

Instructor: HAWRYSHKEWICH A

Course: IAT 110

Semester: 14-3

D100

COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

BACKGROUND	Frequency Distribution					Valid Responses	No Resp.		
	Weight:	4	3	2	1			0	
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		12 15%	28 35%	32 40%	8 10%	1 1%	3.01 81	38	
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		6 7%	47 53%	6 7%	18 20%	11 13%	88	31	
GENERAL									
3. How often did you attend the lectures/seminars?	always	76 64%	27 23%	11 9%	3 3%	2 2%	hardly ever	3.45 119	0
4. The course prerequisites were	essential	12 11%	6 6%	28 26%	6 6%	55 51%	not essential	1.20 107	12
5. The overall level of difficulty for the course was	too easy	2 2%	16 14%	52 44%	40 34%	8 7%	too difficult	1.69 118	1
6. The amount of work required for the course was	too little	1 1%	6 5%	43 37%	44 38%	23 20%	too much	1.30 117	2
7. How valuable was the course content?	very	9 8%	34 29%	46 39%	17 14%	12 10%	not very	2.09 118	1
8. The course text or supplementary material was	relevant	24 21%	31 27%	40 35%	10 9%	9 8%	irrelevant	2.45 114	5
	A		B	C	D	F			
9. I would rate this course as		11 9%	55 47%	38 32%	10 9%	3 3%		2.52 117	2

Instructor: HAWRYSHKEWICH A Course: IAT 110 Semester: 14-3	COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION									
COURSE GRADING 10. The assignments and lecture/seminar were 11. The exams and assignments were on the whole 12. The marking scheme was on the whole INSTRUCTOR AND LECTURES/SEMINARS 13. How informative were the lectures/seminars? 14. The instructor's organization and preparation were 15. The instructor's ability to communicate material was 16. The instructor's interest in the course content appeared to be 17. The instructor's feedback on my work was 18. Questions during class were 19. Was the instructor reasonably accessible for extra help? 20. Was the instructor responsive to suggestions or complaints? 21. Overall, the instructor's attitude towards students was 22. I would rate the instructor's teaching ability as	Frequency Distribution						Valid No Mean Responses Resp.			
	Weight:	4	3	2	1	0				
	well related	48 40%	47 39%	20 17%	3 3%	1 1%	unrelated	3.16	119	0
	fair	16 13%	36 30%	39 33%	22 18%	6 5%	unfair	2.29	119	0
	fair	17 14%	27 23%	36 30%	21 18%	18 15%	unfair	2.03	119	0
	informative	29 24%	44 37%	36 30%	8 7%	2 2%	uninformative	2.76	119	0
	excellent	67 56%	32 27%	19 16%	1 1%	0 0%	poor	3.39	119	0
	excellent	53 45%	36 30%	21 18%	9 8%	0 0%	poor	3.12	119	0
	high	83 70%	17 14%	15 13%	2 2%	2 2%	low	3.49	119	0
	adequate	26 22%	27 23%	34 29%	19 16%	12 10%	inadequate	2.31	118	1
	encouraged	76 64%	29 24%	13 11%	1 1%	0 0%	discouraged	3.51	119	0
	available	52 44%	30 26%	29 25%	6 5%	0 0%	never available	3.09	117	2
	very	41 36%	36 31%	29 25%	6 5%	3 3%	not at all	2.92	115	4
	excellent	65 55%	31 26%	19 16%	4 3%	0 0%	poor	3.32	119	0
	A	B	C	D	F					
		43 36%	48 41%	19 16%	8 7%	0 0%		3.07	118	1

SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

Instructor:	Andrew Hawryshkewich
Semester:	Fall 2014 (1147)
Course:	IAT 110 – Visual Communication Design
Section:	D100

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:

- Enthusiasms towards subject.
- Friendly, open, knowledgable, approachable.
- Interesting.
- Love his jokes.
- Very nice. Patient. Good passion on teaching.
- He is very good at keeping us interested.
- Materials prepared by instructor are well-prepared and well illustrated.
- He's very passionate. Encourages participation/questions.
- Prof was passionate and engaging, however.
- He keeps the content interesting which is important in a 3 hour lecture and he has a lot of knowledge about the content. And he is easy to talk to.
- I liked the talking and feedback portion in lectures. I got to meet new people.
- Knows the information well. Tries to engage the class a lot.
- Interset in subject.
- Excellent teaching ability and very interactive with the class.
- Passionate, helpful.
- Teaching ability good though.
- Andrew held a lot of interest in the course material, was friendly, and accessible.
- He responded to emails quick, and they were often very informative + helpful.
- Organized.

SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

- Andrew was very good at replying to emails in a timely manner, which I found very helpful as his main office is on the Surrey campus. Overall I thought Andrew was a good instructor and I would take a class with him again in the future.
- Interest in course material, good at conveying information, very enthusiastic.
- Engaging and appears interested in subject.
- Enthusiasm.
- Nice & encouraged questions.
- Well put together slides + content and always encouraging discussion.
- Good lectures.
- Andrew is extremely passionate about IAT. Entertaining lectures.
- Helpful and informative.
- Friendly w/students. Slides were interesting.
- Helpful. Engaged lectures. Highly interested in the course.
- Great course. Loved all the projects. Learned a lot! Thanks! 😊
- Enthusiasm for subject.
- Friendly, approachable.
- Clearly interested in content. Good sense of humour.
- He can be really nice & approachable.
- The instructor did an excellent job teaching in an informative and interesting manner.
- Always has examples and makes lectures fun.
- The lecture is interesting and well-prepared.
- Questions encouraged.
- Lecture slides were clear and relevant. Good videos.
- Enthusiasm and interest in material. Gave adequate breaks.
- Provided a skeleton on course topics.
- Good @ communicating material.

Weakest:

- Not enough info on slides.
- Sometimes explanations aren't the best.
- Hard marker.
- But he uses "reiterate" and "by virtue of..." too often.
- The lectures were highly uninformative and content was rarely related to any 'design' ideas/theories. Participation was over-done, and projects were HIGHLY

SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

convoluted with unclear expectations. Found the course a waste of time, which is unfortunate because I am a professional designer who was interested in improving design theory with relevant project work.

- Expectations were VERY unclear and if I didn't talk to the TA's, I'd be lost.
- Participation marks weren't really for participation. Prof judged you on your creativity based on what THEY thought was creative (very subjective). Marks were taken off your participation if it didn't satisfy prof. he seems to forget it is a 1st YEAR class for NON-SIAT students. He expected too much, considering we just learned this stuff. We try our best, but participation marks were still deducted. Too many projects. Finally understood "process summary" by Project 3.
- His assignments were very abstract and weren't explained well. Took more than one try at the projects to fully understand what he wanted and by then, marks were low. Lectures were dull, we had group discussions about mundane photos. Participation marks were sporadic, didn't learn much.
- Ability to communicate info.
- Good at explaining concepts, but possibly too repetitive a lot of the time.
- Sometimes redundant...
- Not enough feedback.
- Not enough feedback.
- The professor is a poor lecturer with useless information and poorly explained assignments.
- Obviously there was an extremely right/wrong way of doing things for the projects, so sometimes I felt like he was a bit vague on things.
- Office hours mainly available at Surrey campus ☹
- Not clear enough on explaining assignments and projects.
- Unclear in rubric (why sections).
- Sometimes leaves too much time for class discussion.
- Weak on elaborating about project details.
- Not really relevant on what he teach and the project needs.
- No comments on assignments – only one office hour at Burnaby – not available by appoint at Burnarby. Only Surrey! Asked for feedback but had to see in person...
- Videos.
- Content is a bit boring, provide too many videos.
- You need to get your marking standards straight. Both TAs grade on way



SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

different levels.

- Doesn't explain concepts well.
- Give more positive feedback to students.
- Unclear when giving instructions/directions, not enough feedback.
- His weakness was that he was quite vague with certain things that he was looking for in assignments. So there was a lot of confusion with where I lost marks.
- Seemed intolerant at times, not very clear on project expectations.
- Unreasonably harsh marking. Should have assigned two term projects instead of four. The reason being is that requirements are more suited for 4-6 weeks of time instead of two. Should have provided heuristics on when to use different fonts/sfx design principles/photo angles. Word count limit too restrictive. Make quizzes concept based/written instead of M.C. Stop mo section unnecessary.
- Try to include more things to teach because the last few lectures we were let out after an hour and half of class and another lecture we just watched vides and movies. Maybe assign the videos to watch at home so in class we can do more productive things. Also work on standardizing marking between TA's. it's unfair when one marks noticeably harder than another.

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

Strongest:

- Not so heavy on design creativity b/c not for design students.
- Interesting material.
- Fun to make the projects.
- Prof.
- Interesting topic and lectures.
- In class exercises.
- Course content was good.
- Good for learning visual communication + photographic skills.
- It's interesting.
- Pushes you to be creative. You learn new concepts.
- Interesting.
- Flexibility w/assignment topics.
- The breaks.
- The course work was very open-ended, which allowed on to be creative, but it could be difficult thinking of topics to highlight.
- Structure of lectures.

SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

- The course teaches good amount knowledge of visual design for a starter level.
- Videos in lecture were good.
- Basic understanding of communication design – photography + typography.

Weakest:

- Too much time discussing things in class with each other. Projects were all basically the same. Quiz questions were difficult. Lecture was not that interesting.
- Too much discussion.
- Hard marking scheme.
- Hard marking, too many readings.
- Analysis sucked. He tells us to talk to each other too much.
- Abstract concepts (i.e. design principles) should have explained more in-depth to clarify some grey areas in rubrics.
- I'm a science student and needed a humanities credit. This course was much more enjoyable to me than an English course, but I did not find the course too interesting.
- Too much work load required for this course.
- The quizzes were way to hard and based only on the readings – the marking overall was harsh.
- Readings were way too long & too many for first year IAT class, and were irrelevant to lectures. Quizzes were hard.
- Very heavy reading load. Some articles were long and boring. Too much discussion time between students.
- Material of what required unclear.
- Actual content of the course was not what I expected and I felt the course description misrepresented what the course actually was. A lot more loose principles and basic ideas. Didn't learn many practical tools that I can apply to my career or field.
- Readings + lecture often did not correspond, marking rubric wasn't very clear on what was needed.
- Projects were repetitive. Having different assignments would benefit the class and students that learn differently.
- Slides useless.
- Lecture slides were useless – no information on them.
- Too many readings & useless quizzes!
- Quizzes were useless and irrelevant. Too many readings.



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

- Readings are very broad and course tries to cover too much. Quizzes were fairly difficult.
- The course was good because it forced you to think critically about things and how they (your thoughts) can be conveyed visually.
- I found some of the questions on the quizzes random, even though they can be found in the course material. I felt there were better areas to focus our attention.
- My one complaint was the setup of the quizzes. Questions could not be reevaluated and answers could not be changed once submitted. Students would benefit from being able to review previous answers and make changes.
- The course assignments required lots of time and marking was harsh because the instructions were very vague sometimes.
- Too much work; hard grading.
- The classes we learned narrative (completely superfluous).
- Class much too large to facilitate successful activities. There should be separate tutorial + lecture. Could have had more interesting projects.
- Not very engaging lecture slides & reading material assigned.
- Too much reading, not enough hands on.
- Lectures were not relevant. Readings were not necessary.
- The course has very dry readings and vague project rubrics.
- I don't think it's fair to mark our projects just by judging it.
- Quizzes are so difficult.
- Hardmarking & lots of work. Heavy workload.
- Handing in in class assignments right when class ends, internet sucks.
- Readings were not relevant in relation to assignments.
- Workload.
- Quiz structure and phrasing of questions were extremely difficult. Readings sometimes irrelevant or uninteresting/unrelated to course.
- TA & instructor explanations are so vague.
- Marking not consistent between TAs.
- Grading scheme.
- Move specific requirement or more specific direction for the projects.
- Projects were confusing.
- Projects were very confusing. Quizzes were also unclear/broad.
- Project clarity, quizzes were too ambiguous.

SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

Question 3: Any other comments or suggestions?

- It would help to have a sample of how to write a good project report. The report seemed marked hard without any clear indication towards improving and what exactly I've missed.
- Some of the exam questions can be easier! 😊 (I remember likes we had a question in one quiz from what it was written under a picture in one of the books!!)
- This was my first IAT course, I thoroughly enjoyed it.
- I'd like to have gotten written feedback on assignments instead of seeing just numbers on a rubric.
- Drawing of a snake with a human head.
- 😊 V
- NOT A GPA BOOSTER...
- Help students understand what you want (specifics) more.
- I was told that you needed no prior photography experience, so the grading should reflect that.
- First assignment was surprising marked hard!
- Process – what is it? Design principles – what are they? LIST THEM OUT!!
- This class was not related to the course description. I feel like I wasted money paying tuition for this class. Learned nothing useful.
- Focus more on topics and actually introduce students to vector imaging.
- Explain what is expected from assignments in detail from the beginning of the course. Possibly show example projects.
- Provide more feedback on project...give some past project as examples, since many topics are too open-ended and it's hard to know to is expected.
- Providing more office hours will be helpful.
- Lighten workload.
- Subjectivity was probably the main issue. Telling us about the concepts and telling us what you want didn't always match up. Some more direction as to what you exactly wanted would've been nicer.
- Smaller classes for this course, I know its probably not possible to split it, but would work better with smaller lecture.
- Explain more clearly starting from the first project what you expect with process.
- I appreciate that he tries to encourage participation, but I feel that he should ask even more open-ended questions.
- Surrey campus is too far so some students don't have time to go there for

SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

feedback.

- Add more reading which are related to the powerpoint.
- Marks were graded unfairly from different TAs.
- The quizzes are too difficult when the readings are so dull.
- Money in the bank, getting all the dank, gotta give thanks. I enjoyed the course Andrew! Drawing of Andrew.
- I felt like there should be prereq's for this course. I felt lost during the editing process.
- Too big of a room for an IAT course. Called IAT in a nutshell course, but isn't. It should put more emphasis on process on course description.
- Andrew needs to stop critiquing student's work on design principles he didn't fully explain.
- Make the quizzes easier.
- Would not recommend this course to other students.
- The course discription was very different than the actual course. I thought the course would be about other stuff based on the discription. The course was heavy in online readings, and its hard to study for the final.
- I'm in a bit of an odd position in this class, as I am a mature student with previous experience in design. While I completely understand what you're trying to teach, I disagree that tons of photography is the best way to do it. This took an extreme amount of time. As well, there was no clear picture of the overall course. I think it would be beneficial for students to see the whole plan so that they can see how things fit together. That said, I like your style! I'm sure I'll see more of you once I get in to SIAT.