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.

EVSC-485-02 Environmental Science Capstone
2013-2014 Term 2

Instructor(s): Colin Laroque

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: 0
   - Strongly Disagree: 3
   - Disagree: 2
   - Neutral: 1
   - Agree: 4
   - Strongly Agree: 5
   - Your Avg(Std)/Med: 3.13(1.31)/4
   - Overall Avg(Std)/Med: 3.97(0.92)/4
   - 1XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
   - 2XX Avg(Std)/Med: 4.08(0.82)/4
   - 3XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
   - 4XX Avg(Std)/Med: 3.74(1.21)/4

2) I have learned something which I consider valuable.
   - Not Applicable: 0
   - Strongly Disagree: 3
   - Disagree: 2
   - Neutral: 1
   - Agree: 4
   - Strongly Agree: 5
   - Your Avg(Std)/Med: 3.2(1.47)/3
   - Overall Avg(Std)/Med: 4.16(0.98)/4
   - 1XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
   - 2XX Avg(Std)/Med: 4.36(0.64)/4
   - 3XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
   - 4XX Avg(Std)/Med: 3.83(1.31)/4

3) My interest in the subject has increased as a consequence of this course.
   - Not Applicable: 0
   - Strongly Disagree: 3
   - Disagree: 2
   - Neutral: 1
   - Agree: 4
   - Strongly Agree: 5
   - Your Avg(Std)/Med: 3.15(1.25)/4
   - Overall Avg(Std)/Med: 4.03(0.84)/4
   - 1XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
   - 2XX Avg(Std)/Med: 4.03(0.75)/4
   - 3XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
   - 4XX Avg(Std)/Med: 3.95(0.97)/4

**ENTHUSIASM**

5) Instructor was enthusiastic about teaching the course.
   - Not Applicable: 0
   - Strongly Disagree: 3
   - Disagree: 2
   - Neutral: 1
   - Agree: 4
   - Strongly Agree: 5
   - Your Avg(Std)/Med: 4.7(0.82)/5
   - Overall Avg(Std)/Med: 4.2(0.83)/4
   - 1XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
   - 2XX Avg(Std)/Med: 4.01(0.91)/4
   - 3XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
   - 4XX Avg(Std)/Med: 4.52(0.91)/5

6) Instructor was dynamic and energetic in conducting the course.
   - Not Applicable: 0
   - Strongly Disagree: 3
   - Disagree: 2
   - Neutral: 1
   - Agree: 4
   - Strongly Agree: 5
   - Your Avg(Std)/Med: 4.8(0.94)/5
   - Overall Avg(Std)/Med: 4.07(0.92)/4
   - 1XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
   - 2XX Avg(Std)/Med: 3.86(0.96)/4
   - 3XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
   - 4XX Avg(Std)/Med: 4.46(0.84)/5

7) Instructor enhanced presentations with the use of humour.
   - Not Applicable: 0
   - Strongly Disagree: 3
   - Disagree: 2
   - Neutral: 1
   - Agree: 4
   - Strongly Agree: 5
   - Your Avg(Std)/Med: 4.15(1.07)/4
   - Overall Avg(Std)/Med: 3.89(1.1)/4
   - 1XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
   - 2XX Avg(Std)/Med: 3.51(1.02)/4
   - 3XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
   - 4XX Avg(Std)/Med: 3.51(1.14)/4

8) Instructor's style of presentation held my interest during class.
   - Not Applicable: 0
   - Strongly Disagree: 3
   - Disagree: 2
   - Neutral: 1
   - Agree: 4
   - Strongly Agree: 5
   - Your Avg(Std)/Med: 3.47(1.36)/4
   - Overall Avg(Std)/Med: 3.87(0.97)/4
   - 1XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
   - 2XX Avg(Std)/Med: 3.85(0.91)/4
   - 3XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
   - 4XX Avg(Std)/Med: 3.87(1.3)/4

**ORGANIZATION**

9) Instructor’s explanations were clear.
   - Not Applicable: 0
   - Strongly Disagree: 3
   - Disagree: 2
   - Neutral: 1
   - Agree: 4
   - Strongly Agree: 5
   - Your Avg(Std)/Med: 3.7(1.42)/4
   - Overall Avg(Std)/Med: 3.84(1.14)/4
   - 1XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
   - 2XX Avg(Std)/Med: 3.86(1.1)/4
   - 3XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
   - 4XX Avg(Std)/Med: 3.87(1.3)/4

10) Course materials were well prepared and carefully explained.
    - Not Applicable: 0
    - Strongly Disagree: 3
    - Disagree: 2
    - Neutral: 1
    - Agree: 4
    - Strongly Agree: 5
    - Your Avg(Std)/Med: 2.1(1.32)/2
    - Overall Avg(Std)/Med: 3.9(1.13)/4
    - 1XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
    - 2XX Avg(Std)/Med: 4.09(0.81)/4
    - 3XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
    - 4XX Avg(Std)/Med: 3.51(1.48)/4

11) Proposed objectives agreed with those actually taught so I knew where the course was going.
    - Not Applicable: 0
    - Strongly Disagree: 3
    - Disagree: 2
    - Neutral: 1
    - Agree: 4
    - Strongly Agree: 5
    - Your Avg(Std)/Med: 2.57(1.35)/2.5
    - Overall Avg(Std)/Med: 3.78(1.17)/4
    - 1XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
    - 2XX Avg(Std)/Med: 3.88(1.08)/4
    - 3XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
    - 4XX Avg(Std)/Med: 3.13(1.35)/3

12) Instructor gave lectures that facilitated taking notes.
    - Not Applicable: 0
    - Strongly Disagree: 3
    - Disagree: 2
    - Neutral: 1
    - Agree: 4
    - Strongly Agree: 5
    - Your Avg(Std)/Med: 4.67(0.47)/5
    - Overall Avg(Std)/Med: 4.23(0.84)/4
    - 1XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
    - 2XX Avg(Std)/Med: 3.89(0.94)/4
    - 3XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
    - 4XX Avg(Std)/Med: 4.57(0.63)/5

**GROUP INTERACTION**

13) Students were encouraged to participate in class.
    - Not Applicable: 0
    - Strongly Disagree: 3
    - Disagree: 2
    - Neutral: 1
    - Agree: 4
    - Strongly Agree: 5
    - Your Avg(Std)/Med: 4.67(0.47)/5
    - Overall Avg(Std)/Med: 4.23(0.84)/4
    - 1XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
    - 2XX Avg(Std)/Med: 3.89(0.94)/4
    - 3XX Avg(Std)/Med: N/A
    - 4XX Avg(Std)/Med: 4.57(0.63)/5
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## Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree(5)</th>
<th>Agree(4)</th>
<th>Neutral(3)</th>
<th>Disagree(2)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree(1)</th>
<th>Instructors I have had at the U of S, I would say this course is:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14) Students were invited to share their ideas and knowledge.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Good (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Students were encouraged to ask questions and were given meaningful answers.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Good (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Students were encouraged to express their own ideas and/or question the instructor.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Good (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Individual Rapport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree(5)</th>
<th>Agree(4)</th>
<th>Neutral(3)</th>
<th>Disagree(2)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree(1)</th>
<th>Instructor was friendly towards individual students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17) Instructor was friendly towards individual students.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Good (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) Instructor made students feel welcome in seeking help/advice in or outside of class.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Good (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) Instructor had a genuine interest in individual students.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Good (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Instructor was adequately accessible to students during office hours or after class.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Good (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Breadth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree(5)</th>
<th>Agree(4)</th>
<th>Neutral(3)</th>
<th>Disagree(2)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree(1)</th>
<th>Instructor contrasted the implications of various theories.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21) Instructor contrasted the implications of various theories.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Good (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) Instructor presented the background or origin of ideas/concepts developed in class.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Good (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) Instructor presented points of view other than his/her own when appropriate.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Good (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) Instructor adequately discussed current developments in the field.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Good (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Examinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree(5)</th>
<th>Agree(4)</th>
<th>Neutral(3)</th>
<th>Disagree(2)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree(1)</th>
<th>Feedback on exams/graded materials was valuable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25) Feedback on examinations/graded materials was valuable.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Good (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) Methods of evaluating student work were fair and appropriate.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Good (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27) Examinations/graded materials tested course content as emphasized by the instructor.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Good (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree(5)</th>
<th>Agree(4)</th>
<th>Neutral(3)</th>
<th>Disagree(2)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree(1)</th>
<th>Required readings/texts were valuable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28) Required readings/texts were valuable.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Good (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29) Readings, homework, laboratories contributed to appreciation and understanding of subject.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Good (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree(5)</th>
<th>Agree(4)</th>
<th>Neutral(3)</th>
<th>Disagree(2)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree(1)</th>
<th>Compared with other courses I have had at the U of S, I would say this course is:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30) Compared with other courses I have had at the U of S, I would say this course is:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Good (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31) Compared with other instructors I have had at the U of S, I would say this instructor is:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Good (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREADTH</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUAL RAPPORT</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXAMINATIONS</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSIGNMENTS</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The average and standard deviation are calculated for each category.*
### STUDENT AND COURSE CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>34) Course difficulty, relative to other courses was:</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Very Easy(1)</th>
<th>Easy(2)</th>
<th>Average(3)</th>
<th>Difficult(4)</th>
<th>Very Difficult(5)</th>
<th>Your Avg(std)/Med</th>
<th>Overall Avg(std)/Med</th>
<th>Overall %</th>
<th>1XX Avg(std)/Med</th>
<th>2XX Avg(std)/Med</th>
<th>3XX Avg(std)/Med</th>
<th>4XX Avg(std)/Med</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35) Course workload, relative to other courses:</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Very Light(1)</td>
<td>Light(2)</td>
<td>Average(3)</td>
<td>Heavy(4)</td>
<td>Very Heavy(5)</td>
<td>Your Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>Overall Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>Overall %</td>
<td>1XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>2XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>3XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>4XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36) Course pace was:</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Too Slow(1)</td>
<td>Slow(2)</td>
<td>About Right(3)</td>
<td>Fast(4)</td>
<td>Too Fast(5)</td>
<td>Your Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>Overall Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>Overall %</td>
<td>1XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>2XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>3XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>4XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37) Hours per week outside of class:</td>
<td>0(1)</td>
<td>1 to 5(2)</td>
<td>6 to 10(3)</td>
<td>11 to 15(4)</td>
<td>16 to 20(5)</td>
<td>More than 20(6)</td>
<td>Your Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>Overall Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>Overall %</td>
<td>1XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>2XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>3XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>4XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38) Level of interest in the subject prior to the course was:</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Very Low(1)</td>
<td>Low(2)</td>
<td>Medium(3)</td>
<td>High(4)</td>
<td>Very High(5)</td>
<td>Your Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>Overall Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>Overall %</td>
<td>1XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>2XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>3XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>4XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39) Overall average at U of S: Leave blank if not yet established:</td>
<td>Less than 50%(1)</td>
<td>50% to 59%(2)</td>
<td>60% to 69%(3)</td>
<td>70% to 79%(4)</td>
<td>80% to 89%(5)</td>
<td>90% to 100%(6)</td>
<td>Your Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>Overall Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>Overall %</td>
<td>1XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>2XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>3XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>4XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40) Expected grade in the course:</td>
<td>Less than 50%(1)</td>
<td>50% to 59%(2)</td>
<td>60% to 69%(3)</td>
<td>70% to 79%(4)</td>
<td>80% to 89%(5)</td>
<td>90% to 100%(6)</td>
<td>Your Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>Overall Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>Overall %</td>
<td>1XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>2XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>3XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
<td>4XX Avg(std)/Med</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMENTS/FEEDBACK

44) Please provide any additional comments or feedback.

163011: Colin is great. This course will be better next year with a little more planning and structure. I think more of the course can be spent working on our sustainability projects. Having more time on our projects would help us to produce better results which would be more likely to create change on campus.

163225: As an RRM student taking a full year project course (RRM 421) it was very difficult to be working on another group project in the same term. The class overall was very disorganized and we never knew how much our work was worth in our overall grade. The project was disorganized. We were given way too much freedom in designing the project. This project was not nearly as much work as we thought it would be to make sure our projects were completing all that was required. Much of class time was wasted. There was a two hour lecture on what not to do in a powerpoint. Most of the time was spent on students inattentive and talking on homework then going to class. Also there is no need for two professors to be teaching this class. If this class was not required for my major I would have dropped it. Colin had dropped RRM 221 because he thought it was not a good course.

167079: This was actually a valuable and interesting course, even though I imagine you’ll be getting a bit of negativity on these surveys. I think once students sensed the slightly unplanned nature of this course they felt justified in not taking it as content and have had the exact same experience. I do believe if everything was laid out solidly beforehand there would have been a bit more engagement I think. It did sort of bother me how the marking was not completely defined from the start, but at the end of the day I know that neither prof is out to get anyone and I’m confident I’ll get quite a satisfactory grade. However, it is still important to know how to do things in the best possible way. The marking rubric was not a single grading rubric was provided to students throughout the entire term, not even for the final project worth 40% of the student’s grade. In fact the final project was so unstructured it was the...
responsibility of the student to tell the professors how their project should be marked. The professors continually lectured about empowering students, yet when students requested to change the midterm exam so that it was not a take-home midterm during the February break, both professors were reluctant to even grant student requests to hold a class vote. Eventually the class was allowed to vote. As the result of the vote, the midterm exam would be held in class before the break or worked on at home over the February break. However, the professors phrased the question to be voted on in a very partial way that made it clear to students that the professors would be unhappy if students voted to hold the midterm in class. As a result students felt forced to vote for what the professors wanted. It wasn’t a take-home midterm over the February break. I felt this was very unfair for the professors to influence the vote. Overall I was extremely disappointed in this class. It was the most poorly constructed, unstructured, and poorly taught class I have ever taken in the College of Agriculture throughout my four years as a student at the U of S.

167773: I truly appreciated this class. It did feel a bit rocky at times but it was also your first time teaching the class and you guys took a different approach than was used before, and it was my first truly seminar based class. I tried to commit to group discussion whenever possible but it is hard to get a real discussion going as some people do not think of their fee. The readings were good but they were time consuming, I never actually read the two books in full due to time constraints but I promise I will read them as it is the first time any literatur in this area has been assigned to me. The best part by far was the 3 slides on sustainability each day. I don’t know how you guys find this info, but I have been writing down every website you reference and have added them to my bookmarks and filter through them regularly. I found the project to be difficult mainly because STARS was new to me and there was a lot of freedom in what we could do as a project. I think that possibly more guidance towards meaningful projects could be useful. I also talked to margret and she was thinking that you guys would impose a “talk to margret by...” deadline. This would be a good idea mainly for margret but it would also help keep the projects moving at a good pace. Also I would be highly interested to know if you would take an angle different than STARS for the final project, possibly make larger projects that are possible for multiple people to work on, but this would take away from the freedom of choosing a project that actually interests people. I found that some groups were grudgingly doing this project because they were in RRM and didn’t want to put in effort on another big project. It damaged my personal experience with it as I am not in RRM and was looking for a really meaningful project but was kind of limited by the group I was in. Do not get me wrong I learned a lot and it was still a good experience but I believe I could have done better. I was worried about getting in a group at the start but maybe should have done a solo project. I just want to make it clear the STARS approach was good because if was working on actual goals that are not yet realized, but there may be other ways to achieve this. For your individual teaching abilities I loved it. Colin is amazing. He is also a scientist, which is good and comes from the social sciences. This next bit will focus mainly on the class itself and should not be taken as direct malice to Colin or Philip or their teaching abilities. I do not have a different style you wanted to take. Either way every time you talked it was pure gold and completely relevant. Also Colin is an amazing teacher. He should have been the one teaching with the template. His PowerPoint presentations I had to give in the same semester and you should definitely give that lecture again, it was pure gold.

164285: More structure in this class would have been appreciated. I understand where the idea of being less structured came from but I feel it was over-correction and not related to the points being covered. For example rather than having basically no syllabus and not updating it as things the class progressed, giving us a syllabus that is open to change but making sure we always know what the current state of it is. I would have liked to see Colin take a larger role in this class as I enjoyed small amounts that he contributed. I feel like Colin will be a very good professor here once he has more of an understanding of the students programs he is teaching and is able to have his own class to teach. Overall I was not very pleased with this class but I was more displeased with the SENSS side of things.

164167: I think Colin is a brilliant professor who was overpowered by his co-prof in this course. What little structure the class had was his pace him teachture. It would have been better if we had a clear syllabus. His work sounds amazing and I think he has a lot of knowledge to offer that got lost behind the other professor teaching the course.

169163: This course was very disorganized. I felt like I got nothing out of it. There was to many differing opinions on subjects and where the course was intended to take us by the end. I did not feel as though this course was a "capstone" of any kind. It needs work and restructuring.

165329: I’m not quite sure what the idea of having two professors for this class was. Philip did most of the talking and directed the flow of the lectures. Colin was mostly quiet and chimed in when appropriate. He did add balance to the class which was good, ie he kept the class from veering off into philosophical and religious domain. He is also a scientist, which is good and comes from the social sciences. This next bit will focus mainly on the class itself and should not be taken as direct malice to Colin or Philip or their teaching abilities. I do not have a different style you wanted to take. Either way every time you talked it was pure gold and completely relevant. Also Colin is an amazing teacher. He should have been the one teaching with the template. His PowerPoint presentations I had to give in the same semester and you should definitely give that lecture again, it was pure gold.