

2022W1 UBC Individual Instructor Report for GEOS 270 101 - Geographic Information Science (June Skeeter)

Project Title: **2022W1 UBC Instructor SEI Surveys**

Course Audience: **94**

Responses Received: **33**

Response Ratio: **35%**

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: **Tuesday, January 3, 2023**

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.	94	32	2	1	0	10	19	0	4.7	0.5
The instructor conducted this course in such a way that I was motivated to learn.	94	33	2	0	6	11	14	0	4.3	0.5
The instructor presented the course material in a way that I could understand.	94	33	3	0	0	9	21	0	4.7	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.	94	33	2	0	5	10	16	0	4.5	0.5
The instructor showed genuine interest in supporting my learning throughout this course.	94	33	2	0	1	11	19	0	4.6	0.4
Overall, I learned a great deal from this instructor.	94	33	2	0	2	10	19	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.	76%
The instructor presented the course material in a way that I could understand.	91%
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.	79%
The instructor showed genuine interest in supporting my learning throughout this course.	91%
Overall, I learned a great deal from this instructor.	88%

Faculty Questions

Considering everything, how would you rate this course?

N	n	Very Poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Very Good	IM	DI
94	33	1	1	1	9	21	4.7	0.4

	%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
94	32	2	0	3	3	24	4.8	0.4

								%Favourable
								84%

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.	94	33	2	2	7	8	13	1	4.1	0.6
High standards of achievement were set.	94	33	1	0	3	12	17	0	4.5	0.4
The instructor was generally well prepared for class.	94	33	1	1	0	3	28	0	4.9	0.3
The instructor was readily available to students outside of class (e.g., through email, office hours, or by appointment).	94	33	1	1	1	11	18	1	4.6	0.4
The instructor treated students with respect.	94	33	2	0	0	1	30	0	5.0	0.3
The instructor was responsive when needed.	94	33	1	1	0	10	20	1	4.7	0.4
The instructor's feedback and comments contributed positively to my learning.	94	33	2	1	1	13	15	1	4.4	0.5
The instructor attempted to provide satisfactory answers to all questions in class.	94	33	2	0	0	4	27	0	4.9	0.3
The instructor established effective communication with students in the classroom.	94	33	2	1	1	8	21	0	4.7	0.5
The instructor was helpful when students requested course related assistance outside of class.	94	33	1	2	0	9	21	0	4.7	0.4
Assignments and tests were returned within a reasonable time.	94	33	1	0	0	4	28	0	4.9	0.2

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.	66%
High standards of achievement were set.	88%
The instructor was generally well prepared for class.	94%
The instructor was readily available to students outside of class (e.g., through email, office hours, or by appointment).	91%
The instructor treated students with respect.	94%
The instructor was responsive when needed.	94%
The instructor's feedback and comments contributed positively to my learning.	88%
The instructor attempted to provide satisfactory answers to all questions in class.	94%
The instructor established effective communication with students in the classroom.	88%
The instructor was helpful when students requested course related assistance outside of class.	91%
Assignments and tests were returned within a reasonable time.	97%

Open ended feedback

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

Comments
Other practical GIS examples
In class, the instructor could provide more in depth explanations of ArcGIS tools and how to use them.
Challenge us more throughout the term in labs. It was a bit hard to go from labs that sort of held our hands to doing a project where we are on our own.
NA
The only thing I didn't find that helpful was when we would go through demonstrations of ArcGIS during lecture, I didn't get much out of that in lecture because I would kind of forget what we went through once it was time for me to do it myself and you can't really take notes on that. But I also understand that some people in the class would find it helpful and June may just be catering to different learning styles so it is not really a problem, it is just the only piece of feedback I can think of.
n/a
I think June is a great professor, though they could show a little more passion for the class. I'm sure as a PhD holder they don't necessarily want to be teaching this course, but a little bit of passion would go a long way. Aside from this, June is amazing and put the course together super well Lots of effort was obviously put into this course
I don't really have negative feedback for June
Expectations were not always clear. Course policies were inconsistent, which became a bit confusing. Skeeter seemed well-informed on the subject, but they were not effective communicator. I didn't feel that the course was very engaging. To improve, I think that Skeeter could use more simple language when teaching, as this is an introductory course. I also think that they could try to be more enthusiastic about the subject. I can tell that they care about the subject, but they didn't seem to communicate that with enthusiasm. I think that they could make expectations more clear. Based on my experience, I would not recommend Skeeter to a student interested in taking this course.
N/A
I loved this course, the material was presented in a very understandable way and i have no complaints!!
Provide more interactive learning. I feel like I only followed steps and did not learn anything. The labs were straightforward forward but I feel as though the final assignment did not do them justice, most fellow students I spoke to had similar issues where all the lab work they did felt only partially translatable. The grading scheme needs more clarity rather than its obscure state at the moment. I feel as though the professor overestimated to total knowledge of students despite it being an introductory course. Frankly, despite it being an interesting field, this course has discouraged me from wanting to continue GIS.
I don't think so
Make the slides on the course website available as a PDF for easier annotation. I also think that I would have benefited from an earlier timeline regarding the final project. While the project was introduced pretty early, and the information was available from the onset of the course, it would have been helpful to get the proposal feedback earlier than two weeks before the final project was due.

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

Comments
This class was very transparent and the prof outlined exactly what we needed to learn. It was a very engaging class and it motivated to engaged in the class material
Basic Knowledge Workflow Attention to procedural development
The course has a good flow and moves at a comfortable pace.
digestible and interesting content
I really enjoyed how the course content was split up into very clear modules, so it was easy to see how the content we learned in class matched up to our lab assignments. All of the information was clearly on the course website, which I preferred greatly to having textbook readings. Overall the class was very well organized and taught very clearly and well. June was a great professor and I loved this class!
spacing between labs , grace period, lab length time, course website, lab structure (videos), lecture content
The course is genuinely interesting and does a really good job of understanding that this is an introduction class, it does not go too fast or assume the students have any prior knowledge of GIS. I also like the structure of lectures combined with weekly practical applications within the labs. The labs were also made significantly easier to understand and more manageable because of all of June's work to create videos that we could follow along with. Also, I really enjoyed we got to experience of dealing with relevant everyday examples of data, most of our lab projects worked with data and trends in BC, which made it more personal and engaging.
The breadth of uses and applicability for GIS was well explained and taught. Lectures were very useful for explaining broad/fundamental concepts
The use of screen recordings in labs made the tasks more easily understandable, and I found TopHat to be effective for testing our understanding during lecture and encouraging participation.
Very clear about what we were expected to learn.
good distinction between lecture and lab content, and lectures helped prepare students for the labs
The course is challenging, but good grades are reasonably achievable
The tophat participations for free points ensured that I practiced effective note taking during lectures.
Great intro course Helps develop conceptual understanding quite well Labs were fun and super well put together
I really liked the hybrid format of this course.
The grace period surrounding labs and other submission was extremely helpful. It definitely made it feel like the instructor cared and thought about our individual performance, and allowed us to advance at our own pace while still keeping up with the rest of the course material. Given the technical nature of this course, this was greatly appreciated.
Get to know the basic of GIS
It provided lots of practical skills and it was very focused on useful skills and knowledge, but it also provided helpful information about broader concepts and ethics/dilemmas within geography and how to use those skills well
The instructor made the topics easy to understand and made me want to learn.
The course was really well layed out. We still learned a lot but I never felt overwhelmed. June's flexible due dates were really nice because although most of the time I could meet the deadline when I really needed it I could still submit my best work
Labs were straightforward.
The strengths of this course are all thanks to the instructor, June. I liked that we went over the materials before we had to do the related lab, so we were always prepared for the lab, and that June explained the material with lots of examples and in a very clear way. I also greatly appreciate the very clear instructions for the lab activities, as that really helped me whenever I got confused or stuck on something.
Less of a grades-based course and more of an open learning course. Having larger labs but every other week was really nice as it let me choose when to do it if I had a busy week. I know having an in-person course but also using zoom is tough but it really was helpful if I was sick or had to miss a class. Having tophat as free marks for attending was good. I also really liked the finals format.

Please provide suggestions on how this course might be improved.

Comments
More practical GIS examples in the classroom to visualize data and shoe useful applications in climate solutions!
n/a
NA
The only thing I can think of is two minor things. 1) I think the module quizzes could have been shortened slightly, sometimes I found that some of the module questions were redundant or unnecessary and just made extra work and 2) I think it would be really beneficial and engaging to move the lecture on GIS ethics and applications to the beginning of the course, or split the content into two parts, one at the beginning and one at the end. I think it would be really interesting to hear about a lot of that content (especially the stuff about how it affects people's lives and why it is important) at the beginning to know to kind of guide the rest of the course and get excited and engaged with GIS.
A bit more focus on, or time spent explaining, the tools available in arcGIS. Also, I think a summary question at the end of each module similar to Module 5 would be useful to help students understand the processes that they performed within their lab assignments. I sometimes felt as if I was just following instructions and not really learning what each process/analysis method was or did.
While I prefer the course website being on github instead of Canvas, it is a bit frustrating that all/most of the pages within the website aren't made immediately accessible from the homepage. Having to go searching for a module link on the homepage, then searching further for a specific resource within that page is a bit confusing and time-consuming. It's also a bit tough to remember where I once saw a resource that I want to refer back to. Additionally, even though I learned a lot about ArcGIS Pro throughout the course, I felt like I was in over my head with the final project. This may just be because ArcGIS Pro is so extensive and I'm generally not well-versed in using such complex software, but the assignment was intimidating and I didn't feel totally qualified to execute it even with two peers. That being said, June and Sierra were very helpful with making sure everything ran smoothly and we could ultimately get the project done.
maybe more interactive learning opportunities?
The lecture content was a bit dense and redundant
Labs were engaging and manageable, but they were too long for an introductory course. I think that the labs could be simplified given that this is a lower-level course.
N/A
The labs are very step-by-step, which is nice because we can easily do what we need to do on arcGIS, but to a certain extent it is disadvantageous for us because we aren't fully "learning" why or how to do certain things. It is very easy to follow along instructions on what to click, but to recreate the processes in our minds, knowing what tools to use and when in order to get the end results we're looking for, was a skill that was harder to acquire throughout the labs. I do still think that it's important to give detailed instructions, but maybe giving less detail in later labs where we should know how to do certain processes that we've done before. This is something that I noticed was done in later labs. I only really gained problem-solving skills in arcGIS while doing the final project. I also found the final group project to be quite difficult, running into many issues on arcGIS. Myself and my group members invested an immense amount of time into our project, and perhaps we overcomplicated it at some points but overall the expectations for us were maybe just a tad bit much.
A different teaching method would be better. Make it not required.
While this might not be helpful, I literally cannot think of any way to improve this course. It was a surprisingly pleasant experience :)
To be honest, I don't have any suggestions. This course was really well done!

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 would love to join another class with June as the instructor. I was motivated a lot to explore GIS field, and provided any support I need to accomplish success in the course.
Excellent environment! More in-class collaboration and support!
The instructor was enthusiastic and showed a strong interest in the course topics.
enjoyable course. Prof has evident passion for teaching/GIS. easily available for help. Structure of course/workload was fitting. Challenging but not overwhelming.
I was seriously so impressed with how dedicated June is to the course material and to the students. In so many aspects I could tell they were going above and beyond for their students, it felt like they really understand what it is like to be a student in a way that not a lot of other instructors are. They made the course incredibly accessible, were understanding, and really engaged.
June genuinely cared about our learning, and especially how our final projects were going which was great. Their accessibility outside of class time during the final project period was also much appreciated.
I really appreciated a lot of the elements June incorporated into the course. Their active effort to tie GIS to social justice principles helped me understand some of the potential GIS has in combatting big-picture systemic injustices, and they made a point to give us general suggestions for employment opportunities in the field. I also like how they are quite laid-back and incorporate a bit of humour into their lectures here and there – it makes them feel more relatable and easy to talk to, and I never felt intimidated to approach them with questions or ask for help. I took (and dropped) GEOS 270 with a different professor before and I found the content a bit dull, dense and daunting, but I had a much better experience with it this time around. I'm planning to pursue GIS further beyond 270 largely because I found June's method of structuring/presenting the info easier to wrap my head around, and I even found it quite interesting! It was a steep learning curve but I found they provided a lot of support and additional resources to students throughout the semester. Overall, June did a great job teaching this course and I think they are very cool. I will likely be referring back to the course website in the future if/when I use ArcGIS, GEE, etc. again.
Both the instructor and TA's were very helpful and there was always a good vibe in class. Not stressful (but still challenging at a student), instructor never forced students to answer questions in class (very good)
Lectures often dragged on the content often felt unrelated to lab material
June was a great professor to deal with, very approachable and respectful
I didn't get the impression that teaching was something that Skeeter was passionate about. Course policies were fair, but used inconsistently, which created confusion. Skeeter cares about the subject, but did not seem enthusiastic.
June was always ready to help students when needed. It was also clear that they highly took students interests into consideration when designing the course and provided an appropriate structure to the class that allowed for students to advance at their own pace while keeping track of the rest of the course. The many bonus exercises and other possibilities to improve ones grade were also greatly appreciated. The fact that the lectures were also recorded live made for a more accessible class.
TA are really helpful in the labs which makes life much easier.
I really liked both the course content and the teaching style, and I liked that the instructor provided helpful examples and context in the lessons and also taught us how to use the technology in a responsible and conscious way
Overall i really enjoyed this course and it has made me more interested in GIS, a subject area i had no idea about before!
June was a helpful instructor and they went at a good pace during class. Most of the time though, we would be let out early (20–40 mins), which makes me wonder if there is other good uses of time that could be allocated for during lecture time. Perhaps additional office hour/question time, lab help time, etc. Or if the content and speed at which we learned it was evenly spaced throughout the semester.
It was very monotone and felt non-engaging at all. There was no incentive to learn aside from completing the course.
While I found the topic of GIS to be not quite my cup of tea, June explained things in a way that made it easy to understand, and provided more than enough instructions and materials to make sure we were well prepared for the lab section.
The lecture's were pretty good! There wasn't that much class participation aside from tophat but that's not a huge deal, just something I noticed.
June had some of the most thoughtful and accessible course approaches/designs I have seen in a long time. Even as a student that doesn't have any formalized accommodations, I felt like I had the adaptability in a course that I've always needed. It goes to show that when you make a class more accessible, it benefits everyone not only those with disabilities!

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

Comments
ARC GIS PRO was great, make it easier for students to save in the H-Drive and access after the class ends!
Technology was often readily available and easy to use
course website was easy to navigate. In course lecture slides easy to access and understand.
Technology generally seemed to work fine for me, though I know I others had some real struggles with arcGIS.
TopHat was helpful!
Why are we paying so much for a course and then having to pay more to access the geog computer lab? – liked that the instructor had lectures in person and available on zoom
The technology used in this course was complex, but very engaging!
Recording the lecture live on zoom was a great way to make the class more accessible + June made sure to answer the online as well as the in-person questions at an equal rate. TopHat was also a nice way to interact with the class material as the lecture was going on, as it didn't place too much pressure on students given that they were fairly easy questions, but instead was just a quick and easy way for us tp test our attentiveness.
Tophat is good way to interact
The geography lab computers were very handy and a helpful tool in my learning.
Please upload the slides as PDF so we can download them. I like to annotate my slides on OneNote (other students may use other note-taking apps) so it was hard for me to have to screenshot and
Tophat would freeze and not give me ample time for me to answer. I feel like there would be a better way to incentivize engagement.

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.