

Project Title: 2020W1 UBC Instructor Evaluations

Course Audience: 33

Responses Received: 12

Response Ratio: 36.36%

---

**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 & $\pm 10\%$ 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, January 7, 2021**

## 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.	33	12	1	1	2	6	2	0	3.83	0.58
The instructor communicated the subject matter effectively.	33	12	1	2	1	5	3	0	3.90	0.67
The instructor helped inspire interest in learning the subject matter.	33	12	1	1	2	5	3	0	3.90	0.62
Overall, evaluation of student learning (through exams, essays, presentations, etc.) was fair.	33	12	0	0	3	5	3	1	4.00	0.40
The instructor showed concern for student learning.	33	12	1	1	2	7	1	0	3.79	0.51
Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.	33	12	1	0	2	6	3	0	4.00	0.53

Question	%Favourable
The instructor made it clear what students were expected to learn.	66.67%
The instructor communicated the subject matter effectively.	66.67%
The instructor helped inspire interest in learning the subject matter.	66.67%
Overall, evaluation of student learning (through exams, essays, presentations, etc.) was fair.	72.73%
The instructor showed concern for student learning.	66.67%
Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.	75.00%

## Faculty Questions

### Course Questions

Question	N	n	SD	D	N	A	SA	IM	DI
The assigned workload for the course was heavy.	33	12	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	0.51
The course material is rather advanced.	33	12	0	2	3	3	4	3.83	0.60
The material is relevant to my professional needs.	33	12	0	0	4	5	3	3.90	0.41
The course material is interesting.	33	11	1	0	4	2	4	3.75	0.64

Question	%Favourable
The assigned workload for the course was heavy.	58.33%
The course material is rather advanced.	58.33%
The material is relevant to my professional needs.	66.67%
The course material is interesting.	54.55%

## Open ended feedback

**Comment on what the instructor has done especially well in teaching the course and what they might do to improve it.**

Comments
Uploading lecture videos was good. The lab software was a huge pain to get installed, that should've been figured out before october in my opinion. Assigning lab simulations that taek 13 hours to run, when you know the virtual computers log you out after 30 mins of inactivity, and the software in 1 hour seems cruel. He should maybe not change the exam date TWO DAYS before the final exam, leading to a clash for multiple students, and adding to their stress. Overall, the content was displayed in a relatively ok manner, the tests were ok, but please at least consult the class before making major changes that increase student stress.
Professor and the lecture part is nice, labs are a disaster.
Mahyar is a very professional professor. He can teach us very useful stuff in the course and let us learn a lot of interesting things. Thank you
This class was one of the worst educational experiences I have ever had. The instructor did not clearly communicate the course material or learning goals, and there were very few resources to support our learning. Studying for the final exam has been incredibly frustrating, as there are no practice problems, sample questions, or review outlines to work off of. Even our assignments have been one-off questions only relating to a few specific topics, and there haven't been any assignments since October 30 to practice topics in the latter half of the course. When we asked the instructor what to expect from our final exam during our last lecture, he told us all he knew at that point was the date and time of the exam. We got an email later telling us how many questions there would be and how the exam would be administered, but nothing about what we would be expected to know. This course has been a series of relatively unrelated facts about welding, with no overarching concept or goal to tie the pieces of knowledge together. There should be more consistent assignments in the course that relate to clearly communicated learning goals, and more adequate learning and review resources should be provided for exams.
Additionally, the instructor tried to change the date of our final exam two days before the exam was scheduled to occur. This was confusing and stressful to the class, as it would have caused other exam conflicts and hardships that students had not planned for in advance. The instructor also did not consult with the class before proposing a date change, and didn't provide a reason for moving the exam in his email. This was very unprofessional of our instructor and should not have occurred.
Very knowledgeable on the subject matter.

**Comment on the things you appreciated about the course and provide suggestions for improvement.**

Comments

The lab portion of the course was extremely interesting but due to the online format was challenging to execute. I had to run 4–8 hour simulations in the background as I tried to complete other school work on my laptop. This made it very slow and I couldn't open Excel while it ran since it used so much of my CPU. Students who had more powerful computers or a home desktop were able to complete the simulations faster and therefore go through more iterations to optimize their labs and term project. This in the end put students in low income situations (I can't afford a more powerful laptop/have another computer to run this) at a disadvantage. There is the virtual computer option but if you are inactive on it for 30 minutes it will log you off. So if you are running a 6 hour simulation you need to put a reminder ever 25 minutes to open the virtual computer window and click somewhere on the screen so you don't lose the simulation.

Please improve the lab software or make us run multiple shorter simulations. It baffles me that we are to run 10+ hour scenarios in abaqus when all the versions we can access have time limits < 1 hr. Allowing us to access time limit free versions so we can actually work on other things would be ideal

Allow us to pick our own lab groups or introduce peer evaluation at the beginning of the semester. It was extremely difficult to communicate with group members we've never met before especially with everything being online. Some of my group members are not very responsive and did NO work for some of the lab assignments.

Also, it's very difficult to follow the TA in the live lab sessions as he goes over the steps really fast and it's difficult to see his cursor and where he is clicking. Me and a lot of my classmates just gave up attending the tutorials because of that. It's better to just pre-record all the Abaqus content so that students can pause the video when they missed something.

Great course thank you

I was very interested in welding and excited to learn more when I started this course. I feel like I didn't learn anything and that I paid over \$500 to get 10 fun facts and 15 (at least 1/week) headaches instead. The Abaqus portion of the course should have been removed due to online learning, as I was unable to run the program on my computer or access the virtual computers, and obviously couldn't use the computers in the Frank Forward computer lab. This significantly limited my ability to participate in the course.

To improve this course, there should be consistent, relevant assignments, learning goals, and adequate review materials. Using Abaqus as a central component of the course should also be significantly re-thought, as it is incredibly difficult to use, poorly documented, and does not support the concepts "taught" in the other portions of the course.

The class activities could be done away with in favour of more assignments. Labs should be done by a single person and not a group with Abaqus. Some group members can scrape by without actually understanding how to use the software.

## 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.