

COMPASS Course and Instructor Evaluations

I. COURSE EVALUATION FORM - FIS1310H LEC0101

Term: 2009 Winter

Instructors: JENNA HARTEL

Completed: 80% (28 / 35) completed

	inadequate (1)	poor (2)	average (3)	good (4)	excellent (5)	not applicable	AVERAGE
1. Fulfilled course objectives (as stated in the course outline).	0	0	0	12	16	0	<b>4.57</b>
2. Distributed graded course work due dates throughout the term.	0	1	2	5	20	0	<b>4.57</b>
3. Used methods of evaluation that reflect subject matter appropriately and provide a fair evaluation of student learning.	0	1	5	7	15	0	<b>4.29</b>
4. Contained useful readings.	0	0	4	12	11	1	<b>4.26</b>
5. Was complemented by guest lecturers.	0	0	2	5	21	0	<b>4.68</b>
6. Overall, how would you rate this course?	0	0	3	10	15	0	<b>4.43</b>

much greater the less much not AVERAGE

	greater (1)	(2)	same (3)	(4)	less (5)	applicable
7. Compared to other courses I have taken at the same level, the workload of this course is...	4	8	15	0	0	1 <b>2.41</b>
8. Compared to other courses I have taken at the same level, the difficulty of the course material is...	0	1	19	6	0	2 <b>3.19</b>
9. Considering your experience with this course, and disregarding program or degree requirements, would you still have taken this course?				YES - 23	NO - 4	N/A - 1

II. INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION FORM FIS1310H LEC0101

Term: 2009 Winter

Instructors: JENNA HARTEL

	inadequate (1)	poor (2)	average (3)	good (4)	excellent (5)	not applicable	AVERAGE
1. Clarity in explaining concepts with appropriate use of examples?	0	0	0	7	21	0	<b>4.75</b>
2. Availability for consultation during office hours or by appointment?	0	0	2	4	15	7	<b>4.62</b>
3. Overall satisfaction with the course?	0	0	1	1	10	1	<b>4.00</b>

or discussion in class time when appropriate?	0	0	1	11	16	0	<b>4.54</b>
4. Ability to respond to a wide range of questions about material in the course?	0	1	1	4	22	0	<b>4.68</b>
5. Commitment to grading student work fairly, with helpful comments and feedback (if appropriate)?	0	0	1	4	23	0	<b>4.79</b>
6. Commitment to returning graded work within a reasonable time?	0	0	0	4	24	0	<b>4.86</b>
7. Ability to communicate interest and enthusiasm in the subject matter?	0	0	1	8	19	0	<b>4.64</b>
8. Contribution to how much you learned in course?	0	0	1	5	22	0	<b>4.75</b>

### III. Comments - FIS1310H LEC0101

Term: 2009 Winter

Instructors: JENNA HARTEL

1. What are the specific strong points of the course?

1. The integration of theory with practical application. Also, the professor's high level of organization made the progression of ideas clear and easy to follow, building upon what had already been learned.
2. - Lectures were interesting, engaging, and to the point - Assignments were enjoyable - class atmosphere very comfortable
3. -clear theory -the course work was also practical and helped in understanding the theoretical aspects of the course
4. Jenna Hartel really made the course interesting when it could have been very dry
5. The strongest aspect of this course was the professor's professionalism, enthusiasm, and obvious depth of knowledge in the area.
6. I learned a lot from the workbooks.
7. Very well organized.
8. Instructor's enthusiasm, The subject, Workbooks, Reading material
9. Jenna Hartel is a motivational, enthusiastic and intellectually curious individual/professor.
10. Good enthusiasm.
11. It is a good course to have.
12. I thought the course was better than most at balancing the practical and theoretical components of library work.
13. workbook and group presentations provide broad comprehension of the reference service and materials; also very good guest lectures
14. The overview of multiple disciplines and their related reference sources and complications
15. Enthusiasm and effort on the part of Professor Hartel. Very engaging lectures. Good guest speakers. The T.A. was excellent and gave very useful guest lectures.
16. Different perspectives from guest lecturers, extra effort evident in making assignments interesting and useful and course material relevant to students (both career and diverse interests)
17. It felt like there was less coursework, which reduced stress, but overall there was probably the same amount of work as the average course. Innovative and interesting ways of integrating the course materials (workbook, reference interview paper and exam).
18. - very organized - clear in her idea of the goals for the course
19. It covered a wide variety of reference resources and provided a comprehensive overview of the subject.
20. introduction of major reference work concepts and theories was really well done
21. Jenna Hartel is an outstanding professor and lecturer. I think she is a star at this faculty. She also made sure to link

appreciated. Her general positive energy, excitement, and organization are strong points.

22. Useful assignments (especially, workbooks)
23. Jenna was very clear in the introduction of each lecture and related back to the class theme every lecture. Also, the assignments encouraged us to engage with the resources we were learning about.

## 2. How could the course be improved?

1. - less emphasis on grades and grading and more interest in helping the student in their understanding of the topic and development of their reference abilities - more help gaining confidence and competence at the reference desk - more practice using the "sense making" theories - I had trouble practicing it at work. PACT practices were helpful, but more practice with neutral questioning would help - clearer explanations of expectations for the Reference Interview paper (that the theory was more important than telling the story of the RI, as had been my understanding) and the presentation (that the content was less important than presentation skills - in a reference course on ref resources, content and teaching the class about it would seem to be the most important)
2. Perhaps more intellectually rigorous reading. I found many of the readings all little to commonsensical.
3. group presentations should be removed and the workbook questions changed every semester; there should be more lectures and less class presentations - some presentations were not original work but repeats from other courses (i.e. comparison of search engines taken completely from prof. Choo's class guest speaker's lecture handout without even bothering to change the examples)
4. Greater time given between when the take home is handed out and when it is due. One week was VERY difficult to finish on time (esp. during a week where other exams and final assignments are due!).
5. Though I appreciated the guest lectures, I found myself thinking that Prof. Hartel probably could have presented the material to the class in a much more interesting, engaging way (I mean, guest speakers are supposed to be enthusiastic 'experts' in the field they're speaking about, right? The 'enthusiastic' part was rarely the case). In addition, the workload can/should perhaps be re-considered. This course seemed to be the heaviest in terms of outside-class assignment preparation time.
6. n/a

8. - It would be nice if the iSchool worked with the UTS and provided library students with practical experience at the reference desk. It would be extra nice if this was part of the course. For example, (4hrs of reference desk shadowing as part of job requirement)
9. A workbook blog - somewhere we can discuss troubles we are having locating materials, but moderated so answers aren't being given away.
10. Presentation should aim more to content and less to how you convey it
11. More continuous class lectures. I understand the reason for breaking up the lecture with student presentations, but it can make it more difficult to follow the progression of ideas in the lecture.
12. It is already great.
13. Maybe one less workbook, so 2 instead of 3
14. Minor: with feedback from students, can proceed slightly faster (sometimes a concept is simple enough and do not really need many examples, or can be included in handouts to make room in lecture for other information)
15. The workbooks are great, but perhaps 3 is too many. Maybe two larger ones would be better.
16. Not just this course, but in all courses, I find the one week assignments (i.e. only one week to complete from the date the assignment is given) a bit anxiety-causing because of work and family commitments, one week for me is one or two days, which is okay unless a child gets sick etc. However, I recognize for the reference course particularly, it would be difficult to give an in-class final exam.
17. I can't think of any improvements - it was well organized - a lot of work - but not necessarily too much.
18. I believe the workbook assignment to be a little bit excessive, especially considering that there are five major assignments required during the course. Also, I did not find the workbook to be particularly useful in teaching us search strategies. It might have been better to talk more about how to find particular types of information, and teaching particular search strategies rather than surveying reference materials in this manner. In addition, I do not think that this course requires an eight page essay analysis of reference encounters. This is a bit basic, and elementary... might have been better to analyze a particular type of resource, or an analysis of search structures -- something more practical.
19. A LIGHTER WORKLOAD PLEASE! It is unreasonable to assign 4-5 different assignments/components for 1 course. Especially for students taking a full course load, who have a household, a job, or children to care for. The workbook is a great idea but we did not need 3 of them. Each workbook took a lot of time (at least a day each) and at the end

excessive to ask for both in addition to a presentation and an essay.

3. What is your overall opinion of the course?

1. this course was much more useful and informative than I had expected at the beginning of the semester
2. Excellent! I feel much more comfortable with library resources now.
3. Fantastic course. The exam was a little bit over the top, though (too time consuming in relation to all other assignments for the course).
4. I loved it. This confirmed to me exactly where I want to work in the library. I particularly enjoyed the guest lecturer (Rita?) Vine - She was dynamic and precisely the kind of reference librarian I aspire to be. I would love to take more workshops or courses with her.
5. An excellent course, taught with incredibly infectious enthusiasm.
6. Very useful and informative.
7. good, organized information - need practice and flexibility in using it
8. Good Course
9. Enjoyable class environment, however, the scope is too broad, even for a survey course. I'm not entirely sure what I learned in this course, with the exception of research conducted for our group presentations.
10. I loved every part of it. I have learned a lot, it was very well organized with many points of entries to the world of reference which came together to perfect cover of the subject
11. very good
12. Mostly I am unhappy about the way the grades were distributed in the assignments. The percentages worth for assignments no way reflected actual requirement of effort. Workbooks and final exam were very long and was worth not nearly as much as other parts of grading and that discourages students. Afterall, why try so hard to work on them when it's not going to make a dent on the grades in the course of the term?
13. It has been nicely designed and serves the purpose.
14. It was very valuable, even for a non-library stream student
15. The workload is too great. Particularly, the work book is too much. I would rather have fewer questions in which I

different libraries trying to find a book.

16. Great course, enjoyed the material and the way in which it was presented.
17. I don't know how relevant a reference course is anymore given that reference library positions are decreasing. I was unable to justify putting so much work and effort into a possibly dead field. Also, I found Keren Dali's lectures to be dull and dry.
18. Great!
19. too many assignments and too picky marking - as a result many people cheated: either collaborated on the workbooks, or copied the answers from last semester from friends or used the work of others in their presentation. Also many people worked on the reference interview evaluation by getting the assignments from friends from the previous year and "fixing" what was indicated as weak parts. The expectations for the course were so absurd that people went overboard to make the mark, i.e. 2 technically great presentations (one featuring the donkey as a theme and the other about knitting) - I remember they were very engaging, but find it impossible to recall what reference sources was the first about and how knowing about knitting will make me a better reference librarian. One baffled student asked the instructor to explain why, when grading the presentation she was emphasizing the form rather than the content - see the "corrected" (more appropriate than what was said in class that the content is too easy, so it doesn't matter) answer given by the prof. in the follow-up e-mail: "The issue was: Why isn't "content" a more important factor in the Team Presentation grade? A more complete answer would've been: Content is still a factor, but not the dominant one. In class today I said that the areas you surveyed are so broad, it is difficult to define the "right" content because you don't have time (25 minutes) to cover it all. Here I would like to add that the content of the presentations is not particularly difficult. As graduate students, it is not that challenging to sum up or survey the reference sources in an area. It is not a matter dense with theory or controversy, and is nicely done in the assigned readings and many other textbooks. Therefore, what ends up mattering more is how you convey that content. In your future jobs as professionals you will be required to capture the imagination of an audience." All good, but there is a special course on information literacy that teaches that and the time of this course should be used to learn about the reference resources; thus, the content should matter.
20. Very useful, for my personal and professional information seeking.
21. this has been-by far-the best class i have completed in the program, to date because the course work was balanced, instructive and presented clearly.
22. Excellent - very useful. Crystallized for me the link between a solid understanding of the principles of bibliographic

- 23. Excellently organized, structured and delivered.
- 24. Very good.

4. What are the specific strong points of the Instructor's teaching?

- 1. The professor is very knowledgeable, enthusiastic, and responsive to students' needs, concerns, and questions. She is very clear and comprehensive in her coverage of the course material.
- 2. ability to make material that could be dry into dynamic and interesting lectures, extremely thorough in explaining her expectations, encourages enthusiasm and participation from her students
- 3. Jenna is an excellent lecturer. She was clear and open to new ideas and class participation. A little humour goes a long way in a course about reference materials.
- 4. Prof. Hartel's excellent way of communicating, teaching, making it colorful was amazing. I found this course as the most enjoyable. We are lucky to have Prof. Hartel.
- 5. Her personal engagement with and considerable enthusiasm for the material. Her use of examples from her personal and working experience made the concepts much easier to grasp and remember. Her strong and consistent structuring of lectures (and the accompanying slides), as well as her explanation of said structure and its mandatory adoption, support student comprehension and retention of the material covered.
- 6. Great lectures that have wonderful slides.
- 7. enthusiasm
- 8. clear explanation of concepts, enthusiasm, very friendly.
- 9. Very engaging and enthusiastic. Also, Professor Hartel is very organized and did a great job of making good use of our time, by highlighting the most important concepts and conducting a review of the course content for us.
- 10. Jenna is incredibly enthusiastic about the subject matter which made what could have been somewhat drab lectures engaging and enjoyable.
- 11. Very enthusiastic, knew her subject matter, could engage the class
- 12. Wonderful and visually appealing PowerPoint presentations
- 13. The instructor was the strongest component in this course. She was organized, enthusiastic, and engaging. She is

slides - this was much appreciated. Her lecture style was fresh and kept the course interesting.

14. Excited, engaging, interesting and intelligent. Prof. Hartel asked us questions, solicited class feedback naturally, and used appropriate and clear examples to explain and clarify the concepts discussed in class and the readings.
15. Jenna is straightforward, personable and presented the course material clearly, concisely...and with flair! (i loved her!)
16. - lectures were clear and concise, not bogged down with too much material. Made her point and got them across well
17. Additionally, Professor Hartel's lectures were easy to understand and remember because of the short formats; it often felt like two or three inside one class, which kept my attention and energy up. Her good attitude and enthusiasm were also helpful in this.
18. Good at starting discussions, very responsive to questions, variety in assignments that respond to different learning modes and students' strengths
19. I found Jenna to be warm, enthusiastic, honest, easy going, but also professional and thorough in her evaluations. I liked the way she revealed her marking strategies and gave a detailed overview of how the class did overall on assignments. Her feedback was very helpful. I also appreciated how she reviewed the material covered several times over the course - it's really difficult to retain information particularly in combination with other courses and this was very helpful.
20. Great powerpoints and very organized.
21. Enthusiasm for teaching and passion for the subject. Very engaging slides.
22. she's the only prof so far to break down marks, review expectations fully after assignments are handed back. Really helps us get an idea of how we are doing over all and how to better improve grades etc. I also really like the fact that the group presentation mark also has a personal mark and a group mark.
23. The teacher was very enthusiastic about the subject, and this made the class very enjoyable.
24. Good Use of Examples on how to improve on Assignments when marking.
25. enthusiasm, knowledge, freshness, love of the subject
26. very organized, good slides, interest and enthusiasm for teaching, workbook was a good exercise, though we needed to learn and practice how to choose the appropriate resources (not knowing led to difficulties on the exam)

##### 5. How could the Instructor's teaching be improved?

1. Less activities. Put the course syllabus online.
2. Keep on the same track!
3. The instructor's teaching style does not need much improvement. The subject matter needs to be improved.
4. I would prefer if she did less review of material. I feel that is perhaps better suited for undergraduate type courses.
5. Fuller support on Sakai would be useful, including posting the syllabus (for those of us who consistently misplace the syllabus halfway through the term), posting student presentation handouts and/or overheads, and more timely postings of lecture slides so that if a class is missed they may be reviewed before the next class.
6. N/A
7. n/a.
8. prepare more lectures and rely less on students' presentations; reduce the time devoted to leisure activities and libraries as this is a reference course and there is a lot to cover and leisure activities related reference questions are not the main part of reference work
9. I can't think of anything. She was perfect.
10. Well, it's hard to say, because I think Prof Hartel did such a great job. I know it was her first year teaching and so like anyone else, experience always helps.
11. More communication with the TA (K. Dali). There was an obvious disconnect between the TA's grading expectations and the information that Prof. Hartel was able to provide us with in class. - Also, perhaps a re-thinking of who will be invited to guest lecture could benefit future students. Lecturers who sit and speak in a monotone the whole way through a 2 hour lecture are not the best complimentary teachers.
12. She is already amazing, and this is my third time that I am taking this course. Last time I dropped and before that I could not drop, so I have the feelings of three different instructors, and I found her unique, AMAZING and GREAT!!!
13. I think Jenna does a great job!
14. more flexibility in listening to the students, some of whom have had quite a bit of experience working in a library, rather than presenting information to be repeated back for grading
15. I have nothing negative to say about the professor's teaching methods.
16. Jenna is a very strong instructor. I have nothing to suggest.
17. ?

6. What is your overall opinion of the Instructor's teaching?

1. see above.
2. Excellent.
3. Good
4. I am eager to take more of her courses!
5. As above, I think Prof Hartel's teaching is excellent. She really puts huge effort into it. She uses a great deal of visuals in her lectures and personally, I found that really helps me to remember the concepts.
6. enthusiastic, but setting standards impossible to meet; also the fact that the prof. herself didn't lecture much did bnot help to motivate students to work honestly in this course.
7. Excellent teacher
8. As I earlier commented, I do not have words about her. She is very organized, clear, transparent and does lot of interesting things to keep us engage.
9. Very effective.
10. I appreciated the dedication to keep the material, even the dry stuff, fresh and interesting.
11. I definitely hope to take more classes with her. She is one of the best profs I've encountered at FI.
12. Excellent.
13. very good
14. I think she's great, but I can also tell by her enthusiasm that she won't be satisfied to stay where she is - she will always be striving to find new and better ways to communicate information and teach the concepts of her courses.
15. - more attention was paid to entertaining the students than is necessary (mascots etc.) - more attention to quality of papers than to grading and making sure they are in exactly on time (i.e. before class starts or it's late)- adds unneeded stress with no leeway for unforseen circumstances
16. Great
17. Jenna is an EXCELLENT instructor.
18. Professor Hartel is a great teacher
19. Very enthusiastic, but tends to have black or white views in regards to due dates, ways to do things which is quite unlike the general vibe of the course.
20. Great! I would seriously consider taking more courses with Prof. Hartel, even if they are not my first 'content' choices. She makes any topic fun and really interesting!

22. Excellent

7. What is your overall opinion of the facilities? (Include the classroom, equipment, software, etc. if appropriate)

1. not great - often couldn't see the slides, and sometimes difficulty hearing. Also lack of desks.
2. we needed more tables to accomodate for the amount of students in the class.
3. Much more comfortable than most rooms in Bissell. A pretty good room overall.
4. Fine.
5. ok, too small for the class
6. The wall between our classroom and the next was far too thin; it was distracting to hear what was going on next door!
7. The classroom was o.k. Still too many people in the class
8. OK, the level of technology available for teaching is not stellar for an Information school.
9. Fair. Equipment and software were suitable, but the classroom was too small, and the layout did not allow all students to see the screen.
10. not bad, needs better wireless access though!
11. OK
12. The class had a loud class going on beside it.
13. Good: sufficient lighting and large screen, though wireless access in the room (3rd floor) is spotty.
14. ?
15. Well the room 303, was a little small, and we had disturbances couple of times from the neighboring classes or from the upper floors.
16. This class was way too small for the number of students in the class. We were cramped. The Bissell building is in need of some serious renovations!
17. Good, could have been better located.
18. adequate.
19. Fine. The use of power point slides complimented the lectures nicely and provided visual cues for learning.

be able to see. We had to cram in when everyone attended.

21. like the set up of the classroom, hate how there's always some group playing music, laughing loudly etc in a room next to us. they aren't even Information students I don't think. very distracting and they never respect our requests to be quiet.

Problems? [Contact Areti Vourinari](#).