

Students at University of Manitoba are asked to respond to statements about the course and course instructor on a 5-point numerical scale. The possible responses range from 'strongly agree' (5) to 'strongly disagree' (1) or "very good" (5) to "very poor" (1).

**Dynamic Earth GEOL 1440 Section A01 (lecture-based) Summer, 2007**

**Total enrollment: 26**

**Number of Survey Respondents: 18**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>Learning</b>	
I have found the course intellectually challenging and stimulating	4.06
I have learned something which I consider valuable	4.22
My interest in this subject has increased as a consequence of this course	4.11
I have learned and understood the subject materials of this course	3.94
<b>Enthusiasm</b>	
Instructor was enthusiastic about teaching the course	4.33
Instructor was dynamic and energetic in conducting the course	4.06
Instructor enhanced presentations with use of humour	3.94
Instructor's style of presentation held my interest during class	3.78
<b>Organization</b>	
Instructor's explanations were clear	4.00
Instructor's materials were well prepared and carefully explained	4.11
Proposed objectives agreed with those actually taught	4.22
Instructor gave lectures that facilitated taking notes	3.95
<b>Group Interaction</b>	
Students were encouraged to participate in class discussions	3.33
Students were invited to share their ideas and knowledge	3.39
Students were encouraged to ask questions and were given meaningful answers	4.00
Students were encouraged to express their own ideas and/or question the instructor	3.56
<b>Individual Rapport</b>	
Instructor was friendly towards individual students	4.39
Instructor made students feel welcome in seeking help/advice in or outside of class	4.33
Instructor had a genuine interest in individual students	4.11
Instructor was adequately accessible to students during office hours or	

<b>Breadth</b>	
Instructor contrasted the implications of various theories	4.00
Instructor presented the background or origin of ideas/concepts developed in class	4.17
Instructor presented points of view other than his/her own when appropriate	4.06
Instructor adequately discussed current developments in the field	4.06
<b>Examinations</b>	
Feedback on examinations/graded materials was valuable	4.28
Methods of evaluating student work was fair and appropriate	4.17
Examinations/graded materials tested course content as emphasized by the instructor	4.17
<b>Assignments</b>	
Required readings/texts were valuable	4.17
Readings, homework, laboratories contributed to appreciation and understanding of subject	4.00
<b>Overall</b>	
Compared with other courses I have had at UofM, I would say this course is	4.00
Compared with other instructors I have had at UofM, I would say this instructor is	4.00
As an overall rating, I would say this instructor is	4.00
<b>Student and Course Characteristics</b>	
Course difficulty (1=very easy; 5=very difficult)	3.22
Course workload, relative to other courses (1=very light; 5=very heavy)	3.61
Course pace (1=too slow; 5=too fast)	3.94
Hours per week required outside of class (1= <1; 5= >12)	3.47
Level of interest in the subject prior to this course (1=very low; 5=very high)	2.61
Overall GPA at UofM (1= <2.5; 5= >3.7)	3.40
Expected grade (1=F; 5=A or A+)	4.38
Year in program (1=1 <sup>st</sup> ; 5=graduate)	2.44