comments contributed positively to my learning. | 97 | 41 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 18 | 2 | 4.4 | 0.5 |
| The instructor attempted to provide satisfactory answers to all questions in class. | 97 | 41 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 14 | 19 | 0 | 4.4 | 0.5 |
| The instructor established effective communication with students in the classroom. | 97 | 41 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 16 | 17 | 0 | 4.3 | 0.4 |
| The instructor was helpful when students requested course related assistance outside of class. | 97 | 41 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 20 | 0 | 4.5 | 0.5 |
| Assignments and tests were returned within a reasonable time. | 97 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 23 | 0 | 4.6 | 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. | 50% |
| High standards of achievement were set. | 85% |
| The instructor was generally well prepared for class. | 90% |
| The instructor was readily available to students outside of class (e.g., through email, office hours, or by appointment). | 88% |
| The instructor treated students with respect. | 95% |
| The instructor was responsive when needed. | 88% |
| The instructor's feedback and comments contributed positively to my learning. | 85% |
| The instructor attempted to provide satisfactory answers to all questions in class. | 80% |
| The instructor established effective communication with students in the classroom. | 80% |
| The instructor was helpful when students requested course related assistance outside of class. | 83% |
| Assignments and tests were returned within a reasonable time. | 88% |



Open ended feedback

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

| |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Comments |
| The modules were okay. The beginning was super hard because as a fellow MacBook user, I had never used Windows before and for a not so computer smart individual it was extremely confusing. Maybe if there was like a before you start anything crash course on Windows basics I would have had an easier time and not handed in late everything. |
| I wish this course could have had more readings or shown more examples of what you can do with GIS such simply showing us more websites or examples. |
| N/A |
| Not really I thought my prof did a great job of teaching the class in a way that kept me eager to learn about this course and it's materials |
| The format for the labs made it hard for me to understand them. I was more focused on finishing them within the allotted time because it was such a hassle to try and complete them on the lab computers when we didn't have time booked. As a consequence the project is becoming quite hard because I have to relearn the skills that were touched on in the earlier labs. Perhaps going through some more lab examples in lecture would be useful for showing us once again what we need to do in ArcPro |
| Hard to think of anything. Only thing that comes to mind is having the lecture notes/slides in a more accessible format (such as a single downloadable pdf file). I found I spent more time trying to string the notes together rather than adding new notes on top of the given material. |
| It was sometimes difficult to hear zoom recordings, but that was more of a technical issue. |
| The course contents can be organized better and be delivered in a more efficient way. |
| More problem solving questions – I didn't really feel like I knew how to solve GIS problems outside of the step-by-step lab instructions. |
| June is making the course materials more complex than it actually is – their explanation is very minimal thus I can't really understand what the course materials are about. This is an issue especially in labs – all we know is to follow their instructions, without actually understanding the reason behind the steps taken |
| Also, June keeps changing the materials, even when a particular module has already started. This makes it even harder to follow the course materials |
| One suggestion I have– I think it was mentioned during the interim reviews by another student– the website is quite confusing / overwhelming to me, especially at the beginning of the year. It is hard to navigate and once you click into a module, you can't go back to the main page without re opening the entire website through canvas. I would have preferred the course be done on canvas, and the lessons in the formats of PDFs or slide decks instead of just web pages– with all the additional links on the web pages I was always worried I was missing out on information. |
| The teacher was very rude and didn't care much for his students. When asked for help the professor isn't great at answering the questions. I wish I had a different teacher for this class. |
| have 2 weekly in person classes. it would make the course more engaging and thus I would have learned more. |
| It may be difficult but maybe engage more with the students during your in class lectures. I think it will be more interesting to learn such a new concept for most |
| Although there was a lot of content to go through for this course, I don't feel as if I really learned a lot. Perhaps more engaging seminars or lab times would be helpful? Or having an in-person lecture on Monday instead of posting content? |
| I think I would've benefited from a more interactive classroom environment, for example if the professor had prompted group discussions in class or facilitated a Q&A period at the end of lectures. |
| I wish that the expectations for module assignments were more clear. Initially, what I had thought was sufficient to gain full marks on a question would only result in a 75% because the requirements were not clear. For the future, it would be much more helpful for students if there was something like a rubric to go with each question. |
| I think this course would benefit from more self-directed assignments, as I felt that I didn't really understand how to use ArcGIS until working on the final project. |
| Hi June, I appreciate the hard work ethic you had for the course, despite the challenges amidst your job application. Overall I felt I learned quite a lot of new things about GIS systems, bias, and overall process design. I do have a suggestion about recorded lectures. I would highly recommend the investment in audio equipment. In particular, a microphone + audio amplifier, etc. This is because I believe your proprietary mic in your laptop is quite poor and sometimes it makes it so that it is quite hard to comprehend what you are trying to say. Aside from that, overall the quality of the lecture videos was great, just the audio suggestion is definitely a bump in quality. |
| N/A. June did a great job as the instructor. |
| I had trouble actually viewing the feedback on assignments. I'm not sure if that was a me problem or a canvas issue, but I often was only able to access a preview of the feedback and not the actual feedback itself. |

| Comments |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Nope! Fantastic prof. Very professional |
| I feel that June could have provided actual lecture slide and not just read directly off the github page. |
| I felt pretty shaky about the final project. I didn't know enough about GIS to be able to make a plan before doing an analysis. It was also very open ended, June provided project ideas which were very helpful, but more so the actually GIS actions that we could take were so open ended it was hard to figure out what to do when GIS was such a new concept to me. I wish that past final projects were shown to us so we could get a sense of how complicated our final project was supposed to be instead of a vague "It should be more complicated then the labs we've done" |

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

| |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Comments |
| the presentation of the content. |
| The one week grace policy for assignments |
| The step by step instruction videos |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – very interesting topics – enables you to learn practical skills of how to use GIS software – Instructor looks for feedback and is quick to make the adjustment |
| I think it this class is a good introductory course. None of the material was too difficult, June took their time in explaining and showing us how to do things which I really appreciated. |
| The format as well as the pacing of this course and it's modules were great. I never felt that I was being presented information or tasks out of order and in a way where I didn't have the skills and resources to understand them. |
| The strengths of this course are the multiple opportunities that Professor Skeeter gave us to succeed. They were also incredibly understanding and really emphasized open communication. The course content itself is very interesting and applicable to real world senarios. |
| N/A |
| Nearly everything |
| I like the structure of the lecture quizzes and assignments. The late policy, although I never took advantage of it was quite nice for keeping my stress levels down during the term. |
| <p>the zoom recordings are in mp4 form,which is easier to access.</p> <p>the course github page is very helpful</p> |
| Easy to follow, well laid out, promoted learning outside of the most basic concepts. |
| June did a fantastic job teaching this course. GIS is a hard subject/tool to learn but they were very reliable in their instructions. Module assignments were made much more achievable by the combination of written and visual/auditorial instructions. Still, these instructions did not take away from the learning process which was great because I now feel I can apply what I learned beyond the course. Overall, great course taught by a great professor. Would highly recommend them to any students. |
| I enjoyed how this course felt very applicable to real life and that June showed us a variety of different ways that GIS applies to different situations. I think that using a hybrid format made the learning very approachable and I very much appreciated the way June handled late assignments. |
| The modular format and the git websites were extremely helpful and guided students through every step. Great care was put into making the content and the possible issues that students might come across. Additionally, it was very helpful to have a mix of in–person and online components to the course and allowed students to work on their own time. |
| Fast marking, June and TA's are friendly and helpful, aassignments/labs are well laid out, workload is manageable. |
| to be fair, not much... except for the good choice of only having Wednesday in–person lecture, or else it would be even more excessive |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –Learned a lot about how to use GIS –Learned a lot about GIS applications –Also learned about some interesting and important background information (racial inequality, ect.) |
| The criticism of the way we look at the world (eg. ethics, colonialism) |
| The in person lectures given by June. It is clear how knowledgeable they are in the topic and they can provide us more information further than what the course generally has |
| <p>The final project was probably my most interesting project all term.</p> <p>The professor did a good job of taking into account issues of access and equity and oppression in all of their lectures.</p> |
| I like the accessibility of the course and the content being taught, as they are all very applicable to real–world tasks. I also love how June incorporated social issues into our lectures about ArcGIS as everything they brought up really heightened my interest in this course and my willingness to learn. |
| This course teaches very applicable and useful skills. |
| the labs were very accessible and straightforward |
| Dr. Skeeter created a whole new website on GitHub for this course which is a lot easier to navigate than Canvas. They also recorded every single lecture which was extremely helpful for remote learners and for those who learn at different paces. |
| The hybrid course format made this course very accessible towards our learning during a pandemic. |
| The broad scope that the course encapsulates for entry level GIS workflow |
| Useful content. |

| Comments |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| I enjoyed that this course was very application based. |
| Recorded lectures, live-stream lectures, open book exam/quizzes, flexible due dates (with limitations of course), a lot of applied learning outcomes in labs and an overall immersive experience in the complex field of GIS |
| I liked that it was so flexible with my schedule since this semester was really hectic. I also like how the professor was able to incorporate real world issues into the mapping. |
| Presented a variety of case studies that allowed us to learn the program of ArcGIS and about cartography in general. |
| Promotes a general understand of GIS processes. Professor Skeeter made the material relatable and took time to provide real world application examples. The information regarding their own work and it's relation to the course provided context and motivation to achieve a high standard of excellence in the class |
| The course provided many options or us to actively participate in the course. |
| The work load up to the final project was very reasonable. Setting deadlines but having a back up of giving an extra week to people if they need it was super helpful for me and made the term much less stressful. June made the course very accessible to everyone and was very respectful. June obviously wanted their students to succeed and was interested in our feedback throughout the course. |

Please provide suggestions on how this course might be improved.

| Comments |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Following video tutorials on the modules we have to do is not helpful when it comes to the final project. Our group was so lost and we had no idea how to even start because we did not learn anything during the semester since we were just copying everything in the videos. I'm not sure if it was the hybrid learning that made it so difficult, maybe in person would have been better. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Better recording setup for online lectures. – Some course content was really confusing. I wish there was some clarification. |
| Lol pay June Skeeter more!!! |
| I think that the placement of the group project could be changed. I understand that students need to have a certain level understanding to navigate ArcGIS on their which is why this project is at the end of term. However, with finals and individual final projects/essays for other courses aligning at the same time, it was extremely difficult to match up schedules in a timely manner and collectively collaborate on the assignment. We can't expect every member to have the same flexibility to work together with end of term scrambling, resulting in people working at odd hours (12–5am) or barely helping, rather than actually working with group members in real time. |
| The course is difficult to do only if you do not have the technology needed to support ARCGIS, otherwise, I really enjoyed this course |
| N/A |
| N/A |
| See above. Also, perhaps having an extra "class" or something similar, maybe posting more videos to cover the Arc assignments would be useful (like videos covering common mistakes or different examples on how to complete tasks) |
| I felt that the last bit of the course felt a little overwhelming between the final project, final module and learning the course content for the upcoming final exam. |
| It might be helpful to have access to all of the modules from one large page on github to avoid having to go back and forth between canvas and the github pages |
| Greater focus on student problem–solving, rather than just following along what instructor is doing. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –focus more on explanation on why a particular step is needed + don't just rush through the buttons –focus on where GIS users could get reliable resources from –have materials prepared beforehand and stick with the course syllabus as much as possible |
| Just the website vs canvas. Other than that it was a great course |
| a little bit less guidance for the labs, as I felt a bit robotic, just following step–by–step guides. And by the time we got to the final project, I had a really hard time figuring out which tools to use and how to do it. |
| More in person lectures :) I think this course is much more beneficial as an in person class considering how much of a learning curve it requires |
| I think it was easy to go through the steps of the modules without actually learning how to use GIS independently; if there's a way to design the modules in a way that prompts students to apply the tools of GIS themselves, that would be ideal. |
| Clearer explanations of what was expected of our assignment questions. |
| I think this course would benefit from more self–directed assignments, as I felt that I didn't really understand how to use ArcGIS until working on the final project. |
| a focus on problem–solving with GIS. We learn aspects of the program which is helpful but problem–solving with it was very challenging because I wasn't sure how to approach it in arc GIS. |
| If we were introduced to concepts like model builder or even had assignments like module 5 earlier on would have been nice for our understanding of the material. It would have provided more understanding of how to make the final project. Since it was a struggle to implement ideas different than what we did in class when we weren't super proficient with some of the tools in arcGIS pro. |
| Pre–recorded lectures should have higher standards of audio quality |
| I think it would be useful to learn more about troubleshooting/ what to do when you run into issues with arcGIS. |
| N/A |
| The course could be improved by providing doing more livestreamed lectures instead of pre recorded videos. |
| More detailed description of the final project, as in show us an example of the minimum complexity expected so we can aim for that and above. |

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 |
| I really enjoyed learning about indigenous culture through this class, as well as the ethics involved in GIS. |
| Course content was good but I would have liked to see more examples of applications of GIS, June was respectful but there was sometimes a lack of professionalism such as talking about pay, often enough writing mistakes in the class notes where it was sometimes hard to understand what was being said or asked of us, but overall I think the grading was fair, I liked the different portions of the assessments and the walk-through videos that June provided for the labs were veryyy helpful!! |
| N/A |
| The instructor took a lot of care in clearly detailing learning expectations and expectations for assignments. They were very patient and thoughtful detail was put into each module. |
| When my individual work and my group work needed help, we sent email, but we couldn't receive proper or helpful responses, which create challenges during my work. |
| June was very nice and helpful and was a good instructor. As I mentioned earlier, I don't know if the best pedagogy was used in this class to maximize student learning – ex. I don't feel very confident in using GIS without someone's assistance or instructions. But I know June is a pretty new instructor and I think they put a lot of effort into the course! |
| –instructor's teaching: quite unclear with lack of explanations; changing of materials even while teaching a particular module makes it even harder to follow –attitude to students: I found June to be quite cold, thus I am not as willing to ask them questions –class atmosphere: fair but not motivating |
| June was a great instructor. I think I only emailed them twice throughout the term but both times they answered my question promptly and it was very helpful. I also appreciated the integration of online vs. in person class, and I like that I was able to attend class via zoom at home or go in to school. (None of my other classes did this.) |
| there wasn't much class time, which meant that I didn't really feel any connection to other students, which is often an important part of a class. |
| The course i think requires a more personal interaction with instructors/TAs |
| The instructor was great in terms of being available for help, talking, etc. and always very understanding. However, it was the set-up of the course that made my rating for this class go down. The zoom sessions often had poor audio and the Wednesday lectures felt rushed. But once again, a very kind instructor just not a very good set-up for the course. |
| June was a very kind professor who cared about the well-being of their students. They did a very good job of constructing the syllabus of the course and remained very transparent with us about the progression of the course. They are very knowledgeable in their field of study and always remained willing to help their students. |
| I really appreciate how June incorporated critical social issues wherever they could, as this is something I don't see reflected in a lot of my other courses. |
| I appreciated that June was very to the point with their lectures, and I loved that we learned about the ethics behind GIS. I just wish we learned more problem solving or how to approach and apply problems that come up in Arc as that was a big problem in the final project. |
| Dr. Skeeter introduced us to the different jobs that we can go into if we pursue GIS, I found that very helpful. A lot of the labs made us aware of contemporary problems that GIS can identify, and that is extremely important. |
| The class is very dependant on the success of the labs, which was executed by the instructing team quite well. Bravo. |
| June did a great job as our instructor. Halfway through the term, they gave us a survey of constructive criticism to help improve the course. That showed that they cared a lot about the course and their students. Since that survey, the course rolled along smoothly. They were also readily available through email and gave great feedback for assignments/projects. In a course where there's so much to learn, they did a great job teaching it. |
| In general it was an informative and interesting course, and the professor was good at presenting the information clearly, and I appreciated the quick return time on assignments. In marking the assignments however, I did not like that the marking scale was simply a 0–4, where you could only get 50,75,or 100% for example. My biggest concern with the class was the group project. My other group members failed to contribute much throughout the project, and I was left to do most of the work. There needs to be some accountability for people who chose to do very little of the work, and put all the stress and strain on one person. |
| The content can sometime seem very dry and not very intuitive. But overall June tried to make it fun and enjoyable |

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

| Comments |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| It would be great to learn this course with open source technologies(egis,python,R) arc pro is propriety and needs a licenses. Being a public university I believe open source should be used as often |
| The geography lab computers were good but it was annoying when other people were logged in remotely and you couldn't use the computer when you were there in person. I also wish we had a proper walk-through of our to access ArcGIS remotely when on Mac. |
| The technologies used in this course were effective for the most part and the sources for retrieving data were accurate/reliable. The only technology I personally had issues with was Jupyter lab. This site was useful for geocoding when it worked but was very glitchy and difficult to have it run properly. I tried to get the code to work (restarting the kernel, logging in and out, refreshing etc) on three separate occasions before it would work. When it did work on my fourth attempt, it was very close to assignment deadline. I'm not sure what alternatives there are to this technology, if any at all, but I hope that Professor Skeeter will consider using something different in the future. |
| N/A |
| ArcGIS pro is expensive |
| As someone with no access to windows devices at home, the option to use lab computers was fantastic. Never had any problems. |
| The geography lab computers performed well and the remote desktop access was very seamless and manageable. |
| Would have been helpful for the GIS lab to be open on weekends. |
| it's certain that I won't go on and take 370/other GIS-related stuff... I found GIS to be quite frustrating to deal with, and there are always errors that I don't know how to fix (& thus feel very helpless) |
| I learned a lot about arcGIS. |
| Very good. it would have been very nice to be able to access the computer labs during the weekend before the final project was due. |
| I found it difficult to get used to. It is a software unlike any that I have used before but the instructor and TAs were very helpful |
| GitHub was a useful platform for displaying course content; however, I wish that the professor's lectures expanded more on the content published on the webpage. |
| I believe a shift to open-source software such as QGIS could be beneficial, as this is more likely to be the software students use in the future. |
| As this was a GIS course, technology was very much needed. As I can see the value in learning GIS, the program itself needs work. the remote access was nice and helpful but we did run into saving issues and lost work a few time. |
| The GitHub website was an efficient and effective tool to deliver course content. |
| I liked the format of GitHub. |
| Please improve audio quality of pre-recorded lectures, thats all! Great job overall. |
| Working through ArcGis Pro for the first time was very stressful at times, bit June and the TA's always made themselves available to help out. |
| GIS is a nightmare program that resulted in hours of frustration but I really appreciated having the opportunity to explore the different mapping tools and having so much step by step instruction and repetition in tasks which helped in creating a solid foundation with the program. |
| Lab computers were slow. |
| The mic can sometimes be very low because the mic was not on their person, but at the lectern. |

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.

