



THE UNIVERSITY
OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

2019W2 UBC Individual Instructor Report for LFS 400 001 - Audio Storytelling (Duncan McHugh)

Project Title: **2019W2 UBC Instructor Evaluations**

Course Audience: **16**
Responses Received: **7**
Response Ratio: **43.75%**

Report Comments

Recommended Minimum Response Rates

| Class Size | Recommended Minimum Response Rates based on 80% confidence & $\pm 10\%$ margin |
|------------|---|
| < 10 | 75% |
| 11 - 19 | 65% |
| 20 - 34 | 55% |
| 35 - 49 | 40% |
| 50 - 74 | 35% |
| 75 - 99 | 25% |
| 100 - 149 | 20% |
| 150 - 299 | 15% |
| 300 - 499 | 10% |
| > 500 | 5% |

Creation Date: **Tuesday, September 8, 2020**



University Module Questions

University Module Questions

| Question | N | n | SD | D | N | A | SA | N/A | IM | DI | Mean | STDEV |
|--|----|---|----|---|---|---|----|-----|------|------|------|-------|
| The instructor made it clear what students were expected to learn. | 16 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4.63 | 0.24 | 4.57 | 0.53 |
| The instructor communicated the subject matter effectively. | 16 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4.63 | 0.24 | 4.57 | 0.53 |
| The instructor helped inspire interest in learning the subject matter. | 16 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 4.92 | 0.12 | 4.86 | 0.38 |
| Overall, evaluation of student learning (through exams, essays, presentations, etc.) was fair. | 16 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 4.92 | 0.12 | 4.86 | 0.38 |
| The instructor showed concern for student learning. | 16 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 4.92 | 0.12 | 4.86 | 0.38 |
| Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. | 16 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4.63 | 0.24 | 4.57 | 0.53 |

| Question | %Favourable |
|--|-------------|
| The instructor made it clear what students were expected to learn. | 100.00% |
| The instructor communicated the subject matter effectively. | 100.00% |
| The instructor helped inspire interest in learning the subject matter. | 100.00% |
| Overall, evaluation of student learning (through exams, essays, presentations, etc.) was fair. | 100.00% |
| The instructor showed concern for student learning. | 100.00% |
| Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. | 100.00% |

Faculty Questions

Course Questions

| Question | N | n | SD | D | N | A | SA | N/A | IM | DI | Mean | STDEV |
|--|----|---|----|---|---|---|----|-----|------|------|------|-------|
| I would recommend this course to other students. | 16 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 4.80 | 0.20 | 4.71 | 0.49 |

| Question | %Favourable |
|--|-------------|
| I would recommend this course to other students. | 100.00% |

Instructor Questions

| Question | N | n | SD | D | N | A | SA | N/A | IM | DI | Mean | STDEV |
|---|----|---|----|---|---|---|----|-----|------|------|------|-------|
| The course activities (e.g., lectures, labs, PBL, tutorials, field trips, on-line components, assignments) helped me achieve the learning objectives. | 16 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 4.33 | 0.37 | 4.29 | 0.76 |
| I was able to receive assistance from the instructor when needed. | 16 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 5.00 | 0.00 | 5.00 | 0.00 |
| Feedback given by the instructor helped me learn. | 16 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 4.92 | 0.12 | 4.86 | 0.38 |

| Question | %Favourable |
|---|-------------|
| The course activities (e.g., lectures, labs, PBL, tutorials, field trips, on-line components, assignments) helped me achieve the learning objectives. | 85.71% |
| I was able to receive assistance from the instructor when needed. | 100.00% |
| Feedback given by the instructor helped me learn. | 100.00% |

Open ended feedback

What I liked most about this course and/or instructor was ...

| Comments |
|--|
| This is a unique and creative course, the instructors are great and they have created a welcoming and encouraging learning environment. |
| Duncan and Will were incredibly supportive and provided really useful criticism that helped me to improve. |
| how engaged the classes were. |
| I was challenged in areas that other course don't, such as reaching out to experts in my field and interviewing them using audio recording. This went way outside of my comfort zone and now that I have done this once it will be easier to do again in the future. |
| The course was a nice mix of storytelling instruction, practical guidance/hands-on work, and contextualization of where/how in the world this kind of media making has a role. The instructors had a great rapport with each other and with the students. They were consistently helpful, thoughtful, generous, engaging, and patient. |
| they are knowledgeable with the subject matter and are available when I have questions |

I suggest that the course could be improved by ...

| Comments |
|---|
| This course really is a crash course in how to make a podcast, the instructors are balancing what information needs to be delivered, but as a consequence learning the actual technical aspect of audio editing gets lost – instead students have to self learn how to edit and engineer their podcasts. I would suggest having Friday's class actually be a lab dedicated to learning different skills/tricks on audacity. Additional guidance/tutorials on the technical aspect would have been more helpful compared to some of the lectures that were presented instead. |
| It would have been helpful to work on our interview skills in a "safe" way ahead of our final podcast, perhaps having an opportunity to interview someone in the class would have worked for this. |
| N/A. I enjoyed this class very much. |
| Hard to say since we had to leave the classroom learning. |
| We addressed this during the term, but it's true that time management and content prioritization could be improved. Duncan lectured most often and always included a great deal of interesting and sometimes amusing items to keep it engaging. But sometimes it could have been richer and more realistic to have 15% less of this so that we could cover (rather than sometimes scuttle) things better/less superficially. And have more time to directly engage students with content. (Like the times we did exercises like listening etc where we had guided convos and gave feedback – these were especially fruitful.) More direct guidance/in class application for a few more specific Audacity tools/effects would be nice too. I get that we were encouraged and had freedom to play with things. But that felt pretty inefficient. Managing that while also being newly introduced to basics of recording healthy sound, creating a good story...was sort of like being given an ingredients list for a nice dish, shown one way to use a chef's knife and a frying pan, and told to make the best of what we could with all the other utensils in the drawer that we'd never seen before. Who knew a potato peeler and a garlic press could be so helpful! |
| more projects and assignments to help student improve throughout a term |

Please comment on aspects of my teaching which you have found particularly effective as well as on those aspects which might be improved. You may wish to comment on areas such as classroom delivery, class discussions, interaction with students, availability outside class and overall interest in students.

Comments

As mentioned above, more focus on technical skills of editing/recording etc, would be helpful and would improve the quality of final podcast. Some of the lectures/guest speakers felt a bit lost in terms of their importance, which is not ideal given students are commuting to class only for 1 hour on Friday's. Combining the classes to make it 1 three hour lecture would have been better. However if the split class (wed/fri) is required then making the Friday class an actual 'lab' where students can have audacity set up to learn different skills would be very helpful.

However, it's clear the instructors, Duncan in particular goes above and beyond (outside classroom time) to ensure that students feel supported (probably puts too much effort into this!). Both instructors are very kind, easy going, and approachable. Very glad I was able to take this course!

Classroom set-up in a U shape would have worked better for this type of class.

It was great having access to the instructors outside of lab and lecture time. They responded to emails promptly and were able to assist/guide in every way possible. They made the experience in this class worthwhile. It was well organized in terms of how the structure of the class was run. Delivery for the material was clear and easy to follow. It was engaging and the class size was perfect. I really enjoyed the semester taking this class.

I was really interested in the guest speaker that you had in person, the one that were through video less so, especially the last interview. I found it difficult to receive what they are doing in field that was related to our learning and I also found it uninteresting.

Regardless of my improvement remarks, I enjoyed and looked forward to our class times, and learned a great deal. As stated before, Duncan was incredibly generous (Will too, but I interacted with him much less), and good-natured with helping outside of class. I appreciated the different kinds of enthusiasm they both brought to the course material, and enjoyed the way they balanced each other out with their skills.

lectures often overrun and there are activities outside of class time, it would be great if they could be within class time since students might not be able to make it due to other obligations.

Explanatory Note

Percent Favourable Rating

This is the percentage of respondents who rated the instructor a 4 or 5 (Agree or Strongly Agree).

Interpolated Median

The data collected for Student Evaluations of Teaching (SEoT) are ordinal in nature, with a natural order (from 1 to 5). While the mean may be used as a measure of central tendency for such data, it is not an appropriate or accurate representation of SEoT data (cf. Stark & Freishtat, 2014). The usual measure of central tendency for ordinal data is the median. As a result, we have been reporting the mean and the median for the last several years. After considerable thought and data modeling, we now believe that the interpolated median is the best representation of the data, since it takes the frequency distribution into account.

Consider the following example from 2015W, the two classes have identical mean (3.8). However, the instructor in class 2 received 77% favourable (4-5) ratings, compared to 53% for the instructor in class 1. The Interpolated median values of (3.7 and 4.2), much better reflects the distribution of the scores above and below their respective median. Furthermore, the interpolated median is better correlated with percent favourable rating; such that an interpolated median of 3.5 on a Likert scale of 1 to 5, corresponds to 50% favourable rating.

Frequency Distribution

| Response for UMI | Class 1 | Class 2 |
|--------------------------------|---------|---------|
| 5 = Strongly agree | 5 | 5 |
| 4 = Agree | 3 | 5 |
| 3 = Neither agree nor disagree | 6 | 0 |
| 2 = Disagree | 1 | 2 |
| 1 = Strongly disagree | 0 | 1 |
| | | |
| Mean | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| Median | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Interpolated Median | 3.7 | 4.2 |
| Percent favourable rating | 53% | 77% |

Dispersion Index

The dispersion Index is a measure of variability suitable for ordinal data (Rampichini, Grilli & Petrucci 2004). This dispersion index has values between zero and 1. A zero dispersion index indicates that all students in the section gave the same rating to the instructor. An index value of 1.0 is obtained when the class splits evenly between the two extreme values (Strongly Disagree & Strongly Agree), a very rare occurrence. In SEoT data at UBC, the index rarely exceeds 0.85, and mostly for evaluations not meeting the minimum recommended response rate.