### About the results:
- The numbers in brackets behind the answer-options represent the value used in average and median calculations.
- Avg represents the Average.
- std represents the standard deviation.
- Med represents the Median.
- The Overall values represent the statistics for the whole department.
- 1XX represents the statistics for 100 level courses for this department.
- 2XX represents the statistics for 200 level courses for this department.
- 3XX represents the statistics for 300 level courses for this department.
- 4XX represents the statistics for 400 level courses for this department.

### ENVS-807-01 Sustainability Theory
2017-2018 Term 1

Instructor(s): Philip Loring

Instructions: For each of the following statements select the response that most closely expresses your opinion.

#### LEARNING

1. I have found the course intellectually challenging and stimulating.
   - Not Applicable
   - Strongly Agree(5)
   - Agree(4)
   - Neutral(3)
   - Disagree(2)
   - Strongly Disagree(1)
   - Your Avg(std)/Med 4.52(0.83)/5

2. I have learned something which I consider valuable.
   - Not Applicable
   - Strongly Agree(5)
   - Agree(4)
   - Neutral(3)
   - Disagree(2)
   - Strongly Disagree(1)
   - Your Avg(std)/Med 4.74(0.53)/5

3. My interest in the subject has increased as a consequence of this course.
   - Not Applicable
   - Strongly Agree(5)
   - Agree(4)
   - Neutral(3)
   - Disagree(2)
   - Strongly Disagree(1)
   - Your Avg(std)/Med 4.52(0.83)/5

4. I have learned and understood the subject materials of this course.
   - Not Applicable
   - Strongly Agree(5)
   - Agree(4)
   - Neutral(3)
   - Disagree(2)
   - Strongly Disagree(1)
   - Your Avg(std)/Med 4.52(0.83)/5

#### ENTHUSIASM

5. Instructor was enthusiastic about teaching the course.
   - Not Applicable
   - Strongly Agree(5)
   - Agree(4)
   - Neutral(3)
   - Disagree(2)
   - Strongly Disagree(1)
   - Your Avg(std)/Med 4.74(0.53)/5

6. Instructor was dynamic and energetic in conducting the course.
   - Not Applicable
   - Strongly Agree(5)
   - Agree(4)
   - Neutral(3)
   - Disagree(2)
   - Strongly Disagree(1)
   - Your Avg(std)/Med 4.52(0.83)/5

7. Instructor enhanced presentations with the use of humour.
   - Not Applicable
   - Strongly Agree(5)
   - Agree(4)
   - Neutral(3)
   - Disagree(2)
   - Strongly Disagree(1)
   - Your Avg(std)/Med 4.52(0.83)/5

8. Instructor’s style of presentation held my interest during class.
   - Not Applicable
   - Strongly Agree(5)
   - Agree(4)
   - Neutral(3)
   - Disagree(2)
   - Strongly Disagree(1)
   - Your Avg(std)/Med 4.52(0.83)/5

#### ORGANIZATION

9. Instructor’s explanations were clear.
   - Not Applicable
   - Strongly Agree(5)
   - Agree(4)
   - Neutral(3)
   - Disagree(2)
   - Strongly Disagree(1)
   - Your Avg(std)/Med 4.52(0.83)/5

10. Course materials were well prepared and carefully explained.
    - Not Applicable
    - Strongly Agree(5)
    - Agree(4)
    - Neutral(3)
    - Disagree(2)
    - Strongly Disagree(1)
    - Your Avg(std)/Med 4.52(0.83)/5

11. Proposed objectives agreed with those actually taught so I knew where the course was going.
    - Not Applicable
    - Strongly Agree(5)
    - Agree(4)
    - Neutral(3)
    - Disagree(2)
    - Strongly Disagree(1)
    - Your Avg(std)/Med 4.52(0.83)/5

12. Instructor gave lectures that facilitated taking notes.
    - Not Applicable
    - Strongly Agree(5)
    - Agree(4)
    - Neutral(3)
    - Disagree(2)
    - Strongly Disagree(1)
    - Your Avg(std)/Med 4.52(0.83)/5

#### GROUP INTERACTION

https://evaluation.usask.ca/evaluation/viewSurveyResults.jsp?id=27194
13) Students were encouraged to participate in class discussions.

14) Students were invited to share their ideas and knowledge.

15) Students were encouraged to ask questions and were given meaningful answers.

16) Students were encouraged to express their own ideas and/or question the instructor.

**INDIVIDUAL RAPPORT**

17) Instructor was friendly towards individual students.

18) Instructor made students feel welcome in seeking help/advice in or outside of class.

19) Instructor had a genuine interest in individual students.

20) Instructor was adequately accessible to students during office hours or after class.

**BREADTH**

21) Instructor contrasted the implications of various theories.

22) Instructor presented the background or origin of ideas/concepts developed in class.

23) Instructor presented points of view other than his/her own when appropriate.

24) Instructor adequately discussed current developments in the field.

**EXAMINATIONS**

25) Feedback on examinations/graded materials was valuable.

26) Methods of evaluating student work were fair and appropriate.

27) Examinations/graded materials tested course content as emphasized by the instructor.

**ASSIGNMENTS**

28) Required readings/texts were valuable.

29) Readings, homework, laboratories contributed to appreciation and understanding of subject.

**OVERALL**

30) Compared with other courses I have had at the U of
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31) Compared with other instructors I have had at the U of S, I would say this instructor is:
Not Applicable Very Poor(1) Poor(2) Average(3) Good(4) Very Good(5)
0 0 0 3 3 17
0.41(0.71)/3 N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A
Overall Avg(std)/Med
32) As an overall rating, I would say the instructor is:
Not Applicable Very Poor(1) Poor(2) Average(3) Good(4) Very Good(5)
0 0 0 3 3 17
0.41(0.71)/3 N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A
Overall Avg(std)/Med
33) Should this instructor be nominated for an outstanding teaching award?
Yes(1) No(2) Don't Know(3)
15 1 0
Overall Avg(std)/Med

STUDENT AND COURSE CHARACTERISTICS

34) Course difficulty relative to other courses was:
Not Applicable Easy(1) Easy(2) Average(3) Difficult(4)
0 1 0 16 5
1.98(2.73)/3 N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A
Overall Avg(std)/Med
35) Course workload, relative to other courses was:
Not Applicable Very Light(1) Light(2) Average(3) Heavy(4)
0 0 1 12 8
1.98(2.73)/3 N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A
Overall Avg(std)/Med
36) Course pace was:
Not Applicable Too Slow(1) Slow(2) About Right(3) Fast(4)
0 0 0 19 4
3.17(0.38)/3 N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A
Overall Avg(std)/Med
37) Hours per week outside of class:
0(1) 1 to 5(2) 6 to 10(3) 11 to 15(4) 16 to 20(5)
8 6 11 15 4
3.17(0.38)/3 N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A
Overall Avg(std)/Med
38) Level of interest in the subject prior to the course was:
Not Applicable Low(1) Medium(3) High(4)
0 1 11 3
3.43(0.92)/3 N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A
Overall Avg(std)/Med
39) Overall average at U of S. Leave blank if not yet established:
Less than 50%(1) 50% to 59%(2) 60% to 69%(3) 70% to 79%(4) 80% to 89%(5) 90% to 100%(6)
0 0 0 11 2 2
5.09(0.5)/5 N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A
Overall Avg(std)/Med
40) Expected grade in the course:
Less than 50%(1) 50% to 59%(2) 60% to 69%(3) 70% to 79%(4) 80% to 89%(5) 90% to 100%(6)
0 0 0 17 4 2
5.09(0.5)/5 N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A
Overall Avg(std)/Med
41) Reason for taking the course. Select the one which is best:
Required For Major(1) Elective For Major(2) Degree Requirement(3) Minor or Related Field(4) General Interest Only(5) Other(6)
1 0 10 2 4 1
3.04(1.49)/3 N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A
Overall Avg(std)/Med
42) Year in program:
First(1) Second(2) Third(3) Fourth(4) Fifth(5) Sixth or more(6)
17 5 0 0 1 5
1.69(0.87)/1 N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A
Overall Avg(std)/Med
43) Year in University:
First(1) Second(2) Third(3) Fourth(4) Fifth(5) Sixth or more(6)
9 0 0 0 8 5
3.74(2.25)/5 N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A
Overall Avg(std)/Med

COMMENTS/FEEDBACK

44) Please provide any additional comments or feedback.

317410: I really appreciate the fact that the instructor broke down complex ideas or theories (Example: Frameworks) into more or less simple concepts. This made complex topics more understandable. I also appreciate that the instructor was really passionate about the subject matter which really got my attention. And I appreciate the presentation slides with humorous yet relevant pictures and cartoons.

318424: Helen and Phil were excellent teachers for this course. I really enjoyed the co-teaching and both of their backgrounds and perspectives. As for ENVS 807, I don't really understand why this is a required course for the MES program. SENS is lacking in practical courses for their Masters’ students. Although the application of frameworks is valuable in a high-level academic setting, a course on environmental management, project management, or collaborative approaches to sustainability problems would’ve been much more interesting. I enjoyed learning about the application of sustainability frameworks, however, I would’ve been much more engaged if a required course had focused on environmental management, project management, or collaborative approaches to sustainability problems would’ve been much more interesting. I enjoyed learning about the application of sustainability frameworks, however, I would’ve been much more engaged if a required course had focused on environmental management, project management, or collaborative approaches to sustainability problems would’ve been much more interesting. I enjoyed learning about the application of sustainability frameworks, however, I would’ve been much more engaged if a required course had focused on environmental management, project management, or collaborative approaches to sustainability problems would’ve been much more interesting.

318996: Philip was very accessible and helpful. Good teaching skills.

315616: Phil is a fantastic instructor and his deep knowledge of and interest in sustainability pervades his teaching. He provided copious but useful readings and examples to assist our learning, but arranged them so it was never overwhelming or non-applicable. He was very responsive to feedback and encouraged student ideas and input. I would love to study more with him in the future!

316066: Great professors and enjoy having it co-taught, seems more engaging. Not particularly keen on the topic and don’t think it should be a required class, I wish I could have taken one off their other courses instead.

321138: Overall I found the course to be very interesting and helpful in understanding sustainability theory and practice. I’m still not quite sure, however, how the fisheries assignment tied into the overall course objectives. It seems like the purpose of the class is more about learning about frameworks and how to apply them than anything else, but I felt a bit rushed to be able to adequately learn about the frameworks and to apply them at the end of the term, especially since much of us were working on problems outside of our disciplinary background. So not only did we have to learn what frameworks were and how to apply them, we had to do so across disciplinary boundaries, which is quite challenging. I wonder if the course might be structured better by taking out the fisheries assignment and providing more time for mastery of frameworks? Also as many of the readings started to get repetitive, I wonder if a better use of the jigsaw readings would be to use that time for students to learn about frameworks and teach each other?

Then course activities could revolve around learning how to apply them? This would also take out the need for a presentation about frameworks. Moving everything up several weeks in time would allow for more time to not only understand what frameworks are but also how to apply them. It would also be helpful if the applied presentation could be done 2 weeks before the final paper so that we had a chance to incorporate feedback into that paper by either having the presentation due a week earlier or the paper due a week later. Finally, there weren’t any assignments related to sustainability theory even though it was talked about in class. I wonder if the fisheries assignment could be replaced or reworked to include more of a theoretical
component? Overall, I enjoyed the class. These are just some suggestions. :)
these concepts. Readings may have been a little much, but there is a sense of the role and contribution they provide. Assignments were a nice mix of incorporating course material, allowing individual freedom and building multi-disciplinary teams. Overall the course is very valuable for people interested in sustainability sciences, but the coursework felt a bit on the heavy side.

325117: This instructor did a very well job of tying in social science aspects and providing stimulating conceptual topics and statements. For the final paper, two frameworks in under 4000 words is rather difficult. I suggest a higher word count or embellish on just one framework instead.