

Boston University

Summer Term
755 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02215

617-353-5124



TO: Summer Faculty

FROM: Donna Shea
Assistant Dean, Summer Term

RE: Summer 1 Course Evaluation Results

DATE: September 1, 2006

Enclosed are copies of the evaluation results for your Summer 1, 2006 course. In addition to the compiled results from the questionnaire, we have also included typed copies of the student comments. We did not edit these comments from what was written, so they might contain spelling and/or grammatical errors.

These results have also been distributed to your department.

Thank you for your cooperation with the course evaluation process, and please let me know if you have any questions.

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 16
 NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 19
 PERCENT OF ENROLLED STUDENTS RESPONDING: 84.21

STATISTICS REFLECT FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES

I. SECTION A: COURSE EVALUATION

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
1. THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FOUND THE CLASS INTELLECTUALLY CHALLENGING	POOR	0	0	2	7	4	3 SUPERIOR	3.500	0.966
2. THE EXTENT THAT ASSIGNMENTS FURTHERED YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF COURSE CONTENT	POOR	0	0	1	3	9	3 SUPERIOR	3.875	0.806
3. THE EXTENT THAT THE CLASS NORMALLY MET THE REQUIRED NUMBER OF HOURS	POOR	0	0	0	1	5	10 SUPERIOR	4.562	0.629
4. I FOUND THE TEXTBOOK/CASES/COURSE MATERIALS	POOR	0	0	1	3	7	5 SUPERIOR	4.000	0.894
5. THE EXTENT TO WHICH I WOULD RECOMMEND THIS COURSE TO OTHERS	POOR	0	1	0	7	6	2 SUPERIOR	3.500	0.966
6. I WOULD RATE THE COURSE OVERALL AS	POOR	0	0	1	4	8	3 SUPERIOR	3.812	0.834

II. SECTION B: INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

	NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
7. THE INSTRUCTOR'S ABILITY TO PRESENT MATERIAL IS	POOR	0	0	0	3	11	2 SUPERIOR	3.938	0.574
8. I WOULD RATE THE INSTRUCTOR'S ENTHUSIASM AS	POOR	0	0	0	1	8	7 SUPERIOR	4.375	0.619
9. THE INSTRUCTOR'S ABILITY TO ENCOURAGE QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION IS	POOR	0	0	0	4	6	6 SUPERIOR	4.125	0.806
10. THE INSTRUCTOR'S MASTERY OF THE COURSE MATERIALS IS	POOR	0	0	0	1	4	10 SUPERIOR	4.600	0.632
11. THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE INSTRUCTOR'S GRADING CRITERIA ARE CLEAR AND FAIR	POOR	0	0	4	5	4	2 SUPERIOR	3.267	1.033
12. THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE INSTRUCTOR RETURNED ASSIGNMENTS IN A TIMELY MANNER	POOR	0	3	1	5	6	1 SUPERIOR	3.062	1.237
13. THE INSTRUCTOR'S OVERALL RATING IS	POOR	0	0	0	3	10	3 SUPERIOR	4.000	0.632

III. SECTION C:

	NR	1	2				MEAN	ST DEV	
14. ARE YOU A B. U. STUDENT?	YES	1	13	2		NO	1.133	0.352	
15. ARE YOU AN INTERNATIONAL STUDENT?	YES	1	7	8		NO	1.533	0.516	
16. WHAT GRADE DO YOU EXPECT TO RECEIVE IN THE COURSE?	NR	1	2	3	4				
	C OR LESS	1	3	2	7	3	A- OR A	2.667	1.047

College of Arts and Sciences
Instructor/Course Evaluations
Summer Term Session 1, 2006

Course: CAS AS 101 A1
Title: The Solar System
Instructor: WITHERS, PAUL

About the Instructor:

- The instructor knows material very well and is able to explain it to students fairly well. The instructor also encourages class participation and class discussion so that the class won't be too boring/instructor summarizes each chapter for students. Improve: The instructor and his TA should return homework and other assignments to students earlier, especially lab reports. The labs were uninteresting and unrelated to the course at first, but later improved. Should have more in-class demonstration.
- He uses slides and he looks like a nice guy. He probably should not have too high expectations on students. We are not Steven Hawking.
- Very knowledgeable.
- The instructor was very well organized and his class periods always were interesting. Don't let a lazy and unappreciative TA assist you. She was slow in returning assignments and was not very knowledgeable about the course material.
- Very in depth clear lectures, sometimes a little boring but mainly very interesting. Slides very helpful and movies as well. Improve: Explaining the mathematics more.
- Strong: Experiments in class. Improve: The professor should finish the class 10 minutes early so that students have enough time to go to another class. I usually was late at the class after this one.
- Everything is explained in detail, and with picture examples. Encouraged students to discuss questions. Could spend a little time doing some calculation or questions that are similar to those in the homework, so that mathematical problems on homework won't be as confusing.
- Tried to keep class involved with discussion of topics in class.
- Notes are nice. Improve: Assignment questions need to be more clear if you want something explained, say so. Very annoying to have points taken off of lab because I didn't specifically spell out why gravity is important save that for middle school and focus on the actual experiment.
- Strong: Very well – prepared. Great handouts/lecture slides. Materials posted to website are great help. Enthusiastic. Improve: A bit more structured in labs.
- He knew the material well and covered all the material without rushing. Improve: Guided discussion beyond just telling us a topic and telling us to chat in a group.
- He is very friendly and enthusiastic, and always prepared with interesting materials.
- He made the students think for themselves. He was very helpful in office hours. He would answer questions very well. He is very smart. Improve: Make slides

clearer, TA should return stuff on time, TA grades unfairly (too harsh on lab reports, minds things like grammar mistakes).

- Strong: Tries to use many props to get students' attention. Questions in slides are very good. Homework to keep students on track. Improve: The format of lecture (power point) seems very dull, need to change the ways it is presented. Use more blackboard instead of reading off the slides. Instead highlight main points and then use different method to present them e.g. drawing them out.
- Strong: Power point, class activity, getting the class involved.

About the Course:

- Interesting subject. Improve: More demonstration. Improve slide shows/make them more interesting.
- The materials are interesting supposedly. Improve: The grading is ridiculous for 100 level course where many students are taking it for FUN not to have torture! This is not Cambridge system where pass is difficult enough.
- Homework due too soon after assignment – I hardly got a chance to read the book for each.
- Strong: The way that we touched a lot of points, but not for an extensive period of time. Improve: The TA.
- Strong: The content and information. Improve: The grading was extremely harsh – unless a student was very comfortable with mathematics and physics there is a slim chance of receiving a good grade.
- Nice lecture, the professor is very willing to take questions from students. Labs could be a little more organized.
- The subject matter itself is interesting and Dr. Withers made it easier to understand. Improve: The lab portion and prompt return of lab reports.
- Later on in the course, material became much more interesting. Material dragged a bit early in the course, but was necessary for understanding concepts presented later on.
- Lab reports seemed pointless and the labs often seemed irrelevant to the course.
- Interesting material and nice professor. Improve: Grading policies – I felt I knew the material well, but the test seemed to be focused on test-taking skills, rather than on the material. Homework is hard.
- Strong: Good demonstrations – it was easier to understand material. The TA should have a better attitude, after all we are all here to learn and most of us don't know much about astronomy.
- The course length for this class is just right. Didn't like the labs – they were too hard to write up as most of them are pretty obvious – should instead give out questions and relate them to the lab. Too many concepts – makes concepts very confusing for a 101 class.
- The class is more spread out than the other classes, so it's easier for the students to swallow and easier for students to catch up even if they miss a class.