

Instructor: HAWRYSHKEWICH A

Course: IAT 110

Semester: 14-2

D100

COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

BACKGROUND	Frequency Distribution					Valid Responses	No Resp.
	Weight:	4	3	2	1		
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		5 7%	16 23%	28 40%	18 26%	3 4%	2.76 70 33
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		1 1%	45 65%	7 10%	14 20%	2 3%	69 34
GENERAL							
3. How often did you attend the lectures/seminars?	always	64 63%	23 23%	10 10%	3 3%	2 2%	hardly ever 3.41 102 1
4. The course prerequisites were	essential	25 26%	21 22%	20 21%	2 2%	28 29%	not essential 2.14 96 7
5. The overall level of difficulty for the course was	too easy	4 4%	25 25%	49 49%	18 18%	5 5%	too difficult 2.05 101 2
6. The amount of work required for the course was	too little	4 4%	8 8%	40 40%	33 33%	14 14%	too much 1.55 99 4
7. How valuable was the course content?	very	19 19%	35 34%	29 28%	12 12%	7 7%	not very 2.46 102 1
8. The course text or supplementary material was	relevant	32 32%	27 27%	30 30%	8 8%	4 4%	irrelevant 2.74 101 2
	A		B	C	D	F	
9. I would rate this course as		24 24%	48 48%	16 16%	7 7%	4 4%	2.82 99 4

Instructor: HAWRYSHKEWICH A		COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION									
Course: IAT 110											
Semester: 14-2											
		Frequency Distribution									
		Weight:	4	3	2	1	0				
COURSE GRADING								Mean	Valid Responses	No Resp.	
10.	The assignments and lecture/seminar were	well related	44 44%	37 37%	14 14%	3 3%	2 2%	unrelated	3.18	100	3
11.	The exams and assignments were on the whole	fair	29 29%	36 36%	25 25%	9 9%	2 2%	unfair	2.80	101	2
12.	The marking scheme was on the whole	fair	29 29%	32 32%	25 25%	10 10%	4 4%	unfair	2.72	100	3
INSTRUCTOR AND LECTURES/SEMINARS											
13.	How informative were the lectures/seminars?	informative	34 33%	43 42%	13 13%	8 8%	4 4%	uninformative	2.93	102	1
14.	The instructor's organization and preparation were	excellent	46 46%	35 35%	16 16%	1 1%	3 3%	poor	3.19	101	2
15.	The instructor's ability to communicate material was	excellent	50 49%	32 31%	15 15%	3 3%	2 2%	poor	3.23	102	1
16.	The instructor's interest in the course content appeared to be	high	56 55%	25 25%	16 16%	4 4%	0 0%	low	3.32	101	2
17.	The instructor's feedback on my work was	adequate	35 35%	35 35%	23 23%	5 5%	3 3%	inadequate	2.93	101	2
18.	Questions during class were	encouraged	57 56%	28 27%	14 14%	3 3%	0 0%	discouraged	3.36	102	1
19.	Was the instructor reasonably accessible for extra help?	available	54 54%	32 32%	8 8%	6 6%	0 0%	never available	3.34	100	3
20.	Was the instructor responsive to suggestions or complaints?	very	49 51%	33 34%	12 12%	2 2%	1 1%	not at all	3.31	97	6
21.	Overall, the instructor's attitude towards students was	excellent	52 53%	36 36%	8 8%	1 1%	2 2%	poor	3.36	99	4
			A	B	C	D	F				
22.	I would rate the instructor's teaching ability as		47 47%	37 37%	11 11%	3 3%	2 2%		3.24	100	3

SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

Instructor:	Andrew Hawryshkewich
Semester:	Summer 2014 (1144)
Course:	IAT 110
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:

- Interest in course
- Let us go out and do to learn
- Andrew was amazing! Helpful and has excellent command of the course. I did not see any weakness in his ability to conduct such a large class
- Well organized, always had lessons prepared, included lots of assignments and activities related to the lesson
- Very good feedback on assignments and projects
- He is a great instructor but has high requirements
- Very good instructor!
- Andrew always gave excellent examples of each concept
- Great prof; always well prepared and willing to answer questions. Very considerate and understanding. Highly recommended for future periods.
- Decent course, decent prof!
- Very good prof, no weakness, he's strong
- Interest
- Instructor = best girl
- The prof was awesome ☺
- This prof is amazing @ what he does → A+! ☺
- He's a great guy, great prof. Super enthusiastic
- Good communicator
- Great- he is very open + easy going about ideas

SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thanks for teaching • Overall okay, thanks for teaching. • Fantastic
<p>Weakest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Material too hard • Quizzes were timed with unstable end times • Don't know what to review for final • Horrible. A waste of time. Lectures were regularly cancelled with no make-up times. Lectures involved youtube videos and watching movies rather than actual teaching. • Prof seemed to run out of content, 3 hours of lecture was cancelled for no reason • The instruction for assignment is not clear • Engagement • The most boring prof I ever met • Why ☹ • Enthusiastic teacher but doesn't always explain everything
<p>Question 2: What do you consider to be the strongest and weakest features of the course?</p>
<p>Strongest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technimeas in course useful • Great lectures and interesting material presented • The strongest features were the teacher- Andrew and his TA's Leila and Sarah • Engaging, interesting, interactive • Interesting class, very interesting topics • Interesting, humorous, well taught • Lectures were great • The course is a strong one. It brought out my strong points. Yeah...FGTP • The breaks were real. Break before movie, mid-movie, after movie... • Talkative • The breaks were real • Very interesting for someone who wants to get in touch w/ their creative side
<p>Weakest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much material • Could have elaborated more on certain concepts though • Draft revision and assignment were too close together

SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

- Office hours were limited, only in Surrey
- There was too much work. The grading as unfair. Too too much work
- I was looking forward to learning about colour theory and vector images but it was never taught or explained why the course material deviated from the course description.
- The “studio” lectures were a waste of time. Final exam should have been held during exam week.
- Too much wrighting
- Not applicable to daily life though....
- TA’s in course were really not needed
- The readings are not discussed but required for quizzes and exams
- The require reading is not discuss in class but in final & quizzes
- As with most courses at SFU lectures are unnecessary.
- Course needed more group projects
- Too many breaks
- Long classes
- Too many videos during lecture
- Too many in class participation
- Too many breaks, time wasted. Little direction on assignments, too vague. Too many videos, etc. While interesting, would prefer more ideas/explanations from prof.
- Assignments confusing/vague. No direction in programs/software to use
- The assignments would seem better if they were done in groups.

Question 3: Any other comments or suggestions?

- The online quizzes were not straightforward at all, for ex. “choose all that apply” questions were very confusing and not an accurate representation of our knowledge of course material or whether we read the articles
- Hand back assignment before next one due
- The course’s final doesn’t give me content, we don’t know how to review
- The class was too big. A smaller class size would have been so much better
- Worst course I’ve taken in my 10 years of post-secondary. Please lecture to a higher standard next time.
- Perhaps do the course evaluation the class before in class exam.
- Literally the biggest waste of money and time ever. There was so little 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

taught, and time was instead devoted to activities like “learning what narrative is” by watching Juno. This course would suit middle school, not university.