

Instructor: HAWRYSHKEWICH A

Course: IAT 333

Semester: 13-1

D100

COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

BACKGROUND	Frequency Distribution					Valid Responses	Mean	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		9 23%	23 58%	8 20%	0 0%	0 0%	3.26	40	22
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		21 50%	11 26%	6 14%	2 5%	2 5%		42	20
GENERAL									
3. How often did you attend the lectures/seminars?	always	25 40%	19 31%	10 16%	6 10%	2 3% hardly ever	2.95	62	0
4. The course prerequisites were	essential	17 27%	12 19%	19 31%	11 18%	3 5% not essential	2.47	62	0
5. The overall level of difficulty for the course was	too easy	2 3%	4 7%	34 56%	17 28%	4 7% too difficult	1.72	61	1
6. The amount of work required for the course was	too little	1 2%	3 5%	19 31%	26 42%	13 21% too much	1.24	62	0
7. How valuable was the course content?	very	10 16%	21 34%	17 27%	10 16%	4 6% not very	2.37	62	0
8. The course text or supplementary material was	relevant	14 23%	19 31%	18 29%	6 10%	5 8% irrelevant	2.50	62	0
	A	B	C	D	F				
9. I would rate this course as		11 18%	33 55%	10 17%	6 10%	0 0%	2.82	60	2

Instructor: HAWRYSHKEWICH A

Course: IAT 333

Semester: 13-1

COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

COURSE GRADING

10. The assignments and lecture/seminar were

well related 31 22 7 2 0 unrelated  
50% 35% 11% 3% 0%

3.32 62 0

11. The exams and assignments were on the whole

fair 23 19 13 6 1 unfair  
37% 31% 21% 10% 2%

2.92 62 0

12. The marking scheme was on the whole

fair 23 17 14 6 1 unfair  
38% 28% 23% 10% 2%

2.90 61 1

INSTRUCTOR AND LECTURES/SEMINARS

13. How informative were the lectures/seminars?

informative 24 21 10 4 3 uninformative  
39% 34% 16% 6% 5%

2.95 62 0

14. The instructor's organization and preparation were

excellent 31 16 9 5 0 poor  
51% 26% 15% 8% 0%

3.20 61 1

15. The instructor's ability to communicate material was

excellent 30 17 7 5 1 poor  
50% 28% 12% 8% 2%

3.17 60 2

16. The instructor's interest in the course content appeared to be

high 37 14 7 3 0 low  
61% 23% 11% 5% 0%

3.39 61 1

17. The instructor's feedback on my work was

adequate 27 20 10 4 0 inadequate  
44% 33% 16% 7% 0%

3.15 61 1

18. Questions during class were

encouraged 37 16 8 0 1 discouraged  
60% 26% 13% 0% 2%

3.42 62 0

19. Was the instructor reasonably accessible for extra help?

available 45 10 5 1 0 never available  
74% 16% 8% 2% 0%

3.62 61 1

20. Was the instructor responsive to suggestions or complaints?

very 38 15 9 0 0 not at all  
61% 24% 15% 0% 0%

3.47 62 0

21. Overall, the instructor's attitude towards students was

excellent 47 10 3 2 0 poor  
76% 16% 5% 3% 0%

3.65 62 0

A B C D F

22. I would rate the instructor's teaching ability as

36 17 5 2 0  
60% 28% 8% 3% 0%

3.45 60 2

**SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks**

Instructor:	Andrew Hawryshkewich
Semester:	Spring 2013 (1131)
Course:	IAT 333 – Interaction Design Methods
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:**

- Strongest is that he knows his design.
- Joe’s presence in the course.
- LOL! Andrew is great. The course wasn’t the best, but he tried to make the best out of it!
- Your awkwardness made the class funny.
- He’s awesome!
- Very insightful, also a little awkward.
- His glasses are cool. Kind of Hawkward.
- Hipster cat says “Andrew is a purrrdy good teacher.”.
- Good professor. Very knowledgeable. Great prof.
- Engaging instructor. Very informative. Keep up the entertaining classes!
- Great personality, funny.
- Clear and concise, good understanding about the course amterial and works well with students.

**Weakest:**

- Weakest is that he’ passive.
- Not enough puppies.
- The professor is TERRIBLE at understanding his students. It made for an extremely frustrating semester. I really did not enjoy having Andrew as a prof. I hope I never have him again. In lecture, even when students answered a question correctly he would sum it up incorrectly and then say it was wrong. His lectures were extremely vague. He is unable to communicate information effectively and leaves students confused about course content. The amount of work required is

### SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

<p>RIDICULOUS for a 3 credit course. A huge assignment every week? Really? We have 3 or 4 other classes to worry about. All over an extremely unpleasant course.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lecture slides are ugly.</li> <li>• I think you're a nice prof, but I don't think you teach this course well. I found the lectures a waste of time and doing one project for almost 5-6 weeks straight was just a drag. By the middle of the semester my interest in this course was 0%. But on that note, you are funny and very nice ☺ no hard feelings.</li> <li>• Writes very vague criteria/guidelines that are hard to follow.</li> <li>• Tangents.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Question 2: What do you consider to be the strongest and weakest features of the course?</b></p> <p><b>Strongest:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongest is the process that's learned.</li> <li>• Great industry applicable IxD methods.</li> <li>• Lets you really understand how to understand your users to design for.</li> <li>• Breadth of material.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Weakest:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have few time to prepare assignments and get feedback on them.</li> <li>• Too much graphic busy-work.</li> <li>• Having one project for the whole term was a drag.</li> <li>• Doesn't allow students to explore other methods – constrained to a set of methods.</li> <li>• I think this class sucked. a lot of writing, not enough of doing.</li> <li>• Too much work. Hinders quality deliverables.</li> <li>• What was said at the beginning of the course was not what was expected at the end. Disconnect, lots of different opinions between prof &amp; TA.</li> <li>• Lots of work to prepare.</li> <li>• The course however, is too TOO much work, I understand the requirements, but it's too much for a weekly deliverable.</li> <li>• Too much work.</li> <li>• Amount of work.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Question 3: Any other comments or suggestions?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You're a good teacher, be confident and people will listen.</li> <li>• I like cookies!</li> <li>• Did not like how everything was rushed in the end. Should have given one more week to accommodate user testing and time to reevaluate design. Slides are ugly.</li> </ul>

### SIAT Course & Instructor Evaluation Remarks

- Stop saying “sort of” so much! Your rough “sort of” count per lecture is approximately 37.
- Great course overall, and excellent instructor, but wish we had more than 1 week for actual design process. Would it be beneficial to do this course in 2 parts? Each 2 classes 2 terms, so as to cover all the research process but allow us more time to implement them. Otherwise, great term, thank you ☺.
- Course was disorganized in the beginning of the semester. Things got organized later but it was already too late for us to understand what’s going on in the course. It would be nice to provide hints in what we should do for each assignment.
- The beginning of the course was really messy content was not well organized and by the time we know what we “have” to do was too late because everything was build on top of the previous week. Hope you better communicate to us of what we have to do and teach us better.
- Have clear distinction of what is required. Communicate this with the TA. Clearly state what is required separate from what is wanted for exceeding achievements. Good work communicating main issues of the content.
- Let students have more freedom w/ project & methods they use.
- We should have been warned how time consuming this class is at the beginning so that we could adjust our schedules. Andrew was a good prof: the course was valuable though.
- He’s funny, Joe likes cookies ☺.
- Joe likes cookies :P.
- Lower the expectation & deliverable requirements, but keep up the information.
- Good job Andrew.
- Good job!