

Daniel K. Sewell
Peer Teaching Evaluations

BIOS:5710 Biostatistical Methods I
Fall 2021

BIOS:5720 Biostatistical Methods II
Spring 2021
Spring 2023
Spring 2024

BIOS:7600 Advanced Seminar: Statistical Analysis of Network Data
Fall 2023

BIOS:6810 Bayesian Methods and Design
Fall 2020

University of Iowa College of Public Health
Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Fall 2021

Name of Faculty Member being Observed Dan Sewell Date Oct 21st 2021

Context for Observation (e.g., lecture, lab, journal club) Biostat Methods I

Title of Presentation (if applicable) One Sample Inference / One sample Inference Lab

		strongly agree					strongly disagree	not applicable
1.	Demonstrated thorough knowledge of the subject area.	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na
2.	Actively involved learners.	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na
3.	Provided appropriate support materials (e.g., handouts).	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na
4.	Covered an appropriate amount of material for the time allotted.	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na
5.	Asked questions appropriate for the level of the learner.	6	(5)	4	3	2	1	Na
6.	Responded to questions in a clear and non-threatening way.	6	(5)	4	3	2	1	Na
7.	Organized content logically.	6	(5)	4	3	2	1	Na
8.	Used up-to-date materials and references.	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na
9.	Presented content at an appropriate level of complexity.	6	(5)	4	3	2	1	Na
10.	Presented conflicting views (if appropriate).	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na
11.	Effectively uses available time.	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na

12. Leaves enough wait time for a response to questions.	6	5	4	3	2	1	NA
13. Uses eye contact effectively.	6	5	4	3	2	1	NA
14. Gives appropriate time to topics covered.	6	5	4	3	2	1	NA
15. Seems interested in teaching.	6	5	4	3	2	1	NA

STRENGTHS:

- Students feel comfortable asking questions which made the presentation more of a discussion, which is a really good thing.
- Dan did a nice job presenting both frequentist and Bayesian approaches for the one sample inference. It was nice to see similarities and differences between frequentist and Bayesian approaches for the same example.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:

- Some of the topics were presented too abstractly. For example, when you were talking about the p-value, you might talk more about the infant birthweight data and say that the \bar{x} on the right hand side is the average birthweight we observed from our sample.

Similarly when you were talking about improper prior distributions, ^{using} too low or too high infant birthweights could ~~make~~ make it easier ~~to~~ to understand the concept.

University of Iowa College of Public Health
Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Name of Faculty Member being Observed Dan Sewell Date 2021-04-01

Context for Observation (e.g., lecture, lab, journal club) Lecture BIOS:5720

Title of Presentation (if applicable) Diagnostics / standardized regression /

		strongly agree					strongly disagree	not applicable
1.	Demonstrated thorough knowledge of the subject area.	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na
2.	Actively involved learners.	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na
3.	Provided appropriate support materials (e.g., handouts).	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na
4.	Covered an appropriate amount of material for the time allotted.	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na
5.	Asked questions appropriate for the level of the learner.	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na
6.	Responded to questions in a clear and non-threatening way.	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na
7.	Organized content logically.	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na
8.	Used up-to-date materials and references.	6	5	4	3	2	1	(Na)
9.	Presented content at an appropriate level of complexity.	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na
10.	Presented conflicting views (if appropriate).	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na
11.	Effectively uses available time.	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na

12. Leaves enough wait time for a response to questions.	⑥	5	4	3	2	1	NA
13. Uses eye contact effectively.	⑥	5	4	3	2	1	NA
14. Gives appropriate time to topics covered.	⑥	5	4	3	2	1	NA
15. Seems interested in teaching.	⑥	5	4	3	2	1	NA

STRENGTHS:

Really enjoyed the diagnostics questions / interactive "lab". In particular, the use of both graphical methods and tests, with comments on the pros and cons of each.

I like the section on standardized regression -- I think this is an important topic that is often overlooked in courses like this. For example, I've had students say that time is not important because $\beta = 0.01$, even though time is measured in days (default in R for

Great job fielding (and fostering!) questions. Very interactive class, which is wonderful to Dan is an excellent instructor, and overall seems to be doing a great job with this

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:

Personally, with regard to diagnostics, I think it's worth emphasizing that the mean relationship is much more important than variance/distribution of the error. If your mean model is correct but variance/distribution is wrong, your estimates/predictions are usually OK (if suboptimal). If you get the mean model wrong, it doesn't

Would have been nice to see a real-data example with coefs of partial determination.

Maybe you were going to get to this next time, but with regard to interactions, I'd just say that it's very much worth the time to take output from a model with an interaction, and have students calculate the slope (or treatment effect) in each group. Also, to have them work on a model involving an interaction between two continuous predictors. I've just had way too many students in survival tell me that treatment doesn't have an effect because its main effect is not significant in a model with a Trt*Age interaction. OK, it's not significant...IN

**Peer Evaluation of Teaching
College of Public Health**

Name of faculty member being observed: DANIEL SEWELL Date: 04/25/2023

Course Number and Name: BIOSTAT METHODS II BIOS:5720

Format of Course: ☒ Lecture ☐ Discussion ☐ Lab ☐ Group Work ☐ Seminar ☐ Online

Focus of Lecture: VARIABLE SELECTION / MODEL SELECTION CRITERIA

Evaluation Scale: (6) Strongly Agree (5) Agree (4) Slightly agree (3) slightly disagree (2) disagree (1) strongly disagree (NA) Not Applicable

Design

The goals and objectives are appropriately defined in the Syllabus	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Design of the web content is well organized (online course)	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA

Content

Instructor allows sufficient time for topics covered	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The material is up-to-date and relevant	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor demonstrates thorough knowledge of subject	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor presents content at an appropriate level of complexity	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor organizes content logically	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA

Delivery

Instructor shows enthusiasm for subject(s)	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor effectively uses technology to deliver course materials (e.g., PowerPoint, ICON, etc.)	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Course materials are effective (e.g. ICON, handouts, etc.)	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor organizes course web content well	6	5	4	3	2	1	(NA) ³

Communication and Interaction between Instructor and Students

Instructor actively involves learners	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor leaves enough time for a response to instructor questions	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor responds to students questions appropriately	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor uses eye contact effectively	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA

Assessment of Student Learning

Instructor clearly communicates the nature, duration, and due date of planned assessment methods	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
This instructor provides high quality instruction	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA

Approximate # of students in teaching environment: ~ 12

I will have access to the site next.

Instructional Strengths

Eye contact (good use)
Speaks clearly - Made the main points stand out -
Clearly enjoys Bayes Methods :-

Don is fantastic!-

Comments and/or Suggestions for Improvement

No suggestions!

**Peer Evaluation of Teaching
College of Public Health**

Name of faculty member being observed: Dan Sewell Date: March 7th 2024

Course Number and Name: BIOS:5720 Biostatistical Methods II

Format of Course: ☒ Lecture ☐ Discussion ☐ Lab ☐ Group Work ☐ Seminar ☐ Online

Focus of Lecture: Ordinary Least Squares (review) & ANOVA

Evaluation Scale: (6) Strongly Agree (5) Agree (4) Slightly agree (3) slightly disagree (2) disagree (1) strongly disagree (NA) Not Applicable

Design

The goals and objectives are appropriately defined in the Syllabus	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Design of the web content is well organized (online course)	6	5	4	3	2	1	(NA)

Content

Instructor allows sufficient time for topics covered	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The material is up-to-date and relevant	6	(5)	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor demonstrates thorough knowledge of subject	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor presents content at an appropriate level of complexity	6	(5)	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor organizes content logically	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA

Delivery

Instructor shows enthusiasm for subject(s)	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor effectively uses technology to deliver course materials (e.g., PowerPoint, ICON, etc.)	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Course materials are effective (e.g. ICON, handouts, etc.)	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor organizes course web content well	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA

Communication and Interaction between Instructor and Students

Instructor actively involves learners	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor leaves enough time for a response to instructor questions	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor responds to students questions appropriately	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor uses eye contact effectively	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA

Assessment of Student Learning

Instructor clearly communicates the nature, duration, and due date of planned assessment methods	6	5	4	3	2	1	(NA)
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	------

This instructor provides high quality instruction	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	-----	---	---	---	---	---	----

Approximate # of students in teaching environment: 9

Instructional Strengths

It was helpful to give the hemoglobin, favorite shoe brand, and the other survey example to illustrate the theoretical content in a more applied example.

Comments and/or Suggestions for Improvement

- When discussing $(X'X)^{-1}(X'Y)$ for the intercept-only model, it would be helpful if you wrote it up so students could visualize it.
- Perhaps this was due to the lecture I attended, which I felt was a bit too focused on the theory. I think, especially for those students who are planning to graduate after the MS degree and will work on more applied jobs, there was some room for giving more real-world, applied examples.

**Peer Evaluation of Teaching
College of Public Health**

Name of faculty member being observed: Dan Sewell Date: 10/30/2023

Course Number and Name: BIOS:7600 Statistical Analysis of Network Data

Format of Course: ☒ Lecture ☐ Discussion ☐ Lab ☐ Group Work ☐ Seminar ☐ Online

Focus of Lecture: Dependence Structures

Evaluation Scale: (6) Strongly Agree (5) Agree (4) Slightly agree (3) slightly disagree (2) disagree (1) strongly disagree (NA) Not Applicable

Design

The goals and objectives are appropriately defined in the Syllabus	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Design of the web content is well organized (online course)	6	5	4	3	2	1	(NA)

Content

Instructor allows sufficient time for topics covered	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
The material is up-to-date and relevant	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor demonstrates thorough knowledge of subject	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor presents content at an appropriate level of complexity	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor organizes content logically	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA

Delivery

Instructor shows enthusiasm for subject(s)	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor effectively uses technology to deliver course materials (e.g., PowerPoint, ICON, etc.)	6	(5)	4	3	2	1	NA
Course materials are effective (e.g. ICON, handouts, etc.)	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor organizes course web content well	6	(5)	4	3	2	1	NA

Communication and Interaction between Instructor and Students

Instructor actively involves learners	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor leaves enough time for a response to instructor questions	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor responds to students questions appropriately	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Instructor uses eye contact effectively	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA

Assessment of Student Learning

Instructor clearly communicates the nature, duration, and due date of planned assessment methods	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	-----	---	---	---	---	---	----

This instructor provides high quality instruction

(6)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
-----	---	---	---	---	---	----

Approximate # of students in teaching environment: 6 in person
2 on Zoom

Instructional Strengths

I like that the course has lectures as well as hands-on labs.
Dan asks regular questions of students and waits for an answer.

Comments and/or Suggestions for Improvement

No suggestions

University of Iowa College of Public Health
Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Name of Faculty Member being Observed Dan Sewell Date Nov 18th 2020

Context for Observation (e.g., lecture, lab, journal club) BIOS: 6810 Bayesian Methods in Design.

Title of Presentation (if applicable) Model Evaluation / Model Comparison / Bayes Factor

		strongly agree					strongly disagree	not applicable
1.	Demonstrated thorough knowledge of the subject area.	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na
2.	Actively involved learners.	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na
3.	Provided appropriate support materials (e.g., handouts).	6	(5)	4	3	2	1	Na
4.	Covered an appropriate amount of material for the time allotted.	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na
5.	Asked questions appropriate for the level of the learner.	6	(5)	4	3	2	1	Na
6.	Responded to questions in a clear and non-threatening way.	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na
7.	Organized content logically.	6	5	4	3	2	1	Na
8.	Used up-to-date materials and references.	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na
9.	Presented content at an appropriate level of complexity.	6	(5)	4	3	2	1	Na
10.	Presented conflicting views (if appropriate).	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na
11.	Effectively uses available time.	(6)	5	4	3	2	1	Na

12. Leaves enough wait time for a response to questions.	6	5	4	3	2	1	NA
As much as possible with Zoom. 13. Uses eye contact effectively.	6	5	4	3	2	1	NA
14. Gives appropriate time to topics covered.	6	5	4	3	2	1	NA
15. Seems interested in teaching.	6	5	4	3	2	1	NA

STRENGTHS:

- It was obvious that students feel comfortable asking questions.
- It may help ~~to~~ to explain the big picture at the very beginning and at the very end of the lecture. For example where would the model comparison be needed.
- Dan is very much interested in teaching this course.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:

- Avoid saying things like "this is very trivial" or "this is very easy". Some students may not find that concept easy.
- As one of the students pointed out, it was confusing from your hand-writing whether you were writing " μ_1 " or " M_1 ". I really think including those steps in your lecture notes would help prevent that. Providing more comprehensive lecture notes early in advance also enables students to study them in advance of the lecture. You could also put the steps for the BF calculation and the steps for solving the problem with plots.