

PROFESSOR Paul Withers

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 17

NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 22

PERCENT OF ENROLLED STUDENTS RESPONDING: 77.27

STATISTICS REFLECT FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES

## I. SECTION A: COURSE EVALUATION

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV	
1. RELEVANCE OF ASSIGNED READINGS [(1) LOW TO (5) HIGH]	POOR	1	0	2	2	5	7	EXCELLENT	4.062	1.063
2. DIFFICULTY OF COURSE [(1) EASY TO (5) DIFFICULTY]	POOR	0	0	1	7	7	2	EXCELLENT	3.588	0.795
3. WORKLOAD IN COURSE [(1) LIGHT TO (5) HEAVY]	POOR	0	0	1	13	1	1	EXCELLENT	3.125	0.619
4. OVERALL RATING OF DISCUSSION INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	11	0	0	0	3	3	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.548
5. OVERALL RATING OF LAB INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	2	1	0	1	4	9	EXCELLENT	4.333	1.113
6. USEFULNESS OF ASSIGNMENTS AND PAPERS	POOR	0	0	1	2	5	9	EXCELLENT	4.294	0.920
7. OVERALL COURSE RATING	POOR	0	0	1	1	9	6	EXCELLENT	4.176	0.809

## II. SECTION B: FACULTY EVALUATION

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV	
8. EFFECTIVENESS IN EXPLAINING CONCEPTS	POOR	0	0	2	3	5	7	EXCELLENT	4.000	1.061
9. ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST IN SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	1	3	8	5	EXCELLENT	4.000	0.866
10. ENCOURAGEMENT OF CLASS PARTICIPATION	POOR	0	0	0	1	6	10	EXCELLENT	4.529	0.624
11. FAIRNESS IN GRADING	POOR	0	0	2	1	6	8	EXCELLENT	4.176	1.015
12. PROMPTNESS IN RETURNING ASSIGNMENTS	POOR	0	0	0	2	5	10	EXCELLENT	4.471	0.717
13. QUALITY OF FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS	POOR	0	0	1	5	5	6	EXCELLENT	3.941	0.966
14. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE OF CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	1	8	7	EXCELLENT	4.375	0.619
15. OVERALL RATING OF INSTRUCTOR	POOR	0	0	0	3	8	6	EXCELLENT	4.176	0.728

## III. SECTION C: TF/TA EVALUATION

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV	
16. PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	1	0	2	3	3	8	EXCELLENT	4.062	1.124
17. COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	1	0	1	1	3	11	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.894
18. ABILITY TO CONVEY FACTS AND EXPLAIN KEY CONCEPTS IN A DIGESTIBLE MANNER	POOR	1	1	0	1	5	9	EXCELLENT	4.312	1.078
19. ENTHUSIASM FOR THE SUBJECT AND ABILITY TO STIMULATE STUDENT INTEREST	POOR	1	1	0	2	1	12	EXCELLENT	4.438	1.153
20. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE CLASS TIME	POOR	1	0	0	4	7	5	EXCELLENT	4.062	0.772
21. QUALITY OF EVALUATION OF WORK	POOR	1	1	0	3	4	8	EXCELLENT	4.125	1.147
22. PROMPTNESS OF RETURN OF GRADED ASSIGNMENTS AND COMMUNICATION OF STANDING IN CLASS	POOR	1	0	0	4	2	10	EXCELLENT	4.375	0.885

## IV. SECTION D: OTHER

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV	
23. CLARITY AND ACHIEVEMENT OF COURSE OBJECTIVES	POOR	0	0	1	2	11	3	EXCELLENT	3.941	0.748
24. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE USE OF CLASS TIME	POOR	0	0	0	3	9	5	EXCELLENT	4.118	0.697
25. VALUE OF COURSE TOWARD DEVELOPMENT OF INTELLECTUAL SKILLS (CRITICAL ANALYSIS, WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATION, RESEARCH)	POOR	0	0	2	2	5	8	EXCELLENT	4.118	1.054
26. LEVEL OF INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION OF THE COURSE	POOR	0	0	1	3	6	7	EXCELLENT	4.118	0.928
27. VALUE OF LAB/DISCUSSION AS A SUPPLEMENT TO THE LECTURE/READING	POOR	0	0	4	2	6	5	EXCELLENT	3.706	1.160
28. PROFESSOR'S PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	0	6	11	EXCELLENT	4.647	0.493
29. PROFESSOR'S COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	1	4	12	EXCELLENT	4.647	0.606
30. PROFESSOR'S ENTHUSIASM FOR SUBJECT OF THE COURSE	POOR	0	0	0	1	3	13	EXCELLENT	4.706	0.588
31. TO WHOM WOULD YOU RECOMMEND THIS COURSE? (SELECT ONE PLEASE) [1=NOBODY, 2=ONLY MAJORS/MINORS, 3=ONLY MAJORS/MINORS WITH GREAT INTEREST IN SUBJECT, 4=STUDENTS SEEKING DISTRIBUTION/DIVISIONAL STUDIES CREDIT, 5=STUDENTS SEEKING AN INTERESTING ELECTIVE]	POOR	2	0	6	3	0	6	EXCELLENT	3.400	1.404
32. HOW MUCH TIME PER WEEK OUTSIDE OF CLASS DID YOU SPEND ON THE COURSE? [1=LESS THAN 1 HR., 2=1-3 HRS., 3=3-5 HRS., 4=5-10 HRS., 5=MORE THAN 10 HRS.]	POOR	1	0	8	4	2	1	EXCELLENT	2.733	0.961
33. WHAT GRADE DO YOU EXPECT IN THE COURSE SOLELY BASED ON WORK COMPLETED THUS FAR? [1=F, 2=D, 3=C, 4=B, 5=A]	POOR	1	0	1	0	11	4	EXCELLENT	4.125	0.719

PROFESSOR Paul Withers

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 17

NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 22

PERCENT OF ENROLLED STUDENTS RESPONDING: 77.27

STATISTICS REFLECT PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES

## I. SECTION A: COURSE EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
1. RELEVANCE OF ASSIGNED READINGS [(1) LOW TO (5) HIGH]	POOR	6	0	12	12	29	41	EXCELLENT	4.062	1.063
2. DIFFICULTY OF COURSE [(1) EASY TO (5) DIFFICULT]	POOR	0	0	6	41	41	12	EXCELLENT	3.588	0.795
3. WORKLOAD IN COURSE [(1) LIGHT TO (5) HEAVY]	POOR	0	0	6	76	6	6	EXCELLENT	3.125	0.619
4. OVERALL RATING OF DISCUSSION INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	65	0	0	0	18	18	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.548
5. OVERALL RATING OF LAB INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	12	6	0	6	24	53	EXCELLENT	4.333	1.113
6. USEFULNESS OF ASSIGNMENTS AND PAPERS	POOR	0	0	6	12	29	53	EXCELLENT	4.294	0.920
7. OVERALL COURSE RATING	POOR	0	0	6	6	53	35	EXCELLENT	4.176	0.809

## II. SECTION B: FACULTY EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
8. EFFECTIVENESS IN EXPLAINING CONCEPTS	POOR	0	0	12	18	29	41	EXCELLENT	4.000	1.061
9. ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST IN SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	6	18	47	29	EXCELLENT	4.000	0.866
10. ENCOURAGEMENT OF CLASS PARTICIPATION	POOR	0	0	0	6	35	59	EXCELLENT	4.529	0.624
11. FAIRNESS IN GRADING	POOR	0	0	12	6	35	47	EXCELLENT	4.176	1.015
12. PROMPTNESS IN RETURNING ASSIGNMENTS	POOR	0	0	0	12	29	59	EXCELLENT	4.471	0.717
13. QUALITY OF FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS	POOR	0	0	6	29	29	35	EXCELLENT	3.941	0.966
14. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE OF CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	6	47	41	EXCELLENT	4.375	0.619
15. OVERALL RATING OF INSTRUCTOR	POOR	0	0	0	18	47	35	EXCELLENT	4.176	0.728

## III. SECTION C: TF/TA EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
16. PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	6	0	12	18	18	47	EXCELLENT	4.062	1.124
17. COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	6	0	6	6	18	65	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.894
18. ABILITY TO CONVEY FACTS AND EXPLAIN KEY CONCEPTS IN A DIGESTIBLE MANNER	POOR	6	6	0	6	29	53	EXCELLENT	4.312	1.078
19. ENTHUSIASM FOR THE SUBJECT AND ABILITY TO STIMULATE STUDENT INTEREST	POOR	6	6	0	12	6	71	EXCELLENT	4.438	1.153
20. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE CLASS TIME	POOR	6	0	0	24	41	29	EXCELLENT	4.062	0.772
21. QUALITY OF EVALUATION OF WORK	POOR	6	6	0	18	24	47	EXCELLENT	4.125	1.147
22. PROMPTNESS OF RETURN OF GRADED ASSIGNMENTS AND COMMUNICATION OF STANDING IN CLASS	POOR	6	0	0	24	12	59	EXCELLENT	4.375	0.885

## IV. SECTION D: OTHER

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
23. CLARITY AND ACHIEVEMENT OF COURSE OBJECTIVES	POOR	0	0	6	12	65	18	EXCELLENT	3.941	0.748
24. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE USE OF CLASS TIME	POOR	0	0	0	18	53	29	EXCELLENT	4.118	0.697
25. VALUE OF COURSE TOWARD DEVELOPMENT OF INTELLECTUAL SKILLS (CRITICAL ANALYSIS, WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATION, RESEARCH)	POOR	0	0	12	12	29	47	EXCELLENT	4.118	1.054
26. LEVEL OF INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION OF THE COURSE	POOR	0	0	6	18	35	41	EXCELLENT	4.118	0.928
27. VALUE OF LAB/DISCUSSION AS A SUPPLEMENT TO THE LECTURE/READING	POOR	0	0	24	12	35	29	EXCELLENT	3.706	1.160
28. PROFESSOR'S PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	0	35	65	EXCELLENT	4.647	0.493
29. PROFESSOR'S COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	6	24	71	EXCELLENT	4.647	0.606
30. PROFESSOR'S ENTHUSIASM FOR SUBJECT OF THE COURSE	POOR	0	0	0	6	18	76	EXCELLENT	4.706	0.588
31. TO WHOM WOULD YOU RECOMMEND THIS COURSE? (SELECT ONE PLEASE) [1=NOBODY, 2=ONLY MAJORS/MINORS, 3=ONLY MAJORS/MINORS WITH GREAT INTEREST IN SUBJECT, 4=STUDENTS SEEKING DISTRIBUTION/DIVISIONAL STUDIES CREDIT, 5=STUDENTS SEEKING AN INTERESTING ELECTIVE]	POOR	12	0	35	18	0	35	EXCELLENT	3.400	1.404
32. HOW MUCH TIME PER WEEK OUTSIDE OF CLASS DID YOU SPEND ON THE COURSE? [1=LESS THAN 1 HR., 2=1-3 HRS., 3=3-5 HRS., 4=5-10 HRS., 5=MORE THAN 10 HRS.]	POOR	6	0	47	24	12	6	EXCELLENT	2.733	0.961
33. WHAT GRADE DO YOU EXPECT IN THE COURSE SOLELY BASED ON WORK COMPLETED THUS FAR? [1=F, 2=D, 3=C, 4=B, 5=A]	POOR	6	0	6	0	65	24	EXCELLENT	4.125	0.719

PROFESSOR Jordan Montgomery

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 8

NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 9

PERCENT OF ENROLLED STUDENTS RESPONDING: 88.89

STATISTICS REFLECT FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES

## I. SECTION A: COURSE EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
1. RELEVANCE OF ASSIGNED READINGS [(1) LOW TO (5) HIGH]	POOR	1	0	0	2	1	4	EXCELLENT	4.286	0.951
2. DIFFICULTY OF COURSE [(1) EASY TO (5) DIFFICULT]	POOR	0	0	0	8	0	0	EXCELLENT	3.000	0.000
3. WORKLOAD IN COURSE [(1) LIGHT TO (5) HEAVY]	POOR	0	0	1	6	1	0	EXCELLENT	3.000	0.535
4. OVERALL RATING OF DISCUSSION INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	5	0	0	1	1	1	EXCELLENT	4.000	1.000
5. OVERALL RATING OF LAB INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	1	0	0	1	2	4	EXCELLENT	4.429	0.787
6. USEFULNESS OF ASSIGNMENTS AND PAPERS	POOR	0	0	1	1	0	6	EXCELLENT	4.375	1.188
7. OVERALL COURSE RATING	POOR	0	0	1	1	2	4	EXCELLENT	4.125	1.126

## II. SECTION B: FACULTY EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
8. EFFECTIVENESS IN EXPLAINING CONCEPTS	POOR	2	0	1	1	1	3	EXCELLENT	4.000	1.265
9. ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST IN SUBJECT	POOR	2	0	1	1	0	4	EXCELLENT	4.167	1.329
10. ENCOURAGEMENT OF CLASS PARTICIPATION	POOR	2	0	0	1	1	4	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.837
11. FAIRNESS IN GRADING	POOR	2	0	0	0	1	4	EXCELLENT	4.800	0.447
12. PROMPTNESS IN RETURNING ASSIGNMENTS	POOR	2	0	0	1	0	5	EXCELLENT	4.667	0.816
13. QUALITY OF FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS	POOR	2	0	0	2	1	3	EXCELLENT	4.167	0.983
14. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE OF CLASS	POOR	2	0	0	1	1	4	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.837
15. OVERALL RATING OF INSTRUCTOR	POOR	2	0	1	1	1	3	EXCELLENT	4.000	1.265

## III. SECTION C: TF/TA EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
16. PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	1	4	3	EXCELLENT	4.250	0.707
17. COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	1	1	6	EXCELLENT	4.625	0.744
18. ABILITY TO CONVEY FACTS AND EXPLAIN KEY CONCEPTS IN A DIGESTIBLE MANNER	POOR	0	0	0	1	1	6	EXCELLENT	4.625	0.744
19. ENTHUSIASM FOR THE SUBJECT AND ABILITY TO STIMULATE STUDENT INTEREST	POOR	0	0	0	1	0	7	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.707
20. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE CLASS TIME	POOR	0	0	1	1	4	2	EXCELLENT	3.875	0.991
21. QUALITY OF EVALUATION OF WORK	POOR	0	0	1	0	1	5	EXCELLENT	4.429	1.134
22. PROMPTNESS OF RETURN OF GRADED ASSIGNMENTS AND COMMUNICATION OF STANDING IN CLASS	POOR	0	0	2	0	1	5	EXCELLENT	4.125	1.356

## IV. SECTION D: OTHER

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
23. CLARITY AND ACHIEVEMENT OF COURSE OBJECTIVES	POOR	1	1	0	1	2	3	EXCELLENT	3.857	1.464
24. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE USE OF CLASS TIME	POOR	1	0	1	1	1	4	EXCELLENT	4.143	1.215
25. VALUE OF COURSE TOWARD DEVELOPMENT OF INTELLECTUAL SKILLS (CRITICAL ANALYSIS, WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATION, RESEARCH)	POOR	1	1	0	1	1	4	EXCELLENT	4.000	1.528
26. LEVEL OF INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION OF THE COURSE	POOR	1	1	0	1	0	5	EXCELLENT	4.143	1.574
27. VALUE OF LAB/DISCUSSION AS A SUPPLEMENT TO THE LECTURE/READING	POOR	1	0	1	2	1	3	EXCELLENT	3.857	1.215
28. PROFESSOR'S PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	2	0	0	2	1	3	EXCELLENT	4.167	0.983
29. PROFESSOR'S COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	2	0	0	1	1	4	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.837
30. PROFESSOR'S ENTHUSIASM FOR SUBJECT OF THE COURSE	POOR	2	0	0	1	1	4	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.837
31. TO WHOM WOULD YOU RECOMMEND THIS COURSE? (SELECT ONE PLEASE) [1=NOBODY, 2=ONLY MAJORS/MINORS, 3=ONLY MAJORS/MINORS WITH GREAT INTEREST IN SUBJECT, 4=STUDENTS SEEKING DISTRIBUTION/DIVISIONAL STUDIES CREDIT, 5=STUDENTS SEEKING AN INTERESTING ELECTIVE]	POOR	2	0	0	3	0	3	EXCELLENT	4.000	1.095
32. HOW MUCH TIME PER WEEK OUTSIDE OF CLASS DID YOU SPEND ON THE COURSE? [1=LESS THAN 1 HR., 2=1-3 HRS., 3=3-5 HRS., 4=5-10 HRS., 5=MORE THAN 10 HRS.]	POOR	1	0	7	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	2.000	0.000
33. WHAT GRADE DO YOU EXPECT IN THE COURSE SOLELY BASED ON WORK COMPLETED THUS FAR? [1=F, 2=D, 3=C, 4=B, 5=A]	POOR	1	0	0	1	2	4	EXCELLENT	4.429	0.787

PROFESSOR Jordan Montgomery  
 NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 8  
 NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 9  
 PERCENT OF ENROLLED STUDENTS RESPONDING: 88.89

STATISTICS REFLECT PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES

I. SECTION A: COURSE EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
1. RELEVANCE OF ASSIGNED READINGS [(1) LOW TO (5) HIGH]	POOR	12	0	0	25	12	50	EXCELLENT	4.286	0.951
2. DIFFICULTY OF COURSE [(1) EASY TO (5) DIFFICULT]	POOR	0	0	0	100	0	0	EXCELLENT	3.000	0.000
3. WORKLOAD IN COURSE [(1) LIGHT TO (5) HEAVY]	POOR	0	0	12	75	12	0	EXCELLENT	3.000	0.535
4. OVERALL RATING OF DISCUSSION INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	62	0	0	12	12	12	EXCELLENT	4.000	1.000
5. OVERALL RATING OF LAB INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	12	0	0	12	25	50	EXCELLENT	4.429	0.787
6. USEFULNESS OF ASSIGNMENTS AND PAPERS	POOR	0	0	12	12	0	75	EXCELLENT	4.375	1.188
7. OVERALL COURSE RATING	POOR	0	0	12	12	25	50	EXCELLENT	4.125	1.126

II. SECTION B: FACULTY EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
8. EFFECTIVENESS IN EXPLAINING CONCEPTS	POOR	25	0	12	12	12	38	EXCELLENT	4.000	1.265
9. ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST IN SUBJECT	POOR	25	0	12	12	0	50	EXCELLENT	4.167	1.329
10. ENCOURAGEMENT OF CLASS PARTICIPATION	POOR	25	0	0	12	12	50	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.837
11. FAIRNESS IN GRADING	POOR	25	0	0	0	12	50	EXCELLENT	4.800	0.447
12. PROMPTNESS IN RETURNING ASSIGNMENTS	POOR	25	0	0	12	0	62	EXCELLENT	4.667	0.816
13. QUALITY OF FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS	POOR	25	0	0	25	12	38	EXCELLENT	4.167	0.983
14. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE OF CLASS	POOR	25	0	0	12	12	50	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.837
15. OVERALL RATING OF INSTRUCTOR	POOR	25	0	12	12	12	38	EXCELLENT	4.000	1.265

III. SECTION C: TF/TA EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
16. PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	12	50	38	EXCELLENT	4.250	0.707
17. COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	12	12	75	EXCELLENT	4.625	0.744
18. ABILITY TO CONVEY FACTS AND EXPLAIN KEY CONCEPTS IN A DIGESTIBLE MANNER	POOR	0	0	0	12	12	75	EXCELLENT	4.625	0.744
19. ENTHUSIASM FOR THE SUBJECT AND ABILITY TO STIMULATE STUDENT INTEREST	POOR	0	0	0	12	0	88	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.707
20. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE CLASS TIME	POOR	0	0	12	12	50	25	EXCELLENT	3.875	0.991
21. QUALITY OF EVALUATION OF WORK	POOR	0	0	12	0	12	62	EXCELLENT	4.429	1.134
22. PROMPTNESS OF RETURN OF GRADED ASSIGNMENTS AND COMMUNICATION OF STANDING IN CLASS	POOR	0	0	25	0	12	62	EXCELLENT	4.125	1.356

IV. SECTION D: OTHER

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
23. CLARITY AND ACHIEVEMENT OF COURSE OBJECTIVES	POOR	12	12	0	12	25	38	EXCELLENT	3.857	1.464
24. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE USE OF CLASS TIME	POOR	12	0	12	12	12	50	EXCELLENT	4.143	1.215
25. VALUE OF COURSE TOWARD DEVELOPMENT OF INTELLECTUAL SKILLS (CRITICAL ANALYSIS, WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATION, RESEARCH)	POOR	12	12	0	12	12	50	EXCELLENT	4.000	1.528
26. LEVEL OF INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION OF THE COURSE	POOR	12	12	0	12	0	62	EXCELLENT	4.143	1.574
27. VALUE OF LAB/DISCUSSION AS A SUPPLEMENT TO THE LECTURE/READING	POOR	12	0	12	25	12	38	EXCELLENT	3.857	1.215
28. PROFESSOR'S PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	25	0	0	25	12	38	EXCELLENT	4.167	0.983
29. PROFESSOR'S COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	25	0	0	12	12	50	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.837
30. PROFESSOR'S ENTHUSIASM FOR SUBJECT OF THE COURSE	POOR	25	0	0	12	12	50	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.837
31. TO WHOM WOULD YOU RECOMMEND THIS COURSE? (SELECT ONE PLEASE) [1=NOBODY, 2=ONLY MAJORS/MINORS, 3=ONLY MAJORS/MINORS WITH GREAT INTEREST IN SUBJECT, 4=STUDENTS SEEKING DISTRIBUTION/DIVISIONAL STUDIES CREDIT, 5=STUDENTS SEEKING AN INTERESTING ELECTIVE]	POOR	25	0	0	38	0	38	EXCELLENT	4.000	1.095
32. HOW MUCH TIME PER WEEK OUTSIDE OF CLASS DID YOU SPEND ON THE COURSE? [1=LESS THAN 1 HR., 2=1-3 HRS., 3=3-5 HRS., 4=5-10 HRS., 5=MORE THAN 10 HRS.]	POOR	12	0	88	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	2.000	0.000
33. WHAT GRADE DO YOU EXPECT IN THE COURSE SOLELY BASED ON WORK COMPLETED THUS FAR? [1=F, 2=D, 3=C, 4=B, 5=A]	POOR	12	0	0	12	25	50	EXCELLENT	4.429	0.787

PROFESSOR Erin Axai

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 7

NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 9

PERCENT OF ENROLLED STUDENTS RESPONDING: 77.78

STATISTICS REFLECT FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES

I. SECTION A: COURSE EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
1. RELEVANCE OF ASSIGNED READINGS [(1) LOW TO (5) HIGH]	POOR	1	0	0	1	3	2	EXCELLENT	4.167	0.753
2. DIFFICULTY OF COURSE [(1) EASY TO (5) DIFFICULT]	POOR	0	0	1	3	2	1	EXCELLENT	3.429	0.976
3. WORKLOAD IN COURSE [(1) LIGHT TO (5) HEAVY]	POOR	0	0	1	4	1	1	EXCELLENT	3.286	0.951
4. OVERALL RATING OF DISCUSSION INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	2	0	0	0	4	1	EXCELLENT	4.200	0.447
5. OVERALL RATING OF LAB INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	0	1	0	0	2	4	EXCELLENT	4.143	1.464
6. USEFULNESS OF ASSIGNMENTS AND PAPERS	POOR	0	0	0	0	2	5	EXCELLENT	4.714	0.488
7. OVERALL COURSE RATING	POOR	0	0	0	0	4	3	EXCELLENT	4.429	0.535

II. SECTION B: FACULTY EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
8. EFFECTIVENESS IN EXPLAINING CONCEPTS	POOR	0	0	0	2	1	4	EXCELLENT	4.286	0.951
9. ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST IN SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	0	5	2	EXCELLENT	4.286	0.488
10. ENCOURAGEMENT OF CLASS PARTICIPATION	POOR	0	0	0	1	1	5	EXCELLENT	4.571	0.787
11. FAIRNESS IN GRADING	POOR	0	0	1	1	1	4	EXCELLENT	4.143	1.215
12. PROMPTNESS IN RETURNING ASSIGNMENTS	POOR	0	0	0	1	2	4	EXCELLENT	4.429	0.787
13. QUALITY OF FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS	POOR	0	0	1	1	3	2	EXCELLENT	3.857	1.069
14. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE OF CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	1	1	5	EXCELLENT	4.571	0.787
15. OVERALL RATING OF INSTRUCTOR	POOR	0	0	0	1	2	4	EXCELLENT	4.429	0.787

III. SECTION C: TF/TA EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
16. PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	1	0	1	2	1	2	EXCELLENT	3.667	1.211
17. COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	1	0	0	1	2	3	EXCELLENT	4.333	0.816
18. ABILITY TO CONVEY FACTS AND EXPLAIN KEY CONCEPTS IN A DIGESTIBLE MANNER	POOR	1	1	0	0	2	3	EXCELLENT	4.000	1.549
19. ENTHUSIASM FOR THE SUBJECT AND ABILITY TO STIMULATE STUDENT INTEREST	POOR	1	1	0	2	0	3	EXCELLENT	3.667	1.633
20. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE CLASS TIME	POOR	1	0	1	2	2	1	EXCELLENT	3.500	1.049
21. QUALITY OF EVALUATION OF WORK	POOR	1	1	0	1	2	2	EXCELLENT	3.667	1.506
22. PROMPTNESS OF RETURN OF GRADED ASSIGNMENTS AND COMMUNICATION OF STANDING IN CLASS	POOR	1	0	0	2	2	2	EXCELLENT	4.000	0.894

IV. SECTION D: OTHER

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
23. CLARITY AND ACHIEVEMENT OF COURSE OBJECTIVES	POOR	0	0	0	1	3	3	EXCELLENT	4.286	0.756
24. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE USE OF CLASS TIME	POOR	0	0	0	1	4	2	EXCELLENT	4.143	0.690
25. VALUE OF COURSE TOWARD DEVELOPMENT OF INTELLECTUAL SKILLS (CRITICAL ANALYSIS, WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATION, RESEARCH)	POOR	0	0	0	1	2	4	EXCELLENT	4.429	0.787
26. LEVEL OF INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION OF THE COURSE	POOR	0	0	0	0	3	4	EXCELLENT	4.571	0.535
27. VALUE OF LAB/DISCUSSION AS A SUPPLEMENT TO THE LECTURE/READING	POOR	0	0	0	0	4	3	EXCELLENT	4.429	0.535
28. PROFESSOR'S PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	0	1	6	EXCELLENT	4.857	0.378
29. PROFESSOR'S COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	0	1	6	EXCELLENT	4.857	0.378
30. PROFESSOR'S ENTHUSIASM FOR SUBJECT OF THE COURSE	POOR	1	0	0	0	0	6	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
31. TO WHOM WOULD YOU RECOMMEND THIS COURSE? (SELECT ONE PLEASE) [1=NOBODY, 2=ONLY MAJORS/MINORS, 3=ONLY MAJORS/MINORS WITH GREAT INTEREST IN SUBJECT, 4=STUDENTS SEEKING DISTRIBUTION/DIVISIONAL STUDIES CREDIT, 5=STUDENTS SEEKING AN INTERESTING ELECTIVE]	POOR	1	0	2	1	0	3	EXCELLENT	3.667	1.506
32. HOW MUCH TIME PER WEEK OUTSIDE OF CLASS DID YOU SPEND ON THE COURSE? [1=LESS THAN 1 HR., 2=1-3 HRS., 3=3-5 HRS., 4=5-10 HRS., 5=MORE THAN 10 HRS.]	POOR	1	0	3	2	0	1	EXCELLENT	2.833	1.169
33. WHAT GRADE DO YOU EXPECT IN THE COURSE SOLELY BASED ON WORK COMPLETED THUS FAR? [1=F, 2=D, 3=C, 4=B, 5=A]	POOR	1	0	0	0	5	1	EXCELLENT	4.167	0.408

PROFESSOR Erin Arni

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 7

NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 9

PERCENT OF ENROLLED STUDENTS RESPONDING: 77.78

STATISTICS REFLECT PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES

## I. SECTION A: COURSE EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
1. RELEVANCE OF ASSIGNED READINGS [(1) LOW TO (5) HIGH]	POOR	14	0	0	14	43	29	EXCELLENT	4.167	0.753
2. DIFFICULTY OF COURSE [(1) EASY TO (5) DIFFICULT]	POOR	0	0	14	43	29	14	EXCELLENT	3.429	0.976
3. WORKLOAD IN COURSE [(1) LIGHT TO (5) HEAVY]	POOR	0	0	14	57	14	14	EXCELLENT	3.286	0.951
4. OVERALL RATING OF DISCUSSION INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	29	0	0	0	57	14	EXCELLENT	4.200	0.447
5. OVERALL RATING OF LAB INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	0	14	0	0	29	57	EXCELLENT	4.143	1.464
6. USEFULNESS OF ASSIGNMENTS AND PAPERS	POOR	0	0	0	0	29	71	EXCELLENT	4.714	0.488
7. OVERALL COURSE RATING	POOR	0	0	0	0	57	43	EXCELLENT	4.429	0.535

## II. SECTION B: FACULTY EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
8. EFFECTIVENESS IN EXPLAINING CONCEPTS	POOR	0	0	0	29	14	57	EXCELLENT	4.286	0.951
9. ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST IN SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	0	71	29	EXCELLENT	4.286	0.488
10. ENCOURAGEMENT OF CLASS PARTICIPATION	POOR	0	0	0	14	14	71	EXCELLENT	4.571	0.787
11. FAIRNESS IN GRADING	POOR	0	0	14	14	14	57	EXCELLENT	4.143	1.215
12. PROMPTNESS IN RETURNING ASSIGNMENTS	POOR	0	0	0	14	29	57	EXCELLENT	4.429	0.787
13. QUALITY OF FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS	POOR	0	0	14	14	43	29	EXCELLENT	3.857	1.069
14. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE OF CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	14	14	71	EXCELLENT	4.571	0.787
15. OVERALL RATING OF INSTRUCTOR	POOR	0	0	0	14	29	57	EXCELLENT	4.429	0.787

## III. SECTION C: TF/TA EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
16. PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	14	0	14	29	14	29	EXCELLENT	3.667	1.211
17. COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	14	0	0	14	29	43	EXCELLENT	4.333	0.616
18. ABILITY TO CONVEY FACTS AND EXPLAIN KEY CONCEPTS IN A DIGESTIBLE MANNER	POOR	14	14	0	0	29	43	EXCELLENT	4.000	1.549
19. ENTHUSIASM FOR THE SUBJECT AND ABILITY TO STIMULATE STUDENT INTEREST	POOR	14	14	0	29	0	43	EXCELLENT	3.667	1.633
20. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE CLASS TIME	POOR	14	0	14	29	29	14	EXCELLENT	3.500	1.049
21. QUALITY OF EVALUATION OF WORK	POOR	14	14	0	14	29	29	EXCELLENT	3.667	1.506
22. PROMPTNESS OF RETURN OF GRADED ASSIGNMENTS AND COMMUNICATION OF STANDING IN CLASS	POOR	14	0	0	29	29	29	EXCELLENT	4.000	0.894

## IV. SECTION D: OTHER

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
23. CLARITY AND ACHIEVEMENT OF COURSE OBJECTIVES	POOR	0	0	0	14	43	43	EXCELLENT	4.286	0.756
24. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE USE OF CLASS TIME	POOR	0	0	0	14	57	29	EXCELLENT	4.143	0.690
25. VALUE OF COURSE TOWARD DEVELOPMENT OF INTELLECTUAL SKILLS (CRITICAL ANALYSIS, WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATION, RESEARCH)	POOR	0	0	0	14	29	57	EXCELLENT	4.429	0.787
26. LEVEL OF INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION OF THE COURSE	POOR	0	0	0	0	43	57	EXCELLENT	4.571	0.535
27. VALUE OF LAB/DISCUSSION AS A SUPPLEMENT TO THE LECTURE/READING	POOR	0	0	0	0	57	43	EXCELLENT	4.429	0.535
28. PROFESSOR'S PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	0	14	86	EXCELLENT	4.857	0.378
29. PROFESSOR'S COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	0	14	86	EXCELLENT	4.857	0.378
30. PROFESSOR'S ENTHUSIASM FOR SUBJECT OF THE COURSE	POOR	14	0	0	0	0	86	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
31. TO WHOM WOULD YOU RECOMMEND THIS COURSE? (SELECT ONE PLEASE) [1=NOBODY, 2=ONLY MAJORS/MINORS, 3=ONLY MAJORS/MINORS WITH GREAT INTEREST IN SUBJECT, 4=STUDENTS SEEKING DISTRIBUTION/DIVISIONAL STUDIES CREDIT, 5=STUDENTS SEEKING AN INTERESTING ELECTIVE]	POOR	14	0	29	14	0	43	EXCELLENT	3.667	1.506
32. HOW MUCH TIME PER WEEK OUTSIDE OF CLASS DID YOU SPEND ON THE COURSE? [1=LESS THAN 1 HR., 2=1-3 HRS., 3=3-5 HRS., 4=5-10 HRS., 5=MORE THAN 10 HRS.]	POOR	14	0	43	29	0	14	EXCELLENT	2.833	1.169
33. WHAT GRADE DO YOU EXPECT IN THE COURSE SOLELY BASED ON WORK COMPLETED THUS FAR? [1=F, 2=D, 3=C, 4=B, 5=A]	POOR	14	0	0	0	71	14	EXCELLENT	4.167	0.408

AS202 A1, A2  
Withers

**Fall 2011**  
**Course Evaluation Comments**

Course: AS202 A1, A2, Principles of Astronomy  
Instructor: Withers

**1. What were the most positive aspects of the course?**

- The lab when we used the telescope.
- Using the telescope was a nice experience.
- Erin is awesome.
- The course offered good instruction that was easy to follow. Helped solidify basic concepts. Explained lots of information easily.
- I love Jordan! He's amazing!
- Rigorous and thorough. Use of the 10-inch.
- Night lab was excellent. Jordan is a really enthusiastic engaging TF.
- I like astronomy as well as our professor.
- Everything.
- Prepares you for Astronomy Minor/Major
- Labs, observing time.
- Most interesting and engaging course I am currently enrolled in; lots of fun.
- The homework assignments were fun and related well to the class material that we learned.
- The lab was super relevant and fun. I really like Professor Withers. He didn't let the class become a one sided conversation.
- Great explanations and examples. Professor Withers great, funny
- Material conveyed in an interesting and engaging way in class.
- I loved Professor Withers ♥ He knows this subject very well.
- I really like the material we covered.
- All the topics were covered in a timely manner.
- The professor was nice and I love the TFs. Some course material was interesting but for the most part, I had learned a lot of it before.
- Very interesting. Explanation of physical concepts was rigorous and thorough. Use of the 10 inch telescope.
- The subject was interesting and Professor Withers shows great enthusiasm for the subject.
- Conveyed information well most of the time.

**2. What, if any, changes would you recommend for the next offering of the course?  
Be as specific as possible.**

- More structured labs.
- Explain requirements for lab, better improve organization of lab.

Note: (?) indicates that the student's handwriting was illegible and the best effort was made to interpret what was written.

- If there is only going to be one homework assigned from one book one time, there shouldn't be two required textbooks. Those were expensive, and I never found the Norton book useful.
- I feel like for some things we don't need to take the time to derive equations together, show it to us in PowerPoint then show us how to use it in a test like example.
- A bit too much jargon written on the board.
- Going through derivations is very hard to follow.
- None really. I liked how he made sure we understood the concepts before going into the math. Maybe more PowerPoints?
- I can't read his handwriting.
- I have no problem with the teaching method.
- Try not to breeze through the derivations too quickly.
- More application (in the field) of the things being taught would be more helpful.
- More practice problems in class/examples and explain more where certain derivations come from.
- Teaching style is already great but more enthusiasm would make it more interesting.

**4. Comment on the feedback you received from the instructor of the course. Was it useful?**

- Yes.
- Very vague, not useful. Inconsistent.
- Very useful → very good with homework help.
- Instructor's feedback was helpful.
- Yes.
- Always useful.
- Yes.
- Didn't get feedback.
- Feedback always helped.
- Absolutely; especially with regards to formatting lab reports, etc.
- It was useful.
- Yes.
- Sometimes useful.
- The feedback was there, but the grading I felt was a little too nit-picky for this level course. Many of the questions on the homework were too ambiguous to have a right or wrong answer.
- Yes, questions were always answered satisfactorily.
- Yes, he provides great feedback.
- Feedback was almost always useful.

**5. Comment on the frequency and length of assignments, exams, and lab reports.**

Note: (?) indicates that the student's handwriting was illegible and the best effort was made to interpret what was written.



- Good. Spread the labs out more.
- Ok.
- Lab reports, perfect length.
- Lab reports took an extended amount of time, but assignments were concise enough.
- Given at proper intervals.
- Homework once a week is ok, but lab reports were sometimes unrelated to our studies in class.
- Homework very hard, took way too long, was not prepared for exams, lab reports redundant.
- Not unmanageable.
- More homework would mean more preparedness for exams; otherwise it is fantastic.
- Every assignment was just the right length and did not take up too much time, but made me remember the material.
- A good number of things.
- Sufficient.
- I thought these were all well done. Exams were too long though. Good questions, but too many of them.
- It's fine.
- There were a good amount of assignments. Though they were clumped together a little at the end.
- Length of assignments was manageable, try to have the lab reports more spaced out.
- Length of assignments and lab reports are perfect. Exams are too long for the time given (9 pages for 50 mins).
- Exams were strange but length and frequency of lab reports were solid.

**6. Comment on the selection and amount of reading. Which readings were the most and which were the least valuable? Why?**

- No readings.
- Not relevant.
- Valuable readings.
- Readings provided external sources for conceptualization of ideas.
- Reading was far too advanced and went into great detail about things that were not relevant to the course. It widely confused me rather than helped.
- I find that the readings handed out in class, and those found in book, as explained better on Wikipedia.
- All relevant.
- I generally used the textbook alongside homework assignments (Ryden); the observational textbook was really unnecessary.
- The readings (both Ryden and Norton) were not really too easy to follow.
- Need specific readings for class. Not assigned but recommended.

Note: (?) indicates that the student's handwriting was illegible and the best effort was made to interpret what was written.

- The reading for Ryden was relevant, but not necessary to understand course material.
- I didn't read a lot for this class.
- No reading.
- The readings from the textbook were not very helpful, The Cosmic Perspective book by Pearson is better.
- Reading was not a requirement but he always told us where the information in the book was which is very helpful.

**7. Comment on the TA/TF or lab instructor for the course. What did he/she do well? What could he/she improve?**

- See separate TA/TF comments if applicable.

**8. What skills and understanding have you gained from this course?**

- Telescope!
- To be more prompt about doing work and labs.
- None.
- Better at analyzing and writing lab reports.
- I've learned a lot of basic facts about Astronomy.
- Figuring out how to do and learn astronomy from Wikipedia because I could not gather much from class.
- Basic math and conceptual skills for astro.
- Analytical skills, problem solving in the field of astronomy...
- I learned to make observations about the planets using a telescope.
- Many! Telescope!
- Useful for critically thinking about soulless math problems.
- As I said before, I personally know many of the concepts from other physics and astro classes, so I did not get too much from it other than coordinate systems.
- Better geometric understanding of the solar system and other astronomical objects.
- More common sense and analytical understanding.
- Understanding of gravitational/(?) and history of astronomy, just to name a few.

**9. General Comments:**

- Fun.
- Very good course.
- Jordan= perfect TA
- I do not feel as if I gained anything from this course.
- I recommend for the next semester to plan the semester in a more logical fashion.
- Great course.

AS202 A1, A2  
Withers

- Good class overall for anyone interested in astronomy who isn't too afraid of math.

Note: (?) indicates that the student's handwriting was illegible and the best effort was made to interpret what was written.