

<b>Course:</b>	UWC 5004 - Social Justice Frameworks in Action	<b>Department:</b>	UWC
<b>Responsible Faculty:</b>	Tamara Steger	<b>Responses / Expected:</b>	7 / 11 (63.64%)
<b>Overall Mean:</b>	8.1 10 point scale with NA option (57 responses) 2.6 CEU Workload2 (7 responses)		

Part 1: Overall evaluations	UWC 5004											--- Period Comparisons ---			
	Responses										Course		UWC		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	N	Mean	N	Mean	Pct Rnk
Q1	Please assess the overall quality of the course.											17	8.1	7.6	75
Responses: [1] 1=1 [2] 2=2 [3] 3=3 [4] 4=4 [5] 5=5 [6] 6=6 [7] 7=7 [8] 8=8 [9] 9=9 [10] 10=10 Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)															

Part 3: The course	UWC 5004											--- Period Comparisons ---			
	Responses										Course		UWC		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	N	Mean	N	Mean	Pct Rnk
Q2	I clearly understood the course requirements, and what is expected of me in the course.											17	6.6	7.4	25
Q3	The course has achieved its stated goals.											17	7.4	7.8	25
Q4	Course materials advanced my understanding of the subject											17	8.6	8.2	75
Responses: [1] 1=1 [2] 2=2 [3] 3=3 [4] 4=4 [5] 5=5 [6] 6=6 [7] 7=7 [8] 8=8 [9] 9=9 [10] 10=10 Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)															

Part 3: The course	UWC 5004											--- Period Comparisons ---			
	Responses										Course		UWC		
	TL	AR	TH	N	Mean	N	Mean	Pct Rnk							
Q5	Please assess if the workload was in line with the number of credits?											17	2.6	2.2	75
Responses: [TL] too low=1 [AR] about right=2 [TH] too high=3 Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)															

**Q6 - What I liked best about this course:**




**Response Rate:** 85.71% (6 of 7)

1	the interdisciplinary approach is priceless and makes you think and reflect much more than a normal course, for sure.	
2	The multidisciplinarity of the course was fantastic and the idea of the course too	
3	Interdisciplinary Professors and TAs were really willing to help and tried their best for this pilot to be a success Midterm evaluation	
4	I really loved the interdisciplinary aspect of the course, and I felt like the professors made a real effort to weave together their respective components. It was great to have all of the professors attending the class lectures as well- I really like participating in that dialogue. I also felt like when the professors were familiar with the material of the others, it helped bridge the gaps between the various departments in the course itself. I also liked the idea of the class "lab" session, although I have a few ideas of how to improve this a bit (following comments!).	
5	I loved the interdisciplinary nature of the course and how it challenged me to think differently and approach a problem from various perspectives. It was really nice working with students and professors from different departments & specializations, it allowed me to learn a lot.	
6	Environmental justice	

**Q7 - What I liked least about this course:**

**Response Rate:** 85.71% (6 of 7)

1	the workload in particular for the group project was condensed in the last weeks because of the late multimedia curation feedback; I would suggest to anticipate that.	
2	Too many readings for relatively short lecture period Final output requirements were not always clear (paper, presentation, multimedia, etc.) and we were able to come up with something but there was not much time to do the multimedia project between the last lecture and the final presentation date. Too many little requirements made the course feel overwhelming at times Restricting social justice to participation was a bit too constraining. I think students should decide what they want their cases to focus on from the onset and then decide with professors on what dimension of social justice to pursue (participation, etc.). Not all cases weigh equally on participation. Considering the timeframe of the course, students couldn't get the fundamentals of all discipline before now linking them to the cases. As such, consider this course being at least two semesters.	
3	The course sometimes felt a little disjointed, and the workload was definitely a little too high. I felt that we should not have had to do a single group project throughout the duration of the course. There was a lot of lack of communication between the teaching faculty & the students about what was expected from us at the end of the course. It is a course with a lot of potential & it can be made so much better with a little organisation.	

4	It took a very long time to understand what the teachers wanted from the students. To broadness of the course is a strength but also a huge challenge once this course will be developed. But, there is great potential for this course. I am really glad I took this course because I got to reason from multiple perspectives outside of my own department.	
5	I wish we had more time to discuss the course material, not just lectures and then labs to work on the case study. I think the labs could be transformed into a semi-structured seminar, facilitated by the Ph. D students, to really engage with the course material and then bring in our case study.	
6	-	



Part 2. Overall evaluations		Gonzalez Santos, Felipe											--- Period Comparisons ---			
		Responses										Individual		UWC		
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	N	Mean	N	Mean	Pct Rnk
Q8	Please assess the overall performance of your instructor.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	6	9.0	70	8.4	75	
Responses: [1] 1=1 [2] 2=2 [3] 3=3 [4] 4=4 [5] 5=5 [6] 6=6 [7] 7=7 [8] 8=8 [9] 9=9 [10] 10=10																
Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)																

Part 4: Instructor		Gonzalez Santos, Felipe											--- Period Comparisons ---			
		Responses										Individual		UWC		
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	N	Mean	N	Mean	Pct Rnk
Q9	The instructor was well prepared for the course.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	6	9.0	70	8.6	75	
Responses: [1] 1=1 [2] 2=2 [3] 3=3 [4] 4=4 [5] 5=5 [6] 6=6 [7] 7=7 [8] 8=8 [9] 9=9 [10] 10=10																
Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)																

Part 4: Instructor		Gonzalez Santos, Felipe											--- Period Comparisons ---			
		Responses										Individual		UWC		
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	N	Mean	N	Mean	Pct Rnk
Q10	Presentations by the instructor were clear.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	5	9.0	66	8.3	75	
Responses: [1] 1=1 [2] 2=2 [3] 3=3 [4] 4=4 [5] 5=5 [6] 6=6 [7] 7=7 [8] 8=8 [9] 9=9 [10] 10=10																
Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)																

Part 4: Instructor		Gonzalez Santos, Felipe											--- Period Comparisons ---			
		Responses										Individual		UWC		
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	N	Mean	N	Mean	Pct Rnk
Q11	The classroom environment encouraged student participation.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	2	6	8.5	70	8.4	50
Responses: [1] 1=1 [2] 2=2 [3] 3=3 [4] 4=4 [5] 5=5 [6] 6=6 [7] 7=7 [8] 8=8 [9] 9=9 [10] 10=10																
Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)																

Part 4: Instructor		Gonzalez Santos, Felipe											--- Period Comparisons ---			
		Responses										Individual		UWC		
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	N	Mean	N	Mean	Pct Rnk
Q12	The instructor treated the students in a respectful and professional manner.	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	6	9.0	71	9.0	50	
Responses: [1] 1=1 [2] 2=2 [3] 3=3 [4] 4=4 [5] 5=5 [6] 6=6 [7] 7=7 [8] 8=8 [9] 9=9 [10] 10=10																
Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)																

<b>Q13 - Additional suggestions to the instructor:</b>															
<b>Faculty:</b> Gonzalez Santos, Felipe															
<b>Response Rate:</b> 42.86% (3 of 7)															
1	interact more with the other groups as well! I think your feedback on my group's project would have been interesting!														
2	Perhaps engage more in the in-class discussions, I would have loved to learn more about you and your expertise														
3	Felipe was really great to work with. He frequently checked in on us, and was readily available to help and support us!	