

Instructor: HAWRYSHKEWICH ANDREW
 Course: IAT 235
 Semester: 13-3

COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

EICO

BACKGROUND

1. What is your cumulative grade point average?

- 1) 3.5 or over
- 2) 3.0 to 3.49
- 3) 2.5 to 2.99
- 4) 2.0 to 2.49
- 5) below 2.0

2. Why did you take this course?

- 1) It was compulsory
- 2) I am interested in the course
- 3) No alternative course available
- 4) It looked like an easy credit
- 5) Other reasons

GENERAL

3. How often did you attend the lectures/seminars?

always 45 31 11 3 1 hardly ever
 49% 34% 12% 3% 1%

4. The course prerequisites were

essential 33 33 18 4 3 not essential
 36% 36% 20% 4% 3%

5. The overall level of difficulty for the course was

too easy 2 21 48 18 2 too difficult
 2% 23% 53% 20% 2%

6. The amount of work required for the course was

too little 1 9 49 30 2 too much
 1% 10% 54% 33% 2%

7. How valuable was the course content?

very 24 41 17 6 3 not very
 26% 45% 19% 7% 3%

8. The course text or supplementary material was

relevant 28 30 21 4 8 irrelevant
 31% 33% 23% 4% 9%

A B C D F

9. I would rate this course as

25 54 10 0 0
 28% 61% 11% 0% 0%

Weight:	Frequency Distribution					Mean	Valid Responses	No Resp.
	4	3	2	1	0			

3.08	59	33
------	----	----

63	29
----	----

3.27	91	1
------	----	---

2.98	91	1
------	----	---

2.03	91	1
------	----	---

1.75	91	1
------	----	---

2.85	91	1
------	----	---

2.73	91	1
------	----	---

3.17	89	3
------	----	---

Instructor: HAWRYSHKEWICH ANDREW	COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION										
Course: IAT 235											
Semester: 13-3											
	Frequency Distribution										
	Weight:	4	3	2	1	0		Mean	Valid Responses	No Resp.	
COURSE GRADING											
10. The assignments and lecture/seminar were	well related	49 54%	29 32%	9 10%	3 3%	1 1%	unrelated	3.34	91	1	
11. The exams and assignments were on the whole	fair	36 40%	34 38%	14 16%	6 7%	0 0%	unfair	3.11	90	2	
12. The marking scheme was on the whole	fair	30 33%	29 32%	19 21%	10 11%	3 3%	unfair	2.80	91	1	
INSTRUCTOR AND LECTURES/SEMINARS											
13. How informative were the lectures/seminars?	informative	44 48%	35 38%	8 9%	4 4%	0 0%	uninformative	3.31	91	1	
14. The instructor's organization and preparation were	excellent	58 64%	25 28%	5 6%	1 1%	1 1%	poor	3.53	90	2	
15. The instructor's ability to communicate material was	excellent	61 67%	22 24%	6 7%	2 2%	0 0%	poor	3.56	91	1	
16. The instructor's interest in the course content appeared to be	high	73 82%	13 15%	3 3%	0 0%	0 0%	low	3.79	89	3	
17. The instructor's feedback on my work was	adequate	48 53%	30 33%	8 9%	2 2%	2 2%	inadequate	3.33	90	2	
18. Questions during class were	encouraged	61 68%	17 19%	11 12%	0 0%	1 1%	discouraged	3.52	90	2	
19. Was the instructor reasonably accessible for extra help?	available	55 60%	27 30%	9 10%	0 0%	0 0%	never available	3.51	91	1	
20. Was the instructor responsive to suggestions or complaints?	very	56 62%	22 24%	12 13%	0 0%	0 0%	not at all	3.49	90	2	
21. Overall, the instructor's attitude towards students was	excellent	67 74%	20 22%	4 4%	0 0%	0 0%	poor	3.69	91	1	
		A	B	C	D	F					
22. I would rate the instructor's teaching ability as		60 66%	25 27%	6 7%	0 0%	0 0%		3.59	91	1	

SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

Instructor:	Andrew Hawryshkewich
Semester:	Fall 2013 (1137)
Course:	IAT 235 – Information Design
Section:	E100

General Comments: This form contains all of the student responses for the 3 questions below. All student responses for each question were pooled together; individual student responses are separated by bullets.

Question 1: What do you consider to be the strongest and weakest features of the instructor, as a teacher?

Strongest:

- Materials he teaches are very informative.
- Informative for US and UX.
- Interesting & engaging.
- Very enthusiastic about material.
- Engaging orator.
- Andrew is a great prof and makes the class very enjoyable.
- I think Andrew did a wonderful job teaching this class. Proff was involved in labs as well and he was available to help guide.
- Communicated the course content very well. Nice that he showed up to many labs to help and provide critiques. Lectures were always engaging and very interesting.
- Informative, interesting lectures.
- Easy marking.
- He was friendly and helpfull.
- Good, humrous, nice attitude.
- Great Prof! Go Andrew!
- He is a good teacher.
- Andrew is one of the better profs in SIAT, clear, kind and knowledgable.
- He's always here to meet up/give feedback!
- He's nice, friendly, teaches influzatastly though.
- I like how we addressed html and css in this course as I find these skills to be

School of Interactive Arts & Technology
(SIAT)

250 – 13450 102nd Avenue
Surrey, British Columbia
Canada, V3T 0A3
www.siat.sfu.ca

T 778.782.7517
F 778.782.9422

SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

useful in the future. I also like the informative feedback during certain lab times.

- Teaching style was very engaging & interesting.
- Andrew is a very approaching instructor. His teaching material are fairly easy though sometimes it is quite confusing.
- Cool guy!
- Awesome person.
- Enthusiastic about content. Readily available for help. Knowledgeable about industry trends.
- Nice & engaging teacher.
- I really liked how you had class discussion because it's actually engaging to do it. 😊
- Very organized and energetic.
- Interest and knowledge in subject.
- Very approachable & friendly, understanding & knowledgeable in field; great attitude overall.
- Andrew is one of the nicest profs I've ever had. He's knowledgeable and well-read.
- He is quite engaging in lectures.
- Love his sense of humour, and for engaging the class to do discussions during lectures.
- Knows his material too well, very engaging and fun prof.
- Great sense of humor, seems to enjoy instructing.
- Overall Andrew is an engaging and unique professor, his lectures are always interesting and provide excellent content for students of design. Overall Andrew has an awesome personality.
- Keeps me engaged and interested.
- Relaxed, sense of humour, focus on higher level thinking about websites.

Weakest:

- Marking is a little too hard.
- Sometimes have technical problems.
- Disorganized.
- Very busy. Not always available for help, but this is understandable. Also not very direct with crits. Could be more direct.
- Participation marks.
- Could be more organized (material).

School of Interactive Arts & Technology
(SIAT)

250 – 13450 102nd Avenue
Surrey, British Columbia
Canada, V3T 0A3
www.siat.sfu.ca

T 778.782.7517

F 778.782.9422

SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

- Sometime, your feedback and TA's are a bit different.
- Some info was extra or it was repeated too much.
- Confusing instructions.
- A lot of things Andrew looked for while marking are not even taught in course. Especially coding (CSS + HTML) assignment.
- Assignments and projects instructions were quite vague, what was expected of us was ambiguous. Presentation expectation was quite vague so it was difficult to know what we should do and if we were on the right track.
- His teaching isn't very engaging, and I'm not always inspired. I know its hard but it's something you can work on.
- He doesn't always give ALL the feedback. Hides SOME problems of an assignment etc. which could lead to a surprising grade cause he said everything was fine during his hours!
- Sometimes lectures feels slightly unorganized but it is pretty good for the most part.
- Expectation to our assignments were not clear sometimes we had to approach him for extra help.
- Unclear, I am so confused most of the time. But asking for clarification helped.
- I would recommend not telling students this course is being revised (expectations of course were low after that).
- Assignments/projects/slides/outline feel too vague. Would like more specification & details on course content.
- Sometime contradicting statements in lecture and class.
- I think he was too easy on us. People were doing some very bad design and getting away without much comment.
- His last name is impossible.
- Instructions for assignments/projects can sometimes be too vague, unclear, or conflicting.
- None.
- Criteria not always clear.
- A weak point would be not fully communicating what he is looking for in an end product & marking can be harsh (due to confusion of what we must design in the end).
- The grading was at times unclear, i.e. the fact that the requirements listed in the brief were the minimum for a C+.

SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

- No microphone.
- Can only see for 10 mins at a time, cryptic responses on occasion, unclear Canvas structuring.

Question 2: What do you consider to be the strongest and weakest features of the course?

Strongest:

- The course's work load is a little heavy.
- Good projects.
- Good course, lectures were structured well.
- Relevant to "real world".
- I really appreciate that the course was reformatted and made kids learn HTML & CSS. I learned a lot and think this change should be kept.
- Hands on work projects and assignments.
- The parts teaching us how to code were clear and easy to understand.
- Interesting material.
- Relevant.
- HTML (responsive) is useful for future reference (such as portfolios).
- Lectures and assignments were good.
- Interesting topics covered.
- Well structured to teach info design.
- Integration of html/css is beneficial to future courses.
- Interesting topics.

Weakest:

- The course material is very valuable.
- Big part of the course material is critiques but they happen at the end of the project/assignment so you don't have a chance to improve from & learn from the critiques. Should be like papers (Draft → Revision)
- Not enough information learned in class to properly complete Infographic Assignment.
- The course at times felt rough around the edges and not all thought out. It also seemed odd that some projects we were told to "dumb it down" as it was too much for this class.
- Vague and disorganized assignments and projects.
- Hard to get a good mark compare to time spending and effort putting into the course.

School of Interactive Arts & Technology
(SIAT)

250 – 13450 102nd Avenue
Surrey, British Columbia
Canada, V3T 0A3
www.siat.sfu.ca

T 778.782.7517
F 778.782.9422

SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

- A05 and A06 were not that necessary and they were strange.
- I felt that for the parts for design, all the examples were of relatively bad ones, so I learned what not to do, but not what to actually do for assignments.
- The last project was too difficult for those with no html css experiesce.
- Confusing course!.
- Course material seems a bit hard to relate & understand sometimes but overall I really enjoyed the class!
- Projects were not entirely relevant and didn't encourage creativity (as we were designing things that have already been perfected).
- Lectures were hard to engage in due to it's dry content. Content during lecture feels almost unnecessary.
- Coding shouldn't be taught in a large lecture (really hard to follow along and get the learning). Course did not challenge me as a student → I felt very underwhelmed.
- In lab critiques by other students not that useful.
- Workload.
- It's really hard to get a sense of the evaluation in term of rubric only. I have no idea how a good/poor project it be. Probably provide more example? visually rather than in text.
- Online lecture materials weren't great.
- The first third of the course involved far more sketching than should be required, taking up too much time.
- Projects was confusing.
- Lack of examples makes it difficult to know what is expected.
- It seemed like a lot of the readings were very useful, but not discussed at all in lecture or lab, so it was not exactly necessary to read them despite the fact it would be immensely helpful.
- Some topics hard to follow.

Question 3: Any other comments or suggestions?

- More stuff on informatics.
- Did not like the lecture time.
- Best course ever!
- Choose better TA's. *cough* Summer *cough*
- More forced html & css lessons could be helpful. The code academy lessons are useful but weren't required. Ability to revise projects after final

SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

- crits/presentations could help achieve a better final project.
- Projects should be more related to each other.
 - Should have more pre-requs. Be more clear at the beginning of class that your expectations are high. Need more instruction on design principles, not just interaction (or needs more prereqs), IAT 102 did not prepare me for this course). Assignments could be clearer. Amazing prof though.
 - Please make assignments more complex though.
 - Make projects more equal, the 3rd project requires more time than it was given.
 - Many examples shown were of what NOT to do, so sometimes it was hard to tell what's actually good.
 - TA comments and feedback contradicts with professors which causes extreme confusion.
 - TA & Prof feedback should be fairly consistent and NOT contradicting b/c it makes it difficult for us to revise our projects according to your standards.
 - Would be helpful if example of past work was provided so we know what quality of work is expected. Instructions were a bit vague and having these examples would have helped clear this confusion.
 - Weekly group/peer evaluations would have been beneficial.
 - Bring back the box tie!
 - I didn't learn how to make the website hand by hand.
 - This course is one of the ones I care about the least but the topic is SO IMPORTANT, it should be much more difficult like IAT 233.
 - Focus more on user experience instead of HTML/CSS.
 - Kittens and puppies are cute ☺
 - ps. Kittens & puppies are awesome ;)
 - Have a good day sir! The giraffe would appreciate it if you chose another P03, something more than design.
 - Miss his mad scientist look in 102.
 - Andrew needs to be more aggressive if he wants students to take him seriously as a professor.
 - You should enforce the course readings and make it mandatory!
 - I think this class was just WAY too easy...I think there could have been more assignments that could reflect the course material that we learnt (there isn't enough assignments).
 - Could cover more design topics in 2nd half of the course.



SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

- “meeting expectations” should be MUCH higher than a C → marking scheme is rather unreasonable. Should definitely have team evaluations. Should make 3rd project an option of 2 or 3 members.
- I feel badly for Andrew because everyone taking IAT 233 was too occupied with that to spend adequate time on this class.
- Good prof hard course.
- I don't like this course, feels like redoing iat102 again. Some assignments are just not worth doing, and it takes up a lot of time don't really learn anything. But have to take this course because it is required for IAT major.
- Meowth thats right bow tie powers.
- Bowties Andrew. Also go back to the mad scientist look. Couse was ok. Text and reading were useless. TAs
- Nah.
- I really liked and enjoyed the course!
- Due to not my major, I had less chances of getting into classes but in lots of help from Prof. Andrew, I successfully got the class, thank you. Also thank you to my TA, Summer that she have answered my various questions. I really enjoyed the classes, regret that I miss some of the lecture and lab due to my sickness.
- Not enough bowtie or cowbell. Should definitely wear unicorn hat for every lecture.
- The course, since it is being revised still has some things to work on such as better communication amongst TA's & professor as each would provide opposite feedback and information. Love your bowties! Wear moar plox.
- More props & toys! More BOXES.
- Keep on trucking.



**School of Interactive Arts & Technology
(SIAT)
250 – 13450 102nd Avenue
Surrey, British Columbia
Canada, V3T 0A3
www.siat.sfu.ca**

**T 778.782.7517
F 778.782.9422**

SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks