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).

Environmental Geology GEOL 2390 Section D01 (Web-based) Winter, 2011
Total enrollment: 31
Number of Survey Respondents: 11

Question	Mean
Learning	
I have found the course intellectually challenging and stimulating	4.09
I have learned something which I consider valuable	4.27
My interest in this subject has increased as a consequence of this course	3.82
I have learned and understood the subject materials of this course	4.09
I developed the ability to think independently about the subject matter	4.09
Notes & Texts	
The course notes conveyed the writer's enthusiasm about the course	4.09
The course notes were clearly written and easy to follow	4.27
The course notes were enhanced with the used of humour, illustrations and a conversational tone	3.50
The course notes were designed and written to hold my interest	3.82
The courses notes contained clear instructions regarding learning activities	4.27
The textbook was well integrated with the course notes	3.91
Other learning materials (readings, tapes, etc.) were appropriate	3.30
Organization	
Proposed objectives agreed with those actually taught so I knew where the course was going	4.36
The UofM Library resources were easily accessible	3.36
Group Interaction	
I was invited to share my ideas and knowledge	4.64
I was encouraged to ask questions and was given meaningful answers	3.92
I was encouraged to express my own ideas and/or question the instructor	4.44
Individual Rapport	

Instructor had a genuine interest in assisting me to learn	3.64
Instructor was adequately accessible to me	4.60
Breadth	
The course notes contrasted the implications of various theories	3.45
The courses notes presented the background or origin of ideas/concepts discussed	4.00
The course notes presented alternative points of view when appropriate	4.50
The course notes adequately discussed current developments in the field	4.67
Examinations	
Feedback on examinations/graded materials was valuable	3.65
Methods of evaluating student work was fair and appropriate	3.75
Examinations/graded materials tested course content as emphasized by the instructor	3.86
Examinations/graded materials tested course content as emphasized by the instructor	3.90
Assignments	
Required readings/texts were valuable	3.50
Readings, homework, laboratories contributed to appreciation and understanding of subject	4.20
Prompt feedback was provided on assignments/graded materials	3.50
Overall	
Compared with other courses I have had at UofM, I would say this course is	4.30
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
Student and Course Characteristics	
Course workload, relative to other courses (1=very light; 5=very heavy)	2.80
Course pace (1=too slow; 5=too fast)	3.20
Hours per week required outside of class (1= <1; 5= >12)	3.13
Level of interest in the subject prior to this course (1=very low; 5=very high)	3.50
Overall GPA at UofM (1= <2.5; 5= >3.7)	3.00
Expected grade (1=F; 5=A or A+)	4.80