**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 & ± 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**

blue®

## 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. | 76 | 28 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 14 | 0 | 4.5 | 0.4 |
| The instructor communicated the subject matter effectively. | 76 | 27 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 4.5 | 0.4 |
| The instructor helped inspire interest in learning the subject matter. | 76 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 16 | 0 | 4.6 | 0.3 |
| Overall, evaluation of student learning (through exams, essays, presentations, etc.) was fair. | 76 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 18 | 1 | 4.8 | 0.2 |
| The instructor showed concern for student learning. | 76 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 12 | 0 | 4.3 | 0.4 |
| Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. | 76 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 4.3 | 0.3 |

| Question | %Favourable |
|---|---|
| The instructor made it clear what students were expected to learn. | 93% |
| The instructor communicated the subject matter effectively. | 85% |
| The instructor helped inspire interest in learning the subject matter. | 89% |
| Overall, evaluation of student learning (through exams, essays, presentations, etc.) was fair. | 100% |
| The instructor showed concern for student learning. | 82% |
| Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. | 89% |

## Faculty Questions

**Considering everything, how would you rate this course?**

| N | n | Very Poor | Poor | Neutral | Good | Very Good | IM | DI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 76 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 14 | 4.5 | 0.3 |

| | %Favourable |
|---|---|
| | 93% |

**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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 76 | 27 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 17 | 4.7 | 0.5 |

| | %Favourable |
|---|---|
| | 74% |

## 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. | 76 | 27 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 12 | 3.6 | 0.6 |
| High standards of achievement were set. | 76 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 7 | 1 | 4.1 | 0.3 |
| The instructor was generally well prepared for class. | 76 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 13 | 2 | 4.5 | 0.3 |
| The instructor was readily available to students outside of class (e.g., through email, office hours, or by appointment). | 76 | 28 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 20 | 1 | 4.8 | 0.4 |
| The instructor treated students with respect. | 76 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 23 | 2 | 4.9 | 0.1 |
| The instructor attempted to provide satisfactory answers to all questions in class. | 76 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 13 | 0 | 4.5 | 0.3 |
| The instructor established effective communication with students in the classroom. | 76 | 27 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 14 | 6 | 0 | 4.0 | 0.4 |
| The instructor was helpful when students requested course related assistance outside of class. | 76 | 26 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 4.4 | 0.4 |
| Assignments and tests were returned within a reasonable time. | 76 | 28 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 4.3 | 0.5 |

University of British Columbia Course Evaluation

| 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. | 53% |
| High standards of achievement were set. | 81% |
| The instructor was generally well prepared for class. | 96% |
| The instructor was readily available to students outside of class (e.g., through email, office hours, or by appointment). | 89% |
| The instructor treated students with respect. | 100% |
| The instructor attempted to provide satisfactory answers to all questions in class. | 89% |
| The instructor established effective communication with students in the classroom. | 74% |
| The instructor was helpful when students requested course related assistance outside of class. | 81% |
| Assignments and tests were returned within a reasonable time. | 79% |

## 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 |
|---|
| This is a fantastic class and I am very fortunate to have had such a positive experience with June and the TA's |
| One aspect of the course that was beneficial was how valuable the lab assignments were in aiding in my understanding of the course material. Additionally, I liked the weekly quizzes because they helped keep me accountable to the course material.<br>In terms of the lab instructions, an improvement I recommend is to use a combination of written and video format lab instructions because they were both beneficial in their own ways. Written was helpful to quickly refer back to later, but it was often confusing and long. The video instructions were easier to follow but they were quite lengthy in terms of time. Also, I would have appreciated a few more expectations for the lab 5 report because it was a bit unclear what students were expected to include in the report, word count/length, and other details.<br>Overall, the instructor did a great job throughout the course and was very accessible to students if help was needed! |
| I think if anything, having a descriptive header over each week's module explaining the main theme would be helpful to understand the big ideas of the course. With so many 'abstract' concepts learnt throughout the semester, at times it was difficult to see their connections with others, but having clear weekly themes would help clarify a bit.<br><br>I also really appreciate Professor Skeeter's organization of the canvas page, it was incredibly well organized and always up to date, which is much appreciated. |
| unfortunately, this class was difficult to love because we never ever got a chance to be live in class with June. Given that, we could not ask questions live and were left for the lab to have to bombard our TA with questions about labs. Often, labs were sometimes not very clear, and there a lot of spelling mistakes or words missing that could have helped us smoother navigate arcGis. That being said, the format used for Lab 4, doing visual learning, being able to do the lab while watching visual step by steps made the class easier to follow along with. The grading was fair, the class is not overly complicated, just tedious, and I believe it could have been easier if the instructions were better presented and at least one class a week was asynchronous. |
| i really liked how june included a lot of content on racial disparities, biases, ethics, and social justice, tying it back to GIS methods. These are extremely important topics to discuss and i feel not enough instructors talk about them enough. Also very considerate of students who had difficulties throughout the semester during this pandemic, gave extensions where they were needed, and was always happy to schedule office hours or communicate through email. I'm really horrible with computer/techy things, but this course was made engaging through the interesting topics. |
| I think that this class could potentially be quite dry... but June made it so interesting, incorporating tons of case studies (a lot of their own work) relating to very current issues. Like many profs, June acknowledged the difficulties of attending university during a pandemic – but they actually did something about it, making lectures short, weekly quizzes simple, and allowing us to take the final exam anytime over a 3–day period. I wish I could have met or spoken to June, because I really admire their work, and how they help students consider the applicability of GIS tools to social justice issues. |
| I felt like June really cared about us, because they checked in with us throughout the semester to see how we were doing and if their teaching style was effective, and made adjustments throughout the course (like changing the format of the labs) to teach it in a way that worked best for us. |
| I loved this course! June was an excellent professor – they were clear, kind, helpful. I really appreciated the emphasis that they placed on ethics and social justice in the GIS context. Thanks June! |
| Given online school, I would have benefitted from synchronous learning rather than recorded lectures. June stimulated my interest in GIS and lead me develop an appreciated for data science and surrounding ethics. Overall, very effective professor and course. |
| I liked how the labs were modified later in the term so we got to hear June talking more instead of just reading material! It was great that June & the teaching team were adaptive for that. |
| June provided a very open and safe learning environment for students. I personally found the lab instructions a bit hard to follow, the last lab with video instructions were a lot more clear and easier to understand. |
| I found that even though following written instructions was a little more challenging then the last lab that had video instructions, I felt that it required more focus and I retained more information by generating questions, and being able to reach out to my TAs when I needed assistance. Considering this is a course where you're learning how to use 'tools' and |

University of British Columbia Course Evaluation

| Comments |
|---|
| learn a system, sometime troubleshooting and making mistakes allows you to learn quicker. |
| June was an effective and knowledgeable teacher, and made me interested in the subject matter. They helped engage students and encouraged thought about more in–depth concepts. They were helpful and available out of class through office hours or appointment. |
| June did a great job in instructing the course by creating a positive and inclusive learning environment and was readily available for help and questions. I enjoyed how the lectures discussed real–world and current global issues and that we not only learned the foundation of GIS but were able to apply our learning through lab and see real world applications. Furthermore, the lab sessions were very helpful and June provided excellent instruction for each one. Overall this course was my favorite one this term! |
| It was really nice to see some diversity within the UBC staff by having a non–binary professor (it was great to practice my pronouns!). I think the nature of the course being very technology heavy and me not being a tech expert caused a lot of problems and stress on some of the projects we were doing because I ran into a lot if issues. This wasn't on the fault of the professor but was definitely the result of my lack of technological abilities. I really appreciated that later in the course the professor changed the format of our projects to include more instructional videos for the projects which helped me a lot. That reduced the time I had to spend just working on the projects from around having to try to dedicate about 8–10 hours to a lab compared to just 3 or so hours (yeah I'm really that bad at technology). Along with the instructional videos I also liked how the professor included more resources to research the tools we were using because prior to the change in the format I didn't really know what I was doing because I was just following the steps like a recipe. I think the lecture materials were interesting and definitely sparked a curiosity in the actually field work of GIS. |
| I think this class would have felt much more manageable in an in person formant, but given the circumstances I think June did a great job inspiring interest and preparing materials for us to use |
| I am very pleased with June's ability to combine their love for social justice with GIS. Personally, that was the highlight of this course. Perhaps in some areas in the course, June lacked enthusiasm, but at the same time that could just be their demeanour. I am grateful that they adjusted some aspects of the course along the way (like adding video instructions to our labs) to better suit online school. |
| June was clear and used effective teaching methods. They were a little dry and somewhat non–enthusiastic in explanations. Overall I gained a lot from the course and enjoyed the learning material and assignments. Lab sessions provided an opportunity to ask questions with the TA about our assignments and nothing more (which was really all that was necessary to complete the assignments from my perspective.) I felt i had lots of opportunity to ask questions if I ever got stuck. |

# 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.