



THE UNIVERSITY  
OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

## 2021W1 UBC Individual Instructor Report for MTRL 472 101 - Welding and Joining of Materials (Mahyar Asadi)

Project Title: **2021W1 UBC Instructor Evaluations**

Course Audience: **27**

Responses Received: **7**

Response Ratio: **26%**

### 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: **Tuesday, January 11, 2022**

blue®

## 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.	27	7	0	0	0	3	4	0	4.6	0.2
The instructor conducted this course in such a way that I was motivated to learn.	27	7	0	1	3	1	2	0	3.3	0.6
The instructor presented the course material in a way that I could understand.	27	7	0	0	3	2	2	0	3.8	0.4
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.	27	7	0	1	2	3	1	0	3.7	0.5
The instructor showed genuine interest in supporting my learning throughout this course.	27	7	0	0	2	2	3	0	4.3	0.4
Overall, I learned a great deal from this instructor.	27	7	0	0	3	1	3	0	4.0	0.5

Question	%Favourable
Throughout the term, the instructor explained course requirements so it was clear to me what I was expected to learn.	100%
The instructor conducted this course in such a way that I was motivated to learn.	43%
The instructor presented the course material in a way that I could understand.	57%
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.	57%
The instructor showed genuine interest in supporting my learning throughout this course.	71%
Overall, I learned a great deal from this instructor.	57%

## Faculty Questions

### Course Questions

Question	N	n	SD	D	N	A	SA	IM	DI
The assigned workload for the course was heavy.	27	7	0	1	3	2	1	3.3	0.5
The course material is rather advanced.	27	7	0	1	1	3	2	4.0	0.5
The material is relevant to my professional needs.	27	7	0	0	3	2	2	3.8	0.4
The course material is interesting.	27	7	0	0	2	4	1	3.9	0.3

Question	%Favourable
The assigned workload for the course was heavy.	43%
The course material is rather advanced.	71%
The material is relevant to my professional needs.	57%
The course material is interesting.	71%

## Open ended feedback

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

### Comments

Maybe doing more dynamic lectures.

If the instructor can briefly review the key points of this course at the end of the semester, it will be more helpful.

Not particularly! A clear a concise set of formulas for exams would be a huge boost, but otherwise this course is great!

Maybe make the course more interactive. For example, giving pre-readings and then conducting Q&A regarding the pre-reading before starting the lecture

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

### Comments

The content and the lecture from an external consultant.

This course has instructors and TA who are very friendly and willing to help students learn. The available learning content of the course is very rich and interesting. The teaching and simulation content are effectively organized together. This course has very outstanding teaching. A good classroom environment, the instructor's rich industry experience and the guest lecture from industry professional are all highlights of the course.

The teaching and TA are willing to help and ensure that you are learning every step of the way.

The lab section is a good component of the course.

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

### Comments

If this course gives students another opportunity to adjust the grading scheme of each part weight in the second half of the term, it may help boost the motivation of students to learn. The course might have more office hours.

The lab roll out was really rough. Particularly since there is an exceptionally wide breadth of computer and computational power accessibility.

Start the term project much earlier. It was very rushed trying to complete it on time

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

### Comments

Excellent instructor! He is warm to the students. He is perfect in helping students learn. He has a very clear and patient teaching method with many examples to help students understand the content of the course effectively.

Great slide decks (although maybe a little jam packed and messy at times), engaging lectures with hands on props in some of them too.

Good use of board – drawing diagrams and pictures to help explain concepts.

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

### Comments

This course has a very good lecturer and learning resources. I am very grateful for the instructor and TA who are willing to help students grasp more knowledge and achieve better performance in this course. They are professional, friendly and caring for their students. The improvement can be that the total amount of knowledge covered in this course is a bit much.

Love the applicability to industry.

## 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.