Course: POL 451 Semester: 15-1			COC	RSE A	NI Q	COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION			
		i d		so this is the first of the state of the sta	2. 4.				
BACKGROUND	Weight:	1 4	Target of	2 2	्रस	0	Mean	Valid No Responses Resp.	No Resp.
1. What is your cumulative grade point average?		30%	4 40%	20%	1 10%	%	3.20	10	5 cm
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?		⊢ 6	ω ί	0	0	2		11	7
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		D) 96	7. 8. 8.	æ Ö		æ & &			
GENERAL									
3. How often did you attend the lectures/seminars?	always	10 77%	12 33 38	00	000	0 hardly ever 0%	3.77	13	0
4. The course prerequisites were	essential	7 548	23 28 96	⇔ %	H 88	1 not essential 8%	3.08	13	0
5. The overall level of difficulty for the course was	too easy	00	1 %	468 468	38. 38.	1 too difficult 8%	1.54	13	0
6. The amount of work required for the course was	too little	00	H 88	6 468	4 31%	2 too much 15%	1.46	13	0
7. How valuable was the course content?	very	11 858	15%	00	0 %	0 not very 0%	3.85	13	0
8. The course text or supplementary material was	relevant	628	⇔ %	2 15%	⇔ %	1 irrelevant 8%	3.08	13	0
		A	В	บ	Д	Ęs,			
9. I would rate this course as		10 77%	23 33 34	00	0 0	0%	3.77	13	0

Sementer: 15-1	Instructor: A HIRA									
15-1				COD	RSE A	Ži Q	STRUCTOR EVALUATION			
Prequency Distribution Weight: 4 3 2 1 0 0 Weight: 4 3 2 1 1 0 Weight: 5 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2										
Well related 11			Free	nency		ribut	lon			
fair 11 1 1 0 0 0 unrelated 3.77 fair 12 1 1 0 0 0 unfair 3.77 fair 12 0 0 0 0 0 unfair 3.77 fair 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	COURSE GRADING	Weight:	4	m	- 64	н	0	Mean	Valid Responses	No Resp.
fair 11 1 1 0 0 unfair fair 12 0 0 0 1 0 unfair informative 12 0 0 0 0 0 uninformative excellent 12 1 0 0 0 0 uninformative excellent 11 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 uninformative excellent 11 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 uninformative be adequate 12 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			1 85 88	⇔ 60 H 00	~ œ	ap 0 O		3.77	13	0
informative 12 1 0 0 0 uninformative 3.92 informative 12 1 0 0 0 uninformative 3.92 in excellent 12 1 0 0 0 0 uninformative 3.92 excellent 11 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	The exams and were on the wh	fair	11 85%	1 88	13 88 88	0 %		3.77	13	0
informative 12 1 0 0 0 uninformative 3.92 ion excellent 12 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		fair	12 92%	00	0 %	1 8 8		3.77	13	0
How informative were	INSTRUCTOR AND LECTURES/SEMINARS									
The instructor's organization were and preparation were communicate material was a communicate material was the instructor's feedback available available towards students was complaints? The instructor's ability to excellent and thigh 12 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	How	informative	12 92%	H 88	0%	00		3.92	13	0
The instructor's ability to excellent 11 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	The	excellent	12 92%	1 88 86	0 %	80		3.92	13	0
The instructor's interest in the course content appeared to be	The instructor's ability communicate material was	excellent	11 858	1 8%	⊢ %e	0 %	poor	3.77	13	0
The instructor's feedback adequate 12 12 0 0 0 0 inadequate 3.92 on my work was Questions during class were encouraged 13 0 0 0 0 0 discouraged 4.00 was the instructor reasonably available 13 0 0 0 0 0 never available 4.00 os suggestions or complaints? Overall, the instructor's students was excellent 11 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	The instructor's interest course content appeared to	high	12 92%	1 88	0 %	0 %	low	3.92	13	0
Questions during class were encouraged 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		adequate	12 92%	H 86	08	00		3.92	13	0
Was the instructor reasonably accessible for extra help? available 100% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4.00 Was the instructor responsive to suggestions or complaints? very 10 2 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3.69 Overall, the instructor's attitude towards students was excellent 11 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3.85 I would rate the instructor's teaching ability as 10 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Questions during class were		13 100%	00	0 %	900		4.00	13	0
Was the instructor responsive to suggestions or complaints? very 10 2 158 88 08 08 08 08 08 08 08 08 08 08 08 08	Was the accessib	available	13 100%	00	0 %	00	never	4.00	13	0
Overall, the instructor's attitude towards students was excellent 11 2 0 0 0 poor 3.85 attitude towards students was A B C D F A B C D F I would rate the instructor's teaching ability as 10 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		very	10 778	15%	1 8%	00	not at	3.69	13	0
I would rate the instructor's teaching ability as 838 178 08 08 08 3.83	Overall, attitude	excellent	11 85%	11 55 56	00	90		3.85	13	0
I would rate the instructor's 10 2 0 0 0 3.83 teaching ability as 83 17% 0% 0%		j	Ą	В	۲	Д	[Eq.			
	I would rate the teaching ability		10 83%	17% 17%	000	00	0.0	w 00	12	7

Instructor / TA Identification Sheet



Instructor or Y.A.	Course	Number
AHIRIN	FOL	451
6000000000000000	0000	000
ଉତାବାବାବାବାବାବାବାବାବାବାବାବାବାବାବାବାବାବାବ	ଭାରାଭାରା	000
00000000000000	0000	203
0000000000000000		000
0000000000000000	9999	000
8888888888888	9000	606
	0000	© ©
	0000	000
0.3000000000000000000000000000000000000	100000	000
	0000	000
	0000	*=====================================
ତାହାତାହାହାହାହାହାହାହାହାହାହା	0000	

USE HB PENCIL ONLY

- -FILL IN THE CIRCLES
- ERASE CHANGES COMPLETELY
- DO NOT USE INK OR FELT PENS
- USE DARK MARKS

NOORRECT CORRECT





Semester

@@00

80000

0000

popolo

9999

0800

9999

00000

(SIS)(SIS)

3330

36

(1)

(1)(1)

Spring Summer Fall



ଉତାରାଜାତ ହଡ଼ାବର ବାର୍ବ ବାର୍ବ

6000000000000000000 ଉତ୍ୟକ୍ତ ବାଦ୍ର ବାଦ୍

80888088888888

900000000000000

0000000000000000

This sheet should immediately precede the batch of questionnaires used to evaluate the instructor or teaching assistant.

All sheets should be placed face up and erlented in the same direction. Do not fold or use staples.

To minimize operator handling, stack the batches uniformly on top of each other without using elastic bands or envelopes.

To preserve the order of the cheets, submit them in a box with packing paper if necessary.

- 1. Well laid out with high feedback.
 Statistic analysis was not as in depth as expected
- 2. textbook was weakest feature
 - wish PowerPoint had more detail
 - maybe use online sources for SPSS tutorials + textbook
- 3. 1) Best Features Were Lots of Feedback and Knowledgeable about Subject.
 - 2) Course was very Relevant and Helped Get Expertise w/Stats & Public Policy
 - 3) Prof took Feedback on Course to Improve Next Time.
- 4. Strongest knowledgeable

weakest - not giving enough time to think about answer before asking for response

- too much emphasis on stats.
- great that there is no final, less pressure; could concentrate on paper.
- 5. The prof certainly stimulates more interaction than is found in other courses cold calling et all
 - Overall it really seemed like he cared about the learning his students were doing in communicated relevant studies etc.
- 6. It doesn't matter because no one cares about what students think Again ↑
- 7. Nope
- 8. The instructor is very clear, informative, excellent! Good course!
- 9. Hira is a challenging and highly rewarding prof. He has been one of the best profs I have had at SFU. The university admin would be wise to listen to him.
- 10. Awesome prof. Very well prepared and clearly cares about teaching and his students. Did a very good job of gauging class level and comprehension. Very fair.
- 11. Passionate about the course and attentive to lecture. The text book.
- 12. Dr. Hira is an excellent instructor. He was good at challenging us to think and promoted class discussion.
- 13. 1. The instructor was always prepared and available for help, with lots of real life examples. Some of the material could have been communicated in a more simple fashion.
 - 2. The course was very practical in some respects. However there could have been more instruction.