

Project Title: 2018W2 UBC Student Evaluation of Teaching

Course Audience: 19	Assessee Audience: 19
Responses Received: 7	Responses Received: 7
Response Ratio: 36.84%	Response Ratio: 36.84%

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 29, 2019**

University Module Questions

University Module Questions

Question	N	n	SD	D	N	A	SA	N/A	IM	DI	Mean	STDEV
The instructor made it clear what students were expected to learn.	19	7	0	0	0	1	6	0	4.92	0.12	4.86	0.38
The instructor communicated the subject matter effectively.	19	7	0	0	0	2	5	0	4.80	0.20	4.71	0.49
The instructor helped inspire interest in learning the subject matter.	19	7	0	0	0	0	7	0	5.00	0.00	5.00	0.00
Overall, evaluation of student learning (through exams, essays, presentations, etc.) was fair.	19	7	0	0	0	0	7	0	5.00	0.00	5.00	0.00
The instructor showed concern for student learning.	19	7	0	0	0	0	7	0	5.00	0.00	5.00	0.00
Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.	19	7	0	0	0	0	7	0	5.00	0.00	5.00	0.00

Question	%Favourable
The instructor made it clear what students were expected to learn.	100.00%
The instructor communicated the subject matter effectively.	100.00%
The instructor helped inspire interest in learning the subject matter.	100.00%
Overall, evaluation of student learning (through exams, essays, presentations, etc.) was fair.	100.00%
The instructor showed concern for student learning.	100.00%
Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.	100.00%

Faculty Questions

Instructor Questions

Question	N	n	SD	D	N	A	SA	N/A	IM	DI	Mean	STDEV
In classes where the size of the class and content of the course were appropriate, student participation in class was encouraged by the instructor.	19	7	0	0	0	0	7	0	5.00	0.00	5.00	0.00
High standards of achievement were set.	19	7	0	0	0	2	5	0	4.80	0.20	4.71	0.49
The instructor was generally well prepared for class.	19	7	0	0	0	0	7	0	5.00	0.00	5.00	0.00
The instructor was readily available to students outside of class (e.g., through email, office hours, or by appointment).	19	7	0	0	0	0	7	0	5.00	0.00	5.00	0.00
The instructor treated students with respect.	19	7	0	0	0	0	7	0	5.00	0.00	5.00	0.00
The instructor attempted to provide satisfactory answers to all questions in class.	19	7	0	0	0	0	7	0	5.00	0.00	5.00	0.00
The instructor established effective communication with students in the classroom.	19	7	0	0	0	0	7	0	5.00	0.00	5.00	0.00
The instructor was helpful when students requested course related assistance outside of class.	19	7	0	0	0	0	7	0	5.00	0.00	5.00	0.00
Assignments and tests were returned within a reasonable time.	19	7	0	0	0	1	6	0	4.92	0.12	4.86	0.38

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.	100.00%
High standards of achievement were set.	100.00%
The instructor was generally well prepared for class.	100.00%
The instructor was readily available to students outside of class (e.g., through email, office hours, or by appointment).	100.00%
The instructor treated students with respect.	100.00%
The instructor attempted to provide satisfactory answers to all questions in class.	100.00%
The instructor established effective communication with students in the classroom.	100.00%
The instructor was helpful when students requested course related assistance outside of class.	100.00%
Assignments and tests were returned within a reasonable time.	100.00%

Considering everything, how would you rate this course?

N	n	Very poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Very Good	N/A	IM	DI	Mean	STDEV
19	7	0	0	0	0	7	0	5.00	0.00	5.00	0.00

Considering everything, how would you rate this course?

Question	%Favourable
Considering everything, how would you rate this course?	100.00%

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

The reading material for this course offered a very insightful perspective into the ethics of data and how it can be used to transform the lived experience of the city and the agency of individuals. Overall this course unfolded in a chronology which made sense in the context of the final research paper and cumulatively built up a trenchant case on why we must remain critical of big data and its pervasive utilization by powerful entities. I value the lessons I've learned from this course tremendously and it has inspired me not only to learn SAS but to continually question how civil data is used as I go on into urban planning, hopefully as a career.

I was nervous to take this class, as it is was my first fourth-year class, but I am so glad I did not let my nerves get the best of me. This mixed-methods class allowed people from all different disciplines to explore topics of their choosing, and every idea that was brought forth during discussions, whether general discussions or project-specific discussions, was encouraged by Dr. Wyly. I felt that this encouragement of creativity created a mutual bond of respect between me, my classmates, and Dr. Wyly. It was the first time that I felt fully comfortable to speak in class discussions and the feedback from my incredible classmates and Dr. Wyly always made it worthwhile to say what I thought about our readings or my own research. I would highly recommend this class to my fellow geography students as well as students from all other disciplines.

This was a really well organized class and I enjoyed it thoroughly. While I struggled to follow some of the latter stages of the SAS stuff, I really loved the weaving in of non-academic personal narratives and I think this really helped ground the subject matter and keep it from feeling abstract. Elvin is extremely approachable and works hard to include everyone in discussion, creating a really supportive and effective atmosphere for students. I would say that at some points, not having any stats background, that things were going over my head, but Elvin made himself very available to help write code or clear up confusions.

I recommend this class for those who want to have a platform where they can freely discuss their research ideas. What was really helpful for me was the barn-raising type of brainstorming with the class. Discussing your own research with others helped me think about how to effectively communicate and articulate my (potential) arguments. The feedback was also great, not only from Elvin but from other colleagues as well. I guess this also lessens the burden for the instructor to be the sole provider of feedback and information to others but also hones students to make connections and use their own research experience in relation to their colleagues' topics. I am not sure if the discussion of research progress was originally a component of previous cohorts of this course, but I think this exercise made this seminar course more loaded and insightful. I would definitely say this aspect of the course is essential.

I also liked Elvin's flexibility when it comes to the lectures. There were times when the lectures went by too fast (and I couldn't follow due to my lack of quantitative methods absorption skills...) but it was the best compromise as we prioritized the discussions for the individual research, which is, I would argue, more useful for everyone.

I also greatly appreciate the patience to slowly teach quantitative methods even when it is not expected to be used in the course's final output. In that sense, I think Elvin is quite successful in making us understand the concepts and main purpose behind the use of quantitative methods. But in that sense, this course is not good for a student who expects to be fully immersed in urban research that uses quantitative methods.

The readings for this course was light which essentially allows students to focus more on their independent research but still had fruitful and focused discussions.

I also highly commend Elvin's effort in giving prompt and substantial feedback. I greatly appreciated the time and effort for the comments— works well with the final paper as you have the group, including the instructor brainstorming your work with you.

Elvin is one of my favorite professors at UBC, particularly in an engaging class such as GEOG450. The small sizes of this course enabled people to speak in a comfortable setting and fostered ease of communication and great conversation. I wish UBC offered more courses like this, particularly early on in University like most schools do, because I think it's extremely important in creating interest in the subject of study. Overall, I love this class and greatly appreciated how enthusiastic, prepared, and available Elvin is, even outside of class. All of my questions were always answered in an extremely timely mannered. I also applaud the fact that this course put a high emphasis on doing well, but also had a communal aspect to it. Thank you, Elvin!

Elvin is one of the best teachers I've had at UBC! He is so knowledgeable, understanding and passionate about the subject matter and students' projects! He made himself available outside of class whenever students needed it and he encouraged us to participate in class discussions and answered to all our questions. The way he taught SAS was wonderful and effective to many of us who had never worked with such program. I appreciated his ability to think critically and tactically, and how that translated in each of his lectures and discussions. This course was awesome. Thank you, Elvin!

Elvin one of the most inspiring, attentive, and knowledgeable professors at UBC. The readings were an engaging mix of articles, books, and news articles and I looked forward to discussing them each week. Although the quantitative methods portion was challenging, Elvin walked us through each step and was extremely helpful during office hours! Overall this has been a very rewarding course to take!

My only suggestion would be to update the SSC course listing so that it better explains what the course topics is.

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.