

Instructor: HAWRYSHKEWICH A

Course: IAT 110

Semester: 15-1

COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

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 85 22 6 0 1 hardly ever
75% 19% 5% 0% 1%

4. The course prerequisites were

essential 24 21 24 4 37 not essential
22% 19% 22% 4% 34%

5. The overall level of difficulty for the course was

too easy 2 14 46 39 13 too difficult
2% 12% 40% 34% 11%

6. The amount of work required for the course was

too little 3 2 34 39 35 too much
3% 2% 30% 35% 31%

7. How valuable was the course content?

very 14 31 47 17 5 not very
12% 27% 41% 15% 4%

8. The course text or supplementary material was

relevant 28 33 32 14 7 irrelevant
25% 29% 28% 12% 6%

A B C D F

9. I would rate this course as

22 49 31 6 4
20% 44% 28% 5% 4%

Frequency Distribution
Weight: 4 3 2 1 0

Valid No
Mean Responses Resp.

3.05 83 31

78 36

3.67 114 0

1.92 110 4

1.59 114 0

1.11 113 1

2.28 114 0

2.54 114 0

2.71 112 2

Instructor: HAWRYSHKEWICH A Course: IAT 110 Semester: 15-1	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									
	Weight:	4	3	2	1	0		Mean	Valid Responses	No Resp.
	well related	47 42%	40 35%	18 16%	7 6%	1 1%	unrelated	3.11	113	1
	fair	23 20%	37 33%	28 25%	18 16%	7 6%	unfair	2.45	113	1
	fair	15 13%	37 33%	34 30%	20 18%	7 6%	unfair	2.29	113	1
	informative	44 39%	40 35%	23 20%	3 3%	3 3%	uninformative	3.05	113	1
	excellent	61 54%	36 32%	14 12%	0 0%	2 2%	poor	3.36	113	1
	excellent	65 58%	30 27%	13 12%	2 2%	2 2%	poor	3.38	112	2
	high	84 74%	17 15%	10 9%	0 0%	2 2%	low	3.60	113	1
	adequate	33 29%	30 27%	34 30%	10 9%	6 5%	inadequate	2.65	113	1
	encouraged	77 68%	21 19%	12 11%	1 1%	2 2%	discouraged	3.50	113	1
	available	54 48%	32 28%	19 17%	6 5%	2 2%	never available	3.15	113	1
	very	55 50%	27 24%	23 21%	3 3%	3 3%	not at all	3.15	111	3
	excellent	65 58%	31 27%	15 13%	1 1%	1 1%	poor	3.40	113	1
		A	B	C	D	F				
		58 51%	37 33%	15 13%	2 2%	1 1%		3.32	113	1



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

Instructor:	Andrew Hawryshkewich
Semester:	Spring 2015 (1151)
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 I: What do you consider to be the strongest and weakest features of the instructor, as a teacher?

Strongest:

- He was very approachable and had a great sense of humour.
- Interest and class engagement.
- Good ability to communicate, and a fun person.
- Pleasure being in his class – teacher has a lot of energy and passion for his course.
- Friendly instructor.
- Good prof., interesting and funny.
- Really good prof in terms of teaching. Funny too.
- Shows very strong interest to the course.
- Good prof.
- Good at teaching. Makes students interact.
- Really great prof, responsive to comments/questions.
- Excellence way of teaching.
- Energetic, overall good instructor.
- Very well-prepared and knowledgeable about the course.
- Good at engaging and communicating material to students.
- Interest in subject and ability to communicate information.
- Tried to make lectures engaging.
- Helpful, information.
- Good.
- Good.
- I like Andrew. He is a good prof.

SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

- Knows what he's talking about.
- Attitude and interesting approaches to the course.
- Strongest feature is he demonstrates the basic animation principles and photographic principles.
- Knowledgeable about course content and makes lectures engaging. Approachable and offers extra help.
- Andrew is a good instructor with formal and proper attitude.
- There are nothing much to write. I enjoyed the every classes for the whole semester.
- Excellent communicator, you can tell he loves what he is doing.
- Andrew was so much fun! Made the semester a blast! 😊
- Strong sense of design.
- Although responsive to questions and encourages discussion in class.
- Passionate and knowledgeable.
- Interesting way of teaching. Good at grabbing attention of students.
- He is an interesting instructor.
- He is very understanding as an instructor.
- Very entertaining lectures. Humor in the right places. Informative and relevant information. Enjoyable 3-hour lecture (if that was even possible).
- Enthusiasm and knowledge.
- Love the teaching style.
- Great teacher!
- Excellent lecturer, able to capture my attention for the entire lecture!
- Interesting class, knows his work.
- Great instructor
- Very knowledgeable in this field of study, enthusiastic.
- He is funny and enjoys the material and is interesting.
- Style.
- Instructing style was very fun and interesting.

Weakest:

- While he was lecturing he didn't always make it clear what was important so it was sometimes difficult to take notes.
- Doesn't seem to think we have other classes, work, religious commit..etc.
- But I hope he'd give more clear instruction on projects.

SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

- Assignments were a bit vague and the course is going too fast.
- Not much.
- Fails to engage students, asks too much for a very simple topic...
- Perhaps include more real-life examples that relate to course material to keep lecture engaging.
- Seemed to draw out activities in class (time wise) that could have been communicated in a much shorter time.
- Instruction is unclear.
- Lectures need more info for quiz.
- Not enough office hours in Burnaby.
- Weakest feature is he does not have many information on lecture slides.
- Vague answers to questions. Require unnecessary amount of in lecture participation.
- He doesn't explain what he wants in his assignments! Says one thing and next week he changes what he has said.
- His weakness is that he explains very little material in lecture but then in projects he wants the stuff we do not know. Better explaining myself is that after doing projects and their dues we understand what was expected.
- Talk to fast.
- Sometimes Andrew isn't very clear in communicating the content material.
- A bit tedious.
- A little too many information.
- His ability to adequately explain what is highly expected from an assignment.
- Nil.
- There could be more information in the lecture slides.
- Could give more detailed feedback on assignments 😊 !

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

Strongest:

- It was fun and applicable for everyday life.
- The teacher, his way of teaching.
- What worked was the participation marks. Not only kept people in class (even if only for the mar) but also helped me keep on task for projects.
- This was a great course but alot of work.
- Reading materials and lecture notes are well-organized and related.

SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

- Projects are fun.
- Nothing.
- Very straightforward; concepts are simple and easy to understand.
- This was a fun course.
- Teachings applicable.
- Different sources and history.
- The perspectives on visual design taught and applied in the real world.
- Excellent course!
- Interesting, learn taking photograph skills.
- Course material was easy to grasp.
- It is a very interesting course.
- Interesting content.
- Interesting and applicable to real world.
- The courses were interesting, material were helpful.
- Informative and interesting.
- Content.

Weakest:

- There was quite a bit of info to cram into one class per week.
- Course material is basic rehash of readings, not too much added value or vice versa.
- Lack of examples of what he expects out of us. I am often not certain what his expectation is.
- TA's did not help or really communicate.
- Project organization was confusing and deliverables were unclear. There wasn't a lot of clarity of how much was expected for the last project (ie how many pictures or how long the flipbooks should be). Didn't get to see each others final works. The delivery of the lectures were cool, but often times felt could have been covered faster.
- The weakest features of this course would be the readings because there was unreasonable amount of readings to do.
- The lectures are basically the readings summarized. Way too much reading for a non-SIAT major course. Too much work with not enough time for projects. The lectures are too long.
- A lot of reading, writing and project work.

SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

- Some course material needs to be explained better.
- Marking is hard and too much writing.
- Misleading course.
- Good prof, not so great class. Quizzes should be about topics taught.
- Quizzes are too hard/irrelevant to readings. Quizzes should be about topics taught, not about insignificant details.
- Too much forced participation/discussions. Very little support from steff. Many assignments.
- Content is a little dull; I found I would often lose focus.
- Difficult for the design-challenged? Probably I could've tried harder but whatever.
- The marking scheme seems fair but it is actually too subjective that I believe marks are highly depending on TA's feeling. And the course content is not really 'design'! again, it is always about how you personally think. It's useless course, waste of money.
- Taught design principles that are pretty common knowledge.
- Project outlines were unclear.
- Too much work. Unrealistic expectation for student.
- The project is too much.
- Quiz too hard and unfair. Readings too long.
- Assignment topics are very vague, not specific direction. Quizzes are unreasonable difficult considering the large amount of readings for a short quiz.
- Too long of a lecture some days. Could definitely only be 2 hours. A lot of wasted time.
- I found that the 3 hour lectures were too long for the amount of time needed to convey that weeks material. I also felt like the instructions were very unclear for all the projects.
- Too much work.
- Work load is too much, also considering the amount of time needed to finish the assignment.
- The marking on projects are unfair and should be more fair towards students, especially if they have worked hard on it.
- Not a lot of new material.
- It can be a really frustrating course for a non-art student.
- Guidelines vague. Marking seems subjective.

SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

- Workload.
- Wish more feedback could be received on the rubrics for projects, comments were quite vague.
- Should explain the assignments more clearly. Tricky quiz questions.
- Lengthy.
- Too much work for an elective course. The reading does not make any sense. Even a business core course reading does not have as much pages to read as this course. Quizzes are meant to fail you. Does not make sense considering the amount we have to read. Supposedly : more page -> broader question.
- Too many projects, course content is a bit dry.
- The readings and quizzes were bad. You can further understand what images mean, but not relevant to business students.
- Lack of tutorial.
- Should teach students key points on applying design principles during their projects, otherwise they will not fully understand the elements when they put it in practice in projects.

Question 3: Any other comments or suggestions?

- Show more examples.
- I don't even go here T__T.
- Should put a W next to the course for the amount of writing.
- Too much workload, while this course is designed for non-IAT major students. This is not our first priority, however, given the amount of work, it is a very time consuming course.
- Course description stated "learning kinectic typography" sole reason for taking the course. Kinetic typography was never taught.
- Too much information for the quizz. Short period of time to remember everything.
- If I was to take this course again, I'd try harder...it was tougher than I had expected.
- It could have been a 2 hour course rather than a 3 hour course.
- Readings too long, quizzes asked questions that even after doing the readings you couldn't answer. Walk students through the process by activities in class. Would be helpful!
- Expects everyone to have a smartphone or some sort of device that can connect to the internet.

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

- It has been great be in this class.
- The course should tell more about the principle used in the assignment.
- Naw!
- You're funny!
- There should be less assignments.
- Course could be taught in 2 hours, lots of wasted time.
- An equivalent course for non-arts majors.
- Perhaps more examples and more explanation could be provided during projects.
- I prefer this course to assign a text instead of having each student read 100 of pages per week!
- Office hours were too short.
- Great job!