



**THOMPSON
RIVERS
UNIVERSITY**

Integrated
Planning &
Effectiveness



Fall 2017 Course Evaluation

Administration and Results

March 2018

Stephanie Klassen, Senior Research and Planning Officer IPE

Summary

TRU administered 'every course, every time' on campus course evaluations in Fall 2017. This was the fifth full implementation, and the largest to date with 1,230 courses included to be evaluated. Evaluations were administered online for classroom-based courses during the last three weeks of classes (or equivalent).


The majority of Kamloops and Williams Lake evaluations took place between November 14th and December 8th, and Trades evaluations took place during the months of September, October, November, and December (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Course evaluation summary

Total		Kamloops	Williams Lake	Trades
2	Campuses	1	1	2
9	Faculties and Schools	8	5	1
521 ¹	Faculty Members	451	35	37
1,230	Courses	1,083	87	60
1,189 ²	Surveys	1,046	86	57
7,864 ³	Students	7,145	221	520
30,520	Student Course Enrolments	28,672	962	886
18,145	Total Responses	17,273	534	338
63% ⁴	Response Rate	63%	66%	54%
92%	Survey Participation Rate	94%	78%	70%

Technical administration of the evaluations was carried out by Integrated Planning and Effectiveness (IPE). The technical administration included: preparation of data files, surveys and links; technical administration of the survey; data cleaning; reporting; and providing technical assistance on an ad hoc basis (Figure 2).

Figure 2. Technical Administration Process



¹ Some instructors had course evaluations on more than one campus and/or Trades & Technology courses.

² Some instructors chose to have combined course evaluations, therefore the total number of surveys is less than the number of included courses.

³ Some students were registered at more than one campus and/or Trades & Technology courses.

⁴ Includes only surveys that were opened.

Inclusion

There were 1,230 courses identified for inclusion in course evaluations, and 1,189 surveys were prepared (Figure 3). This involved 521 individual faculty members from each of the 9 faculties and schools (including Williams Lake campus). Along with classroom-based, primary sections, this administration also included all Nursing practice and laboratory practice sections, as well as all Faculty of Science Chemistry laboratories (Figure 4).

Figure 3. Faculty, Courses, Surveys and Students included in course evaluations

		Faculty of Adventure, Culinary Arts & Tourism	Faculty of Arts	Faculty of Education and Social Work	Faculty of Law	Faculty of Science	Faculty of Student Development	School of Business & Economics	School of Nursing	School of Trades & Technology	Total
Faculty Members	#	27	97	103	18	111	3	71	62	37	521
	%	5%	19%	20%	3%	21%	1%	14%	12%	7%	100%
Courses	#	72	251	250	32	221	6	209	129	60	1,230
	%	6%	20%	20%	3%	18%	0%	17%	10%	5%	100%
Surveys	#	58	245	243	32	221	6	198	129	57	1,189
	%	5%	21%	20%	3%	19%	1%	17%	11%	5%	100%
Enrolment	#	1,283	7,011	4,323	1,167	7,149	122	5,910	2,669	886	30,520
	%	4%	23%	14%	4%	23%	0%	19%	9%	3%	100%

Figure 4. Criteria for Inclusion or Exclusion

Criteria for Inclusion

- Lecture or combined section type
- Primary section
- Nursing practice or lab practice section type
- Chemistry lab section type
- Course ending within, or attached to, Fall 2017
- Campus Kamloops and Williams Lake
- Trades and Technology courses

Criteria for Exclusion⁵

- Seminar, lab, field, practicum, thesis, directed studies, exchange, co-op work or PLAR section types
- Non-graded support sections
- Courses not ending in, or attached to, Fall 2017
- Open Learning courses
- Course section numbers designating directed studies, BC Campus, PLAR, labs
- Continuing education courses

Considerations for Administration

Several considerations guided the inclusion and administration process. In addition to following guiding documents, centralizing course evaluations included incorporating existing processes of some academic areas while introducing a completely new process in other areas. Specifically:

- Student Course Evaluations - Principles and Procedures approved by IDSC and presented to Senate (March 23rd, 2015)
- Memorandum of Settlement between TRU and TRUFA (July 21st 2015)
- Custom surveys: Law, Science, English as a Second or Additional Language, Education and Skills Training Program, Nursing practice and lab practice section types
- Student confidentiality – reports with fewer than five valid responses were not distributed, as is consistent with the practice of BCStats and current interpretation of the [BC Statistics Act](#) (BC Ministry of Technology, Innovation and Citizens' Services)

⁵ Some criteria appear to be redundant; due to inconsistency in Banner course entry, it is necessary to check each criterion individually. For example, a directed studies course may be identified as such by section type, section number, or actual course title.

After preliminary course inclusion lists were prepared based on the standard criteria for evaluation (Figure 4. Criteria for Inclusion or Exclusion), IPE sent a list of courses to each dean's office in Kamloops (and the Williams Lake campus coordinator) on September 29th, with a request for response by October 12th. Specifically, we requested review of the following:

- Inclusivity of the list (all sections that need to be surveyed are on the list)
- TBA faculty (provide name and ID for any missing faculty assignments)
- Faculty names and course sections (accuracy of course assignments)
- Start and end dates of courses
- Courses with no registrations
- Confirmation of cross-listed courses
- Identification of Nursing practice and lab practice section types
- Identification of Nursing sections where there was a miss-match between the section students were registered in and were taught in

Most faculties and schools responded with either approval or corrections by the requested date. In many cases, several interactions were needed to ensure that the data for each course (inclusion in the project, faculty assignment, type of section and start and end dates) were as accurate as possible.

After the list of courses was finalized through the consultation process described above, a notification email was sent directly from IPE to each faculty member included in the administration on October 17th. The email detailed which of the individual's courses were included, and briefly explained the evaluation process (including contact information for IPE and the Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT) and a link to the [FAQ](#) web page). This email generated approximately nine responses from faculty who had questions or concerns about the included courses. Resolving these inquiries further refined the list of courses for evaluation.

To coordinate with the block semester schedule in Williams Lake, two course lists were prepared: Block 1 and Block 2. Each administration was conducted separately, with all data validation and reporting completed in early January 2018.

To accommodate continuous-entry Trades courses, course lists and surveys were prepared each month in anticipation of the following month. The lists were sent directly to the Trades chairs. Data validation and reporting was completed in early January 2018 for evaluations that took place in October, November, or December, and will continue on a quarterly basis.

Implementation

Distribution of Survey Links

As detailed under the box to the right, Survey Response Data Integrity: Implementation, most course survey links were made available to students through their myTRU portals. This protocol was chosen in response to a specific request from the TRU Students' Union (TRUSU). IPE prepared a data file containing the survey link and course detail (faculty name, CRN, etc.), which was then posted to the Course Evaluation myTRU channel by an IPE data analyst. The channel was populated with data from the survey link file according to each students' current course registrations.

IPE provided the main Kamloops file of survey links and course detail to the IPE data analyst for posting to student myTRU portals on November 1st; after this deadline, changes to the course lists were accommodated manually and links were provided directly to faculty members.

IPE supported the manual administration of several course evaluations due to one of the following reasons:

- requests for changes submitted after the deadline,
- course sections running outside of the regular schedule,
- course sections where there was a mismatch between the section students were registered in and were taught in
- continuous entry course sections, or
- faculty requested the survey link.

In total, 84% of all survey links were distributed via myTRU:

- 995 links distributed via myTRU (91% Kamloops, 55% Williams Lake),
- 57 links distributed via myTRU and emailed directly to faculty members (6% Williams Lake, 79% Trades), and
- 137 links distributed by email directly to faculty members (9% Kamloops, 40% Williams Lake, 21% Trades).

Distribution of Passwords

As detailed under Survey Response Data Integrity: Implementation, each course survey link was assigned a unique password. The passwords were randomly generated using Norton IdentitySafe and were manually programmed into each survey. Every password was then independently verified. A third round of independent, random audit checks ensured password accuracy.

The passwords were individually distributed to faculty members using their official TRU email addresses. Each faculty member received one email per password. Password distribution resulted in 10 responses from faculty, the majority of which included questions regarding instructor assignment and course inclusion (these were forwarded to the appropriate Deans' offices).

Most passwords were emailed to faculty members on November 2nd (seven business days before the regular three-week course evaluation period).

Survey Response Data Integrity: Implementation

Ensuring the highest possible survey participation rates was balanced with the need to ensure the highest possible integrity of survey data. To this end, the following protocols were followed for all surveys (see exclusions below):

Students were required to sign in to their secure myTRU accounts in order to access the survey links.

Survey links were only made available to students with a current registration in the course section.

Each survey was protected with a unique password.

The password was provided to the faculty member just prior to the survey administration period; in most cases (84%), faculty members were not provided with the link to the actual survey.

Faculty members were provided with a direct phone number to contact IPE for technical questions during the evaluation period.

Exceptions to the above protocols were rare, and included course sections that required evaluation before the myTRU implementation, course sections that were included after the IPE deadlines, or a few rare instances of technical difficulty.

Participation

Summary

Overall, 92% (1,090) of the prepared surveys were administered, which is a decrease from 93% in Winter 2017 (Figure 5). At the time of the analysis for this report, there were still six surveys that were open as the evaluation had not yet occurred.

Figure 5: Fall 2017 survey participation rate - Institutional

	#	%
Surveys Administered	1,090	92%
Surveys Not Administered	93	8%
Surveys Still Open	6	1%
Total Surveys Prepared	1,189	100%

It is important to note that these participation rates measure participation in the survey administration only (not response rates). Participation rates varied by faculty and school, ranging from 100% participation in the Faculty of Student Development to 70% participation in the School of Trades and Technology (Figure 6). In terms of the number of evaluations not administered, the largest number was in the Faculty of Education and Social Work (23), followed by 20 in the School of Nursing. The School of Trades and Technology saw the largest decrease in participation rates compared to Winter 2017 (70% compared to 81%), followed by the School of Nursing who's participation rate decreased by 8% compared to Winter 2017.

For participation rates by department, see Appendix A – Participation and Response Rates by Department.

Figure 6: Survey participation rate – Division

	Surveys Administered		Surveys Not Administered		Total Surveys Prepared	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Faculty of Student Development	6	100%			6	100%
Faculty of Adventure, Culinary Arts & Tourism	56	97%	2	3%	58	100%
Faculty of Science	213	96%	8	4%	221	100%
Faculty of Arts	235	96%	9	4%	244	100%
School of Business & Economics	190	96%	8	4%	198	100%
Faculty of Education and Social Work	215	90%	23	10%	238	100%
School of Nursing	109	84%	20	16%	129	100%
Faculty of Law	26	81%	6	19%	32	100%
School of Trades & Technology	40	70%	17	30%	57	100%
Total	1,090	92%	93	8%	1,183	100%

Participation Rate: The percentage of surveys administered out of all prepared surveys. The reasons for not participating may be or may not be known.

Response Rate: The number of valid* responses received for each participating survey as a percentage of the total course registrations (not the attendance in class that day).

*one response per registered student received within 48 hours of survey opening. See Response Validation

Kamloops Timeline

Faculty members chose the date that they opened their course evaluation survey during the last three weeks (or equivalent) of their classes. Surveys were opened when the faculty member chose to provide the unique password to students. In Kamloops, most surveys were opened toward the end of the three-week period, with 51% in the last week (Figure 7). Only 9% of the surveys were opened during the first week. Figure 8 shows that 11% of surveys were opened on a Friday; the remaining were fairly equally distributed from Monday to Thursday.

Figure 7. Kamloops surveys opened by week

	# of Surveys Opened	% of Surveys Opened
Early (before Nov 14)	32	3%
Week 1 (Nov 14 - Nov 17)	90	9%
Week 2 (Nov 20 - Nov 24)	355	36%
Week 3 (Nov 27 onwards)	506	51%
Total	983	100%

Figure 8. Kamloops surveys opened by weekday

	# of Surveys Opened	% of Surveys Opened
Sunday	1	0%
Monday	195	20%
Tuesday	241	25%
Wednesday	215	22%
Thursday	213	22%
Friday	112	11%
Saturday	6	1%
Total	983	100%

Response Rates

Summary

The total institutional response rate (of participating surveys) was 63%, compared to 61% in Winter 2017. Figure 9 details the response rate distribution by course survey. Aggregate response rates ranged from 68% in the Faculty of Education and Social Work to 54% in the School of Trades and Technology. (Figure 10).

It is important to note that response rates were calculated as a percentage of total enrolment as of the end of the term. The total enrolment of the course does not necessarily reflect the number of students who attended class on the day of the evaluation.

Figure 9: Survey response rates – Distribution




Figure 10: Survey response rates – Division

Division	Surveys	Responses Received	Response Rate
Faculty of Education and Social Work	215	2,757	68%
Faculty of Science	213	4,573	67%
School of Nursing	109	1,556	67%
Faculty of Student Development	6	81	66%
Faculty of Arts	235	4,235	62%
Faculty of Adventure, Culinary Arts & Tourism	56	757	61%
School of Business & Economics	190	3,302	57%
Faculty of Law	26	546	56%
School of Trades & Technology	40	338	54%
Total	1,090	18,145	63%

Kamloops Three-Week Timeline


The number of survey responses received during the administration period closely paralleled survey openings. Over half (51%) of the surveys were opened in the last week, and over half (53%) of all responses were received in the last week (Figure 11).

Figure 11. Kamloops surveys opened and responses received by week

	# of Surveys Opened	% of Surveys Opened	Responses Received	% Responses Received
Early (before Nov 14)	32	3%	463	3%
Week 1 (Nov 14 - Nov 17)	90	9%	1,511	9%
Week 2 (Nov 20 - Nov 24)	355	36%	6,182	36%
Week 3 (Nov 27 onwards)	506	51%	9,117	53%
Total	983	100%	17,273	100%

As expected, the number of responses closely followed the survey openings. Figure 12 shows the peak times, as well as a slight lag in when responses were received (accounted for by the 48-hour allowance).

Figure 12. Kamloops surveys opened and responses received over evaluation period



Survey Completion Times

Time to Complete Survey

The large majority (96%) of surveys were completed within an hour, with 91% of surveys completed within 10 minutes or less. The completion time was calculated in minutes, from the time each respondent opened their survey to when they submitted it (Figure 13).

Figure 13. Survey completion time

10 minutes or less	91%
11 to 20 minutes	4%
21 to 30 minutes	1%
31 to 60 minutes	1%
1 hour +	4%
Total	100%

Time to Submit after Survey Open

Overall, 77% of surveys did not have any responses submitted after the 48-hour window, compared to 71% in Winter 2017. Of the 255 surveys that did have responses submitted after 48 hours, most (165) had only one late response. Another 69 surveys had two or three late responses, and 21 course surveys had four or more late responses (Figure 15).

Figure 14. Surveys with responses submitted after the 48-hour window

	# of Surveys	% of Surveys
Kamloops	240	24%
Williams Lake	8	12%
Trades & Technology	7	18%
Total	255	23%

Figure 15. Surveys with late responses

	# of Surveys	% of Surveys
1 late response	165	65%
2 or 3 late responses	69	27%
4 or more late responses	21	8%
Total	255	100%

In total, 2.3% of all otherwise-validated responses were removed due to the 48-hour validation check. (Figure 16 below).

Survey Response Data Validation

To ensure the highest possible quality of response data and to encourage buy-in from all stakeholders, each individual survey response underwent several validity checks. Primarily:

1. The student was registered in the course
2. The student submitted a single response
3. The response was received within 48 hours of the survey opening

For a more detailed process see the Responses Validation Process chart in Appendix B.

Student TID

After students gain entry to the survey with the unique course password, the survey instrument requires them to provide their TID. IPE programmed a validation mask that required the student to enter a 9-character ID (starting with “T”) before they could proceed with the survey.

TID error message

Please provide your TID

This information will be used only to track survey completion and will not be shared with your instructor.
(example: T12345678)

Please use your 9-character TID

The student TID is used to check that the respondent is registered in the course section for which they have complete a survey. This check is redundant to the requirement that students access the survey through myTRU. It is also used to check for duplicate responses.

Duplicate Responses

Responses were determined to be duplicates if they had the same student TID. The first completed response was retained.

48 Hour Response Window

The exact time stamp (hours, minutes) of the first valid response to a given course section survey determined the opening of the 48 hour response window. The time stamp on each subsequent submission for that course section was compared to the first time stamp; responses that were received more than 48 hours (2,880 minutes) after the first time stamp were considered invalid.

Survey Response Data Integrity: Validation

Ensuring that only registered students in each course completed the survey is a top priority. To guarantee the reliability of response data:

Students were required to provide their TID before completing the survey.

Each individual response TID was compared with the registrations for that course; only responses from registered students were validated.

In the case of mismatches between respondent TID and course registration, the records were checked manually prior to deletion.

Only the first completed response for each student in each course was retained; duplicate responses were manually examined and deleted.

Only responses received within 48 hours of the survey opening (the first password-protected response was received) were retained; overdue responses were manually examined and deleted.

Where possible, invalid student TIDs were automatically repaired by changing the letter ‘o’ to ‘O’ and by adding ‘T’ and preceding ‘O’.*

Where specifically advised, obsolete ‘9-IDs’ were manually corrected.

** Due to the large volume of responses, these corrections were accomplished with an automatic script.*

Summary

A total of 19,102 responses were received during Fall 2017 course evaluations. Of those responses, 301 (1.6%) were from students who were not registered in the course that they evaluated, 223 (1.2%) were duplicate student responses, and 433 (2.3%) were received after 48 hours of the survey opening. The remaining total number of valid student responses was 18,145.

Figure 16. Response validation summary by campus

	Total Responses (not cleaned)	# of Not Registered	Not Registered Percent	# of Duplicate TID	Duplicate TID Percent	# Over 48 Hour Window	Over 48 Hour Window Percent	Total Valid Responses (cleaned)
Kamloops	18,158	275	1.5%	198	1.1%	412	2.3%	17,273
Williams Lake	550	4	0.7%	3	0.5%	9	1.6%	534
Trades & Technology	394	22	5.6%	22	5.6%	12	3.0%	338
Total	19,102	301	1.6%	223	1.2%	433	2.3%	18,145

Reporting

Summary

As directed by Senate, IPE produced the following course evaluation reports:

1. Institutional report (all responses, four Senate questions only)
2. Faculty and School reports (all responses, all numeric questions)
3. Individual course survey reports (all questions) where there were five or more responses and final grades were submitted

The Faculty of Science passed a motion at faculty council to allow for the Science dataset to be shared with the Dean's office. This will allow for the current analysis and reporting function to continue within that faculty. Each faculty member will receive a report from the Dean's office; therefore, individual course survey reports were not created for this faculty.

Distribution

Each report is contained within a unique HTML link. The report links were generated by IPE and then shared to the CELT. Faculty are required to have submitted final grades before they are eligible to receive a course evaluation report. The deadline for grade submission for regular semester courses was December 22nd, 2017. As of January 2nd (one week after the grades deadline) 90% of the evaluated courses had 90% or greater of their final grades in Banner. Figure 17 shows the disposition of each report when the links were shared to CELT on January 2nd, 2018.

Figure 17. Report distribution flags January 2nd – IPE report share document

For distribution		Not for distribution	
Kamloops	674	>10% grades missing in Banner	48
		<5 responses	63
		Both conditions applied	17
Williams Lake	41	>10% grades missing in Banner	9
		<5 responses	20
		Both conditions applied	10
Trades	18	>10% grades missing in Banner	5
		<5 responses	26
		Both conditions applied	8

In light of the 10% of courses that were missing grades in Banner, the grades extract was regenerated January 17th and 40 additional reports were released due to 90% or greater of the grades present in Banner.

Courses that are traditionally expected to have enrolment of less than five (for example, Williams Lake Trades and Technology courses) will be produced on a cumulative basis, by request, when a sufficient number of students have completed and evaluated the course.

Appendix A – Participation and Response Rates by Department


Participation Rates by Department

		Surveys Administered		Surveys Not Administered		Total Surveys Prepared	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
Faculty of Student Development	Cooperative & Career Education	2	100%			2	100%
	Counselling	4	100%			4	100%
Faculty of Arts	English & Modern Languages	68	96%	3	4%	71	100%
	Geography & Environmental Studies	15	100%			15	100%
	Journalism, Comm & New Media	33	92%	3	8%	36	100%
	Philosophy, History & Politics	34	100%			34	100%
	Psychology	28	100%			28	100%
	Sociology and Anthropology	27	100%			27	100%
	Visual and Performing Arts	30	91%	3	9%	33	100%
Faculty of Adventure, Culinary Arts & Tourism	Adventure Studies	13	87%	2	13%	15	100%
	Culinary Arts & Retail Meat	8	100%			8	100%
	Tourism Management	35	100%			35	100%
School of Business & Economics	Accounting & Finance	58	91%	6	9%	64	100%
	Applied Bus. Tech. & Legal Assistant	1	100%			1	100%
	Economics	42	100%			42	100%
	Human Enterprise & Innovation	34	100%			34	100%
	Management, Information & Supply Chain	15	100%			15	100%
	Marketing & International Business	26	96%	1	4%	27	100%
	Master of Business Administration	14	93%	1	7%	15	100%
Faculty of Science	Agricultural Related	15	100%			15	100%
	Allied Health	9	100%			9	100%
	Arch, Digi Art, Electron & Eng	15	100%			15	100%
	Biological Sciences	28	93%	2	7%	30	100%
	Computing Science	33	97%	1	3%	34	100%
	Mathematics and Statistics	38	100%			38	100%
	Natural Resource Sciences	12	75%	4	25%	16	100%
	Physical Sciences	63	98%	1	2%	64	100%
Faculty of Education and Social Work	EC, Elementary & Physical Ed	49	77%	15	23%	64	100%
	English as Second or Add Lang	79	100%			79	100%
	Human Services	18	100%			18	100%
	Social Work	17	77%	5	23%	22	100%
	University & Employment Prep	52	95%	3	5%	55	100%
Faculty of Law	Law	26	81%	6	19%	32	100%
School of Nursing	Nursing	109	84%	20	16%	129	100%
School of Trades & Technology	Construction Trades	26	68%	12	32%	38	100%
	Mechanical and Welding Trades	14	74%	5	26%	19	100%
Total		1,090	92%	93	8%	1,183	100%

Response Rates by Department

Division	Department	Surveys	Responses Received	Response Rate
Faculty of Education and Social Work	EC, Elementary & Physical Ed	49	796	70%
	English as Second or Add Lang	79	859	67%
	Human Services	18	242	67%
	Social Work	17	306	78%
	University & Employment Prep	52	554	62%
Faculty of Science	Agricultural Related	15	307	95%
	Allied Health	9	557	86%
	Arch, Digi Art, Electron & Eng	15	252	57%
	Biological Sciences	28	751	69%
	Computing Science	33	557	55%
	Mathematics and Statistics	38	700	58%
	Natural Resource Sciences	12	287	61%
	Physical Sciences	63	1,162	70%
School of Nursing	Nursing	109	1,556	67%
Faculty of Student Development	Cooperative & Career Education	2	49	62%
	Counselling	4	32	74%
Faculty of Arts	English & Modern Languages	68	1,133	62%
	Geography & Environmental Studies	15	243	67%
	Journalism, Comm & New Media	33	582	60%
	Philosophy, History & Politics	34	602	57%
	Psychology	28	646	62%
	Sociology and Anthropology	27	643	63%
	Visual and Performing Arts	30	386	69%
Faculty of Adventure, Culinary Arts & Tourism	Adventure Studies	13	135	46%
	Culinary Arts & Retail Meat	8	72	71%
	Tourism Management	35	550	64%
School of Business & Economics	Accounting & Finance	58	952	59%
	Applied Bus. Tech. & Legal Assistant	1	2	33%
	Economics	42	598	49%
	Human Enterprise & Innovation	34	694	66%
	Management, Information & Supply Ch..	15	323	43%
	Marketing & International Business	26	517	64%
	Master of Business Administration	14	216	72%
Faculty of Law	Law	26	546	56%
School of Trades & Technology	Construction Trades	26	219	48%
	Mechanical and Welding Trades	14	119	71%
Total		1,090	18,145	63%

Course Evaluation Response Validation



Appendix C – Survey Instrument

Fall 2017 Course Evaluation for {{collector.coursecode_section_title}} taught by {{collector.faculty_name}}

You are currently nearing the end of your course. We hope you take the time to assess the course by completing this survey. Your feedback is important and will help to improve the service and quality of learning for future students. At TRU, we are committed to providing learning with the best possible experience, therefore your feedback is crucial to this continuous improvement process. Your responses are confidential and Faculty members will not be able to link an individual student to any specific responses or comments. A course-wide summary report will be provided to Faculty members after all the results are compiled and final grades have been submitted. The Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning will report on campus results of course evaluations for students to see how their responses are improving learning at TRU. Those results can be found at http://www.tru.ca/learning/Course_Evaluations.html

Please provide your TID

This information will be used only to track survey completion and will not be shared with your instructor.
(example: T12345678)

General Questions

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
A1. The course was a valuable learning experience for me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A2. The course challenged me to do my best work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A3. I think the course content reflected the learning outcomes, as stated in the course outline.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A4. The course experience increased my appreciation for the subject matter.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Shown for ESAL and ESTR courses only


Strongly Disagree


Disagree


Agree


Strongly Agree

Rating of Instruction

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
B1. I think the instructor was well prepared for class.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B2. I think the class sessions were well organized.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B3. I clearly understood the relevance of the assignment to the course objectives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B4. Examples and illustrations provided in this course aided my understanding.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B5. I think the instructor communicated the course material clearly.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B6. I clearly understood how my work would be evaluated in this course.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B7. The instructor helped me understand the relevance of the material to real-life situations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B8. I think the instructor was enthusiastic about the course content.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B9. I was engaged in learning the course content during class time.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B10. My interactions with the instructor encouraged me to learn.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B11. The class atmosphere supported my learning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B12. The instructor treated me with respect in this class.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B13. I think the instructor made a genuine effort to be available outside of class (face to face, electronically)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B14. The feedback I received (excluding marks) on work that I completed was helpful to my learning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

B15. What aspects of this course helped your learning the most? Please be specific.

B16. What suggestions do you have that would make this course a better learning experience? Please be specific.

Thank you for participating in this survey.