

# 2023S UBC Individual Instructor Report for GEOS 270 921 - Geographic Information Science (June Skeeter)

Project Title: **2023S UBC Instructor SEI Surveys**

Course Audience: **47**

Responses Received: **15**

Response Ratio: **32%**

## 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: **Thursday, September 7, 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.	47	14	0	0	1	5	8	0	4.6	0.3
The instructor conducted this course in such a way that I was motivated to learn.	47	14	0	0	4	3	7	0	4.5	0.5
The instructor presented the course material in a way that I could understand.	47	14	0	0	1	7	6	0	4.4	0.3
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.	47	14	0	1	1	6	6	0	4.3	0.4
The instructor showed genuine interest in supporting my learning throughout this course.	47	14	0	0	3	5	6	0	4.3	0.4
Overall, I learned a great deal from this instructor.	47	14	0	0	2	4	8	0	4.6	0.4

Question	%Favourable
Throughout the term, the instructor explained course requirements so it was clear to me what I was expected to learn.	93%
The instructor conducted this course in such a way that I was motivated to learn.	71%
The instructor presented the course material in a way that I could understand.	93%
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.	86%
The instructor showed genuine interest in supporting my learning throughout this course.	79%
Overall, I learned a great deal from this instructor.	86%

## Faculty Questions

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

N	n	Very Poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Very Good	IM	DI
47	15	0	0	2	7	6	4.3	0.4
								%Favourable
								87%

**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
47	15	1	1	0	5	8	4.6	0.5
								%Favourable
								87%

## 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.	47	15	0	1	2	4	8	0	4.6	0.5
High standards of achievement were set.	47	15	0	2	1	6	6	0	4.3	0.5
The instructor was generally well prepared for class.	47	15	0	0	0	4	11	0	4.8	0.2
The instructor was readily available to students outside of class (e.g., through email, office hours, or by appointment).	47	15	0	0	0	4	10	1	4.8	0.2
The instructor treated students with respect.	47	15	0	0	0	6	9	0	4.7	0.2
The instructor was responsive when needed.	47	15	0	0	0	5	9	1	4.7	0.2
The instructor's feedback and comments contributed positively to my learning.	47	15	0	1	0	6	8	0	4.6	0.4
The instructor attempted to provide satisfactory answers to all questions in class.	47	15	0	1	1	4	9	0	4.7	0.4
The instructor established effective communication with students in the classroom.	47	15	0	0	0	5	10	0	4.8	0.2
The instructor was helpful when students requested course related assistance outside of class.	47	15	0	0	1	4	10	0	4.8	0.3
Assignments and tests were returned within a reasonable time.	47	15	0	0	0	2	13	0	4.9	0.1

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.	80%
High standards of achievement were set.	80%
The instructor was generally well prepared for class.	100%
The instructor was readily available to students outside of class (e.g., through email, office hours, or by appointment).	100%
The instructor treated students with respect.	100%
The instructor was responsive when needed.	100%
The instructor's feedback and comments contributed positively to my learning.	93%
The instructor attempted to provide satisfactory answers to all questions in class.	87%
The instructor established effective communication with students in the classroom.	100%
The instructor was helpful when students requested course related assistance outside of class.	93%
Assignments and tests were returned within a reasonable time.	100%

## Open ended feedback

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

#### Comments

June presented the class with innumerable opportunities to reach out for support. There really isn't much more they could have offered. Whether a student took advantage of that help or not was entirely up to that student.

– I really wish I had shared this during the course, but the instructor constantly ended lecture at 2 PM instead of at 1:50 as is customary at UBC. This wouldn't have been that big of an issue, if they hadn't constantly done 1–3 clicker questions (which counted towards our grade) during this time. At least 20% of my participation mark was lost because I had another commitment I had to go to and had to leave at 1:50

– PLEASE use iclicker instead of TopHat. I wasn't able to get it set up properly at the start and it constantly glitched later in the term, and I don't understand what the benefit is of this service especially when every other course uses iclicker

– Please check if all the links on canvas work properly. A number of the links in the course either link to the old 22W site, or are actually just wrong. This was extremely frustrating during the course

For a summer course, I would suggest eliminating the group project. It was difficult to arrange a group and I didn't find it aided in my understanding of ArcGIS Pro. I would have preferred a midterm, considering there are no tests before the final and I am not sure what to expect for that examination.

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

#### Comments

Initially, I was worried about the course layout being hosted on a different website. Very quickly I realized this was far preferred than anything Canvas has to offer. Not only was access to the course material on github streamlined, but June had every lab and lecture slide posted before the semester even started. I cannot overstate how incredibly helpful that is. Seriously. Kudos to June.

The labs were well laid out and helpful, especially with the videos.

Well thought out and organized so all information is easy to follow

The format Dr. Skeeter created for this course is awesome. They have made learning GIS so easy for me. I think the labs and corresponding lectures build on each other really well, and I love the policy that on-time assignments will be graded first and with feedback, while late assignments within four days only have the penalty of being graded later. It's very helpful to have that flexibility. I also think the due dates are paced well. I also really appreciated accommodations to be able to do the final project independently.

– Piazza was super helpful

Super cool software with nice applications, was fun to learn

Great example of how instructors can integrate EDI in the coursework/curriculum.

Good hands-on applications of course content in labs.

– Great intro to GIS

### Please provide suggestions on how this course might be improved.

#### Comments

Honestly, I think the remainder of this semester should dictate more self-teaching by each individual. I'm not super confident in mapping programs, but there are probably enough resources on github (and those I can source myself) to figure out how to strengthen my weakest spots.

Felt like a lot of information in a big chunk but I understand this is most likely due to it being a summer course layout.

A pretty lecture heavy course—maybe a few discussions in class to encourage a bit more engagement

– Pace was a bit difficult in terms of labs

The structure of the labs is very inefficient. You need to use both the videos AND the text, but it's not natural or intuitive. I find myself missing steps or information because I relied too much on one or the other. It also makes the course less accessible, and especially when transcriptions can be taken from videos, I don't understand why it can't either a) all be one large video with annotations that you can follow step by step or b) a series of steps completely written out in text.

The videos also sometimes included steps that changed the instructions, and this once led to me submitting the wrong information in the chart because I followed the video instead. This was frustrating since I clearly understood the concepts, but was led astray since the direct information to be included in the question was on the website lab questions sections, not in the lab instructions, lab videos, or canvas quiz itself.

In addition, I found a lot of the questions to be ambiguous, and found myself unsatisfied with the answers provided.

Summer courses are tough – they are just full on and there isn't much to do about it.

More real-world examples to explain different GIS techniques and apply them to concepts we may be already familiar with.

– TopHat questions I feel should be shorter. 30 seconds perhaps. They can break up class and make me lose concentration when they were too long.

**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

The preconceptions I came into this course with were quickly subdued by June's instruction. Colleagues that had taken this course in the Jan–Apr 2023 semester had warned me that it was not only difficult, but a visceral headache to add on top of other course loads. Needless to say, I was very much worried and not looking forward to this course. However, after the first week of classes, my nerves nearly fell flat. Contextually, even with a condensed course load, I've only been taking one other course this semester, and have continued to work part–time outside of school, so my free time is greater than that of most people's (including my own) during the Jan–Apr semester (I also work part–time then but take 2x the amount of courses), so I don't doubt my colleagues had a difficult time then. But June deserves the credit where credit is due. Instructions were above–average at minimum and usually very explicit. Lectures were highly accessible (zoom connection worked so well for my schedule), and having the opportunity to remote connect to the lab computer from home made my work all the more uncomplicated. I commend June for deciphering some of the most difficult aspects about GIS for people like me who are not very literate when it comes to cartography or computer work. Though I have yet to feel decently prepared for the exam next week, I am not fretting it as much as I thought I would. The past two months have been really stressful for me in my personal life, and the last thing I wanted was to have to struggle in school on top of other things. But that didn't happen. Thank you, June. Professors like you are the ones students like me will remember for years to come. Cheers for an educational, highly thought–provoking and informative semester. Good luck with your future endeavours ! 🐼 🐼 🐼

Dr. Skeeter is by far one of the best professors/lecturers I've ever had. They are supportive, helpful, engaging, approachable, and very knowledgeable. Their course layout is incredible – I've never had a more organized instructor – and I'm so impressed by how well they use Github as a class website. I would highly recommend Dr. Skeeter's class to anyone interested in geography or GIS.

Keeping in mind my positionality ;) I Cr/D/F this course, so I definitely wasn't as involved as some students simply because I didn't have the time and largely took this course for fun, that being said, the prof was very interesting to listen too and clearly understands the topic well – and definitely knew how to communicate their expertise in a way that was easily understandable to a beginner. It was nice :)

June is a really excellent instructor – they're engaging, informative, available and really know the material.

– I feel like another unit could be added. Also I noticed lab attendance dwindled as the semester progressed.

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

#### Comments

lab computers were very helpful and made labs easier.

Remote access to the Geography lab computers was really easy and efficient for me. The course Github website was awesome.

Piazza worked okay – I liked that there was a public place where questions could be posted, but it's also true there were a lot of little technical details to keep track of in the course, and adding another site might have been too much. Sometimes I would forget that we needed to have TopHat ready for lectures and I wouldn't be able to log–in fast enough to answer the first question. I did like having these little questions during lectures though.

# Explanatory Note

## Percent Favourable Rating

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

## Interpolated Median

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

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

**Frequency Distribution**

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

## Dispersion Index

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