




THOMPSON
RIVERS
UNIVERSITY

Integrated
Planning &
Effectiveness

Winter 2018 Course Evaluation

Administration and Results

May 2018



Dana Prymak, Research Associate, IPE

Stephanie Klassen, Senior Research and Planning Analyst, IPE

Summary

TRU administered 'every course, every time' on campus course evaluations in Winter 2018. This was the sixth full implementation, and the largest to date with 1,309 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 March 26th and April 9th, and Trades evaluations took place during the months of January, February, and March (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Course evaluation summary

Total		Kamloops	Williams Lake	Trades
2	Campuses	1	1	2
9	Faculties and Schools	8	5	1
526 ¹	Faculty Members	464	34	34
1,309	Courses	1,170	84	55
1,277 ²	Surveys	1,151	45	81
8,091 ³	Students	7,385	221	513
32,108	Student Course Enrolments	30,502	893	713
17,837	Total Responses	17,072	463	302
59% ⁴	Response Rate	59%	63%	60%
90%	Survey Participation Rate	92%	78%	67%

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.

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.

⁴ Includes only surveys that were opened.

Inclusion

There were 1,309 courses identified for inclusion in course evaluations, and 1,277 surveys were prepared (Figure 3). This involved 526 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 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	#	28	97	95	30	114	5	74	60	34	526
	%	5%	18%	18%	6%	22%	1%	14%	11%	6%	100%
Courses	#	57	240	215	51	331	8	220	132	55	1,309
	%	4%	18%	16%	4%	25%	1%	17%	10%	4%	100%
Surveys	#	57	237	211	51	327	8	213	128	45	1,277
	%	4%	19%	17%	4%	26%	1%	17%	10%	4%	100%
Enrolment	#	1,312	6,921	3,729	1,779	8,557	192	6,643	2,262	713	32,108
	%	4%	22%	12%	6%	27%	1%	21%	7%	2%	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
- Science lab section type
- Course ending within, or attached to, Winter 2018
- Campus Kamloops and Williams Lake
- Trades and Technology courses

Criteria for Exclusion⁵

- Seminar, lab (excluding Science labs), field, practicum, thesis, directed studies, exchange, co-op work or PLAR section types
- Non-graded support sections
- Courses not ending in, or attached to, Winter 2018
- 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 (April 23rd, 2018)
- Memorandum of Settlement between TRU and TRUFA (July 21st 2015)
- Custom surveys: Law, Science, English as a Second 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

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 February 5th, with a request for response by February 16th. 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 February 26th. 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 12 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 Faculty of Science laboratory schedule (labs concluded one week before lectures concluded), the lab course list and surveys were prepared on an earlier timeline and separately from the main load process.

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 May 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 April 2018 for evaluations that took place in January, February, or March, and will continue on a quarterly basis.

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 March 16th; 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 requesting the survey link.

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

- 1185 links distributed via myTRU (89% Kamloops, 64% Williams Lake),
- 31 links distributed via myTRU and emailed directly to faculty members (5% Williams Lake, 46% Trades), and
- 196 links distributed by email directly to faculty members (11% Kamloops, 32% Williams Lake, 54% 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 only two responses from faculty,

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.

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 March 22nd.

Participation

Summary

Overall, 90% (1,151) of the prepared surveys were administered, which is a slight decrease from 92% in Fall 2017 (Figure 5).

Figure 5: Fall 2018 survey participation rate - Institutional

	#	%
Surveys Administered	1,151	90%
Surveys Not Administered	126	10%
Total Surveys Prepared	1,277	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 95% participation in the School of Nursing to 67% participation in the School of Trades and Technology (Figure 6). The participation rate in the School of Nursing improved by 11% compared to Fall 2017. In terms of the number of evaluations not administered, the largest number was in the Faculty of Science (46), followed by 15 in the School of Trades and Technology. Faculty of Student Development saw the largest decrease in participation rates compared to Fall 2017 (75% compared to 100%), followed by the Faculty of Science who's participation rate decreased by 10% compared to Fall 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	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
School of Nursing	121	95%	7	5%	128	100%
Faculty of Arts	224	95%	13	5%	237	100%
School of Business & Economics	199	93%	14	7%	213	100%
Faculty of Education and Social Work	197	93%	14	7%	211	100%
Faculty of Adventure, Culinary Arts & Tourism	53	93%	4	7%	57	100%
Faculty of Science	281	86%	46	14%	327	100%
Faculty of Law	40	78%	11	22%	51	100%
Faculty of Student Development	6	75%	2	25%	8	100%
School of Trades & Technology	30	67%	15	33%	45	100%
Total	1,151	90%	126	10%	1,277	100%

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 43% in the last week (Figure 7). Twenty-five percent of the surveys were opened during the first week. Figure 8 shows that 12% 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 March 26)	49	5%
Week 1 (March 26 - April 1)	267	25%
Week 2 (April 2 - April 8)	292	28%
Week 3 (April 9 onwards)	450	43%
Total	1,058	100%

Figure 8. Kamloops surveys opened by weekday

	# of Surveys Opened	% of Surveys Opened
Sunday	1	0%
Monday	213	20%
Tuesday	254	24%
Wednesday	245	23%
Thursday	217	21%
Friday	127	12%
Saturday	1	0%
Total	1,058	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

Response Rates

Summary

The total institutional response rate (of participating surveys) was 60%, compared to 63% in Fall 2017. Figure 9 details the response rate distribution by course survey. Aggregate response rates ranged from 79% in the Faculty of Student Development to 53% in the School of Business and Economics (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 Student Development	6	113	79%
School of Nursing	121	1,491	70%
Faculty of Education and Social Work	197	2,307	65%
Faculty of Adventure, Culinary Arts & Tourism	53	780	63%
Faculty of Science	281	4,726	61%
School of Trades & Technology	30	302	60%
Faculty of Law	40	933	59%
Faculty of Arts	224	3,826	57%
School of Business & Economics	199	3,359	53%
Total	1,151	17,837	60%

Kamloops Three-Week Timeline


The number of survey responses received during the administration period closely paralleled survey openings. Nearly half (43%) of the surveys were opened in the last week, and nearly half (41%) 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 March 26)	49	5%	713	4%
Week 1 (March 26 - April 1)	267	25%	4,489	26%
Week 2 (April 2 - April 8)	292	28%	4,885	29%
Week 3 (April 9 onwards)	450	43%	6,985	41%
Total	1,058	100%	17,072	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

All surveys were completed within an hour, with 90% 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	90%
11 to 20 minutes	7%
21 to 30 minutes	2%
1 hour +	0%
Total	100%

Time to Submit after Survey Open

Overall, 77% of surveys did not have any responses submitted after the 48-hour window, which is the same rate compared to Fall 2017. Of the 270 surveys that did have responses submitted after 48 hours, most (196) had only one late response. Another 68 surveys had two or three late responses, and 6 course surveys had four or more late responses (Figure 15).

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

	# 48 Hour Window survey count	% of Surveys
Kamloops	255	24%
Williams Lake	13	21%
Trades & Technology	2	7%
Total	270	23%

Figure 15. Surveys with late responses

	# 48 Hour Window survey count	% of Total 48 Hour Window surveys
1 late response	196	73%
2 or 3 late responses	68	25%
4 or more late responses	6	2%
Total	270	100%

In total, 2% of all otherwise-validated responses were removed due to the 48-hour validation check. (Figure 16 p.13).

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 '0' and by adding 'T' and preceding '0'.*

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 18,579 responses were received during Winter 2018 course evaluations. Of those responses, 217 (1.2%) were from students who were not registered in the course that they evaluated, 149 (0.8%) were duplicate student responses, and 376 (2.0%) were received after 48 hours of the survey opening. The remaining total number of valid student responses was 17,837.

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	17,761	212	1.2%	130	0.7%	347	2.0%	17,072
Williams Lake	502	4	0.8%	10	2.0%	25	5.0%	463
Trades & Technology	316	1	0.3%	9	2.8%	4	1.3%	302
Total	18,579	217	1.2%	149	0.8%	376	2.0%	17,837

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.

Survey Software Transition

In December 2017, IPE announced that FluidSurveys had been purchased by SurveyMonkey. This required a software transition over the Winter 2018 semester. School of Trades and Technology course evaluations were conducted through SurveyMonkey starting in January 2018 and all other Winter 2018 course evaluations were conducted through FluidSurveys. For the Winter 2018 administration, all faculty reports were distributed as PDF email attachments rather than URL report links.

Distribution

The PDF reports were generated by IPE and then shared to the CELT. Faculty were required to have submitted final grades before they were eligible to receive a course evaluation report. The deadline for grade submission for regular semester courses was May 4th, 2018. As of May 7th, 95% of the evaluated courses had 90% or greater of their final grades in Banner. Figure 17 shows the disposition of each report when the PDFs were shared to CELT on May 7th, 2018.

Figure 17. Report distribution flags May 7th – IPE report share document

	For distribution	Not for distribution	
Kamloops	662	>10% grades missing in Banner	30
		<5 responses	77
		Both conditions applied	10
Trades	23	>10% grades missing in Banner	3
		<5 responses	10
		Both conditions applied	8
Williams Lake	41	>10% grades missing in Banner	7
		<5 responses	20
		Both conditions applied	13

In light of the 10% of courses that were missing grades in Banner, the grades extract was regenerated on May 15th and 22nd 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 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	3	75%	1	25%	4	100%
	Counselling	3	75%	1	25%	4	100%
Faculty of Arts	English & Modern Languages	56	92%	5	8%	61	100%
	Geography & Environmental Studies	14	100%			14	100%
	Journalism, Comm & New Media	40	95%	2	5%	42	100%
	Philosophy, History & Politics	35	100%			35	100%
	Psychology	24	96%	1	4%	25	100%
	Sociology and Anthropology	23	82%	5	18%	28	100%
	Visual and Performing Arts	32	100%			32	100%
Faculty of Adventure, Culinary Arts & Tourism	Adventure Studies	10	91%	1	9%	11	100%
	Culinary Arts & Retail Meat	9	82%	2	18%	11	100%
	Tourism Management	34	97%	1	3%	35	100%
School of Business & Economics	Accounting & Finance	72	92%	6	8%	78	100%
	Economics	45	92%	4	8%	49	100%
	Human Enterprise & Innovation	27	93%	2	7%	29	100%
	Management			1	100%	1	100%
	Management, Information & Supply Chain	22	100%			22	100%
	Marketing & International Business	33	97%	1	3%	34	100%
Faculty of Science	Agricultural Related	27	90%	3	10%	30	100%
	Allied Health	13	48%	14	52%	27	100%
	Arch, Digi Art, Electron & Eng	14	78%	4	22%	18	100%
	Biological Sciences	60	85%	11	15%	71	100%
	Computing Science	35	95%	2	5%	37	100%
	Masters of Science	2	100%			2	100%
	Mathematics and Statistics	36	97%	1	3%	37	100%
	Natural Resource Sciences	24	75%	8	25%	32	100%
	Physical Sciences	70	96%	3	4%	73	100%
Faculty of Education and Social Work	EC, Elementary & Physical Ed	38	84%	7	16%	45	100%
	English as Second or Add Lang	68	97%	2	3%	70	100%
	Social Work and Human Service	42	95%	2	5%	44	100%
	University & Employment Prep	49	94%	3	6%	52	100%
Faculty of Law	Law	40	78%	11	22%	51	100%
School of Nursing	Nursing	121	95%	7	5%	128	100%
School of Trades & Technology	Construction Trades	23	70%	10	30%	33	100%
	Mechanical and Welding Trades	7	58%	5	42%	12	100%
Total		1,151	90%	126	10%	1,277	100%

Response Rates by Department

Division	Department	Surveys	Responses Received	Response Rate
Faculty of Student Development	Cooperative & Career Education	3	86	80%
	Counselling	3	27	77%
School of Nursing	Nursing	121	1,491	70%
Faculty of Education and Social Work	EC, Elementary & Physical Ed	38	603	72%
	English as Second or Add Lang	68	754	65%
	Social Work and Human Service	42	499	65%
	University & Employment Prep	49	451	58%
Faculty of Adventure, Culinary Arts & Tourism	Adventure Studies	10	198	63%
	Culinary Arts & Retail Meat	9	84	92%
	Tourism Management	34	498	59%
Faculty of Science	Agricultural Related	27	434	96%
	Allied Health	13	554	78%
	Arch, Digi Art, Electron & Eng	14	155	45%
	Biological Sciences	60	1,140	64%
	Computing Science	35	478	44%
	Masters of Science	2	30	94%
	Mathematics and Statistics	36	574	50%
	Natural Resource Sciences	24	443	65%
	Physical Sciences	70	918	62%
School of Trades & Technology	Construction Trades	23	215	54%
	Mechanical and Welding Trades	7	87	84%
Faculty of Law	Law	40	933	59%
Faculty of Arts	English & Modern Languages	56	873	58%
	Geography & Environmental Studies	14	266	64%
	Journalism, Comm & New Media	40	678	53%
	Philosophy, History & Politics	35	672	54%
	Psychology	24	604	63%
	Sociology and Anthropology	23	419	54%
	Visual and Performing Arts	32	314	63%
School of Business & Economics	Accounting & Finance	72	1,087	52%
	Economics	45	676	47%
	Human Enterprise & Innovation	27	518	56%
	Management, Information & Supply Ch..	22	455	52%
	Marketing & International Business	33	623	59%
Total		1,151	17,837	60%

Course Evaluation Response Validation



Appendix C – Survey Instrument

Winter 2018 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/celt/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



General questions – shown for all courses except ESAL, ESTR, Nursing practice and lab practice courses, Law and Science

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.