PROFESSOR Paul Withers
NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 4
NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 4
PERCENT OF ENROLLED STUDENTS RESPONDING: 100

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	0	0	0	0	0	4	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
2. DIFFICULTY OF COURSE [(1) EASY TO (5) DIFFICULT]	POOR	0	0	0	2	2	0	EXCELLENT	3.500	0.577
3. WORKLOAD IN COURSE [(1) LIGHT TO (5) HEAVY]	POOR	0	0	0	1	3	0	EXCELLENT	3.750	0.500
4. OVERALL RATING OF DISCUSSION INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	3	0	0	0	0	1	EXCELLENT	5.000	N/A
5. OVERALL RATING OF LAB INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	4	0	0	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	N/A	N/A
6. USEFULNESS OF ASSIGNMENTS AND PAPERS	POOR	0	0	0	1	3	0	EXCELLENT	3.750	0.500
7. OVERALL COURSE RATING	POOR	0	0	0	0	2	2	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.577

II. SECTION B: FACULTY EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
8. EFFECTIVENESS IN EXPLAINING CONCEPTS	POOR	0	0	0	0	2	2	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.577
9. ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST IN SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	0	1	3	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500
10. ENCOURAGEMENT OF CLASS PARTICIPATION	POOR	0	0	0	0	1	3	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500
11. FAIRNESS IN GRADING	POOR	0	0	0	2	1	1	EXCELLENT	3.750	0.957
12. PROMPTNESS IN RETURNING ASSIGNMENTS	POOR	0	0	0	0	0	4	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
13. QUALITY OF FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS	POOR	0	0	0	1	2	1	EXCELLENT	4.000	0.816
14. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE OF CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	0	1	3	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500
15. OVERALL RATING OF INSTRUCTOR	POOR	0	0	0	0	2	2	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.577

III. SECTION C: TF/TA EVALUATION

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

IV. SECTION D: OTHER

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
23. CLARITY AND ACHIEVEMENT OF COURSE OBJECTIVES	POOR	0	0	0	0	2	2	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.577
24. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE USE OF CLASS TIME	POOR	0	0	0	1	1	2	EXCELLENT	4.250	0.957
25. VALUE OF COURSE TOWARD DEVELOPMENT OF INTELLECTUAL SKILLS (CRITICAL ANALYSIS, WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATION, RESEARCH)	POOR	0	0	0	0	2	2	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.577
26. LEVEL OF INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION OF THE COURSE	POOR	0	0	0	0	1	3	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500
27. VALUE OF LAB/DISCUSSION AS A SUPPLEMENT TO THE LECTURE/READING	POOR	3	0	0	0	1	0	EXCELLENT	4.000	N/A
28. PROFESSOR'S PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	0	1	3	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500
29. PROFESSOR'S COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	0	1	3	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500
30. PROFESSOR'S ENTHUSIASM FOR SUBJECT OF THE COURSE	POOR	0	0	0	0	1	3	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500
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	3	0	0	1	0	0	EXCELLENT	3.000	N/A
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	0	0	0	1	2	1	EXCELLENT	4.000	0.816
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	0	0	0	0	1	3	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500

PROFESSOR Paul Withers
NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 4
NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 4
PERCENT OF ENROLLED STUDENTS RESPONDING: 100

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	0	0	0	0	0	100	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
2. DIFFICULTY OF COURSE [(1) EASY TO (5) DIFFICULT]	POOR	0	0	0	50	50	0	EXCELLENT	3.500	0.577
3. WORKLOAD IN COURSE [(1) LIGHT TO (5) HEAVY]	POOR	0	0	0	25	75	0	EXCELLENT	3.750	0.500
4. OVERALL RATING OF DISCUSSION INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	75	0	0	0	0	25	EXCELLENT	5.000	N/A
5. OVERALL RATING OF LAB INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	100	0	0	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	N/A	N/A
6. USEFULNESS OF ASSIGNMENTS AND PAPERS	POOR	0	0	0	25	75	0	EXCELLENT	3.750	0.500
7. OVERALL COURSE RATING	POOR	0	0	0	0	50	50	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.577

II. SECTION B: FACULTY EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
8. EFFECTIVENESS IN EXPLAINING CONCEPTS	POOR	0	0	0	0	50	50	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.577
9. ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST IN SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	0	25	75	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500
10. ENCOURAGEMENT OF CLASS PARTICIPATION	POOR	0	0	0	0	25	75	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500
11. FAIRNESS IN GRADING	POOR	0	0	0	50	25	25	EXCELLENT	3.750	0.957
12. PROMPTNESS IN RETURNING ASSIGNMENTS	POOR	0	0	0	0	0	100	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
13. QUALITY OF FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS	POOR	0	0	0	25	50	25	EXCELLENT	4.000	0.816
14. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE OF CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	0	25	75	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500
15. OVERALL RATING OF INSTRUCTOR	POOR	0	0	0	0	50	50	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.577

III. SECTION C: TF/TA EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
16. PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	100	0	0	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	N/A	N/A
17. COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	100	0	0	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	N/A	N/A
18. ABILITY TO CONVEY FACTS AND EXPLAIN KEY CONCEPTS IN A DIGESTIBLE MANNER	POOR	100	0	0	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	N/A	N/A
19. ENTHUSIASM FOR THE SUBJECT AND ABILITY TO STIMULATE STUDENT INTEREST	POOR	100	0	0	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	N/A	N/A
20. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE CLASS TIME	POOR	100	0	0	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	N/A	N/A
21. QUALITY OF EVALUATION OF WORK	POOR	100	0	0	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	N/A	N/A
22. PROMPTNESS OF RETURN OF GRADED ASSIGNMENTS AND COMMUNICATION OF STANDING IN CLASS	POOR	100	0	0	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	N/A	N/A

IV. SECTION D: OTHER

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
23. CLARITY AND ACHIEVEMENT OF COURSE OBJECTIVES	POOR	0	0	0	0	50	50	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.577
24. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE USE OF CLASS TIME	POOR	0	0	0	25	25	50	EXCELLENT	4.250	0.957
25. VALUE OF COURSE TOWARD DEVELOPMENT OF INTELLECTUAL SKILLS (CRITICAL ANALYSIS, WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATION, RESEARCH)	POOR	0	0	0	0	50	50	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.577
26. LEVEL OF INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION OF THE COURSE	POOR	0	0	0	0	25	75	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500
27. VALUE OF LAB/DISCUSSION AS A SUPPLEMENT TO THE LECTURE/READING	POOR	75	0	0	0	25	0	EXCELLENT	4.000	N/A
28. PROFESSOR'S PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	0	25	75	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500
29. PROFESSOR'S COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	0	25	75	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500
30. PROFESSOR'S ENTHUSIASM FOR SUBJECT OF THE COURSE	POOR	0	0	0	0	25	75	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500
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	75	0	0	25	0	0	EXCELLENT	3.000	N/A
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	0	0	0	25	50	25	EXCELLENT	4.000	0.816
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	0	0	0	0	25	75	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500

GRS AS 781 A1
Withers

Spring 2016
Course Evaluation Comments

Course: GRS AS 781 A1, Planetary Atmospheres
Instructor: Paul Withers

1. What were the most positive aspects of the course?
- Programing exercises were a good way to see how this stuff works in practice and helps gain intuition. Online library and resources were very useful.
- The readings were helpful
- Helped get a base understanding of planetary atmospheres.
- Lecture notes / assigned readings were very helpful. Class was well structured & goal of each class period was very clear from the beginning. Overall, an excellent course.

2. What, if any, changes would you recommend for the next offering of the course? Be as specific as possible.
- Organization of the readings could be done so that it is easier to find stuff.
- More homework at beginning and less at the end of the semester.
- I would challenge you to include exoplanets atmospheres more frequently. This could be done in each course subject when we talk about case studies. For instance, hot Jupiters have measured thermal structures, winds (also measured), chemistry, outflow, and RT applications.

3. What, if any, adjustments would you recommend to the instructor's teaching method or style?
- [no comments]

4. Comment on the feedback you received from the instructor of the course. Was it useful?
- [no comments]

5. Comment on the frequency and length of assignments, exams, and lab reports.
- JITTs(?) and reading assignments felt like they took a lot of time each week, but were helpful. Homeworks were fair.
- Homework assignments often took a lot of time and the expectations were sometimes not clear which made the homework grades unexpected sometimes
- The increase in work load at the end of the semester was unfortunate. I would recommend removing a hw or something. My quality of work simply decreased.

6. Comment on the selection and amount of reading. Which readings were the most and which were the least valuable? Why?
- All were relevant and useful

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?
- [no comments]

9. General Comments:
- Overall good

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