PROFESSOR Paul Withers
NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 14
NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 14
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	3	5	6	EXCELLENT	4.214	0.802
2. DIFFICULTY OF COURSE [(1) EASY TO (5) DIFFICULT]	POOR	0	2	7	4	1	0	EXCELLENT	2.286	0.825
3. WORKLOAD IN COURSE [(1) LIGHT TO (5) HEAVY]	POOR	0	1	1	9	2	1	EXCELLENT	3.071	0.917
4. OVERALL RATING OF DISCUSSION INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	7	0	0	2	2	3	EXCELLENT	4.143	0.900
5. OVERALL RATING OF LAB INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	14	0	0	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	N/A	N/A
6. USEFULNESS OF ASSIGNMENTS AND PAPERS	POOR	0	0	1	3	7	3	EXCELLENT	3.857	0.864
7. OVERALL COURSE RATING	POOR	0	0	1	6	2	5	EXCELLENT	3.786	1.051

II. SECTION B: FACULTY EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
8. EFFECTIVENESS IN EXPLAINING CONCEPTS	POOR	0	0	0	1	7	6	EXCELLENT	4.357	0.633
9. ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST IN SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	6	3	5	EXCELLENT	3.929	0.917
10. ENCOURAGEMENT OF CLASS PARTICIPATION	POOR	0	0	0	0	3	11	EXCELLENT	4.786	0.426
11. FAIRNESS IN GRADING	POOR	0	0	0	2	2	10	EXCELLENT	4.571	0.756
12. PROMPTNESS IN RETURNING ASSIGNMENTS	POOR	0	0	0	4	5	5	EXCELLENT	4.071	0.829
13. QUALITY OF FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS	POOR	0	0	0	4	5	4	EXCELLENT	4.000	0.816
14. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE OF CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	0	6	8	EXCELLENT	4.571	0.514
15. OVERALL RATING OF INSTRUCTOR	POOR	0	0	0	2	6	6	EXCELLENT	4.286	0.726

III. SECTION C: TF/TA EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
16. PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	13	0	0	1	0	0	EXCELLENT	3.000	N/A
17. COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	13	0	0	1	0	0	EXCELLENT	3.000	N/A
18. ABILITY TO CONVEY FACTS AND EXPLAIN KEY CONCEPTS IN A DIGESTIBLE MANNER	POOR	13	0	0	1	0	0	EXCELLENT	3.000	N/A
19. ENTHUSIASM FOR THE SUBJECT AND ABILITY TO STIMULATE STUDENT INTEREST	POOR	13	0	0	0	1	0	EXCELLENT	4.000	N/A
20. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE CLASS TIME	POOR	13	0	0	1	0	0	EXCELLENT	3.000	N/A
21. QUALITY OF EVALUATION OF WORK	POOR	13	0	0	1	0	0	EXCELLENT	3.000	N/A
22. PROMPTNESS OF RETURN OF GRADED ASSIGNMENTS AND COMMUNICATION OF STANDING IN CLASS	POOR	12	0	0	1	1	0	EXCELLENT	3.500	0.707

IV. SECTION D: OTHER

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
23. CLARITY AND ACHIEVEMENT OF COURSE OBJECTIVES	POOR	0	0	0	5	3	6	EXCELLENT	4.071	0.917
24. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE USE OF CLASS TIME	POOR	0	0	0	5	4	5	EXCELLENT	4.000	0.877
25. VALUE OF COURSE TOWARD DEVELOPMENT OF INTELLECTUAL SKILLS (CRITICAL ANALYSIS, WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATION, RESEARCH)	POOR	0	1	0	4	4	5	EXCELLENT	3.857	1.167
26. LEVEL OF INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION OF THE COURSE	POOR	0	2	0	7	2	3	EXCELLENT	3.286	1.267
27. VALUE OF LAB/DISCUSSION AS A SUPPLEMENT TO THE LECTURE/READING	POOR	11	0	0	1	2	0	EXCELLENT	3.667	0.577
28. PROFESSOR'S PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	1	6	7	EXCELLENT	4.429	0.646
29. PROFESSOR'S COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	2	4	8	EXCELLENT	4.429	0.756
30. PROFESSOR'S ENTHUSIASM FOR SUBJECT OF THE COURSE	POOR	1	0	0	3	3	7	EXCELLENT	4.308	0.855
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	4	1	7	2	0	0	EXCELLENT	2.100	0.568
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	2	9	2	1	0	EXCELLENT	2.143	0.770
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	7	7	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.519

PROFESSOR Paul Withers
NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 14
NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 14
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	21	36	43	EXCELLENT	4.214	0.802
2. DIFFICULTY OF COURSE [(1) EASY TO (5) DIFFICULT]	POOR	0	14	50	29	7	0	EXCELLENT	2.286	0.825
3. WORKLOAD IN COURSE [(1) LIGHT TO (5) HEAVY]	POOR	0	7	7	64	14	7	EXCELLENT	3.071	0.917
4. OVERALL RATING OF DISCUSSION INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	50	0	0	14	14	21	EXCELLENT	4.143	0.900
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	7	21	50	21	EXCELLENT	3.857	0.864
7. OVERALL COURSE RATING	POOR	0	0	7	43	14	36	EXCELLENT	3.786	1.051

II. SECTION B: FACULTY EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
8. EFFECTIVENESS IN EXPLAINING CONCEPTS	POOR	0	0	0	7	50	43	EXCELLENT	4.357	0.633
9. ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST IN SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	43	21	36	EXCELLENT	3.929	0.917
10. ENCOURAGEMENT OF CLASS PARTICIPATION	POOR	0	0	0	0	21	79	EXCELLENT	4.786	0.426
11. FAIRNESS IN GRADING	POOR	0	0	0	14	14	71	EXCELLENT	4.571	0.756
12. PROMPTNESS IN RETURNING ASSIGNMENTS	POOR	0	0	0	29	36	36	EXCELLENT	4.071	0.829
13. QUALITY OF FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS	POOR	0	0	0	29	36	29	EXCELLENT	4.000	0.816
14. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE OF CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	0	43	57	EXCELLENT	4.571	0.514
15. OVERALL RATING OF INSTRUCTOR	POOR	0	0	0	14	43	43	EXCELLENT	4.286	0.726

III. SECTION C: TF/TA EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
16. PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	93	0	0	7	0	0	EXCELLENT	3.000	N/A
17. COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	93	0	0	7	0	0	EXCELLENT	3.000	N/A
18. ABILITY TO CONVEY FACTS AND EXPLAIN KEY CONCEPTS IN A DIGESTIBLE MANNER	POOR	93	0	0	7	0	0	EXCELLENT	3.000	N/A
19. ENTHUSIASM FOR THE SUBJECT AND ABILITY TO STIMULATE STUDENT INTEREST	POOR	93	0	0	0	7	0	EXCELLENT	4.000	N/A
20. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE CLASS TIME	POOR	93	0	0	7	0	0	EXCELLENT	3.000	N/A
21. QUALITY OF EVALUATION OF WORK	POOR	93	0	0	7	0	0	EXCELLENT	3.000	N/A
22. PROMPTNESS OF RETURN OF GRADED ASSIGNMENTS AND COMMUNICATION OF STANDING IN CLASS	POOR	86	0	0	7	7	0	EXCELLENT	3.500	0.707

IV. SECTION D: OTHER

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
23. CLARITY AND ACHIEVEMENT OF COURSE OBJECTIVES	POOR	0	0	0	36	21	43	EXCELLENT	4.071	0.917
24. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE USE OF CLASS TIME	POOR	0	0	0	36	29	36	EXCELLENT	4.000	0.877
25. VALUE OF COURSE TOWARD DEVELOPMENT OF INTELLECTUAL SKILLS (CRITICAL ANALYSIS, WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATION, RESEARCH)	POOR	0	7	0	29	29	36	EXCELLENT	3.857	1.167
26. LEVEL OF INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION OF THE COURSE	POOR	0	14	0	50	14	21	EXCELLENT	3.286	1.267
27. VALUE OF LAB/DISCUSSION AS A SUPPLEMENT TO THE LECTURE/READING	POOR	79	0	0	7	14	0	EXCELLENT	3.667	0.577
28. PROFESSOR'S PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	7	43	50	EXCELLENT	4.429	0.646
29. PROFESSOR'S COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	14	29	57	EXCELLENT	4.429	0.756
30. PROFESSOR'S ENTHUSIASM FOR SUBJECT OF THE COURSE	POOR	7	0	0	21	21	50	EXCELLENT	4.308	0.855
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	29	7	50	14	0	0	EXCELLENT	2.100	0.568
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	14	64	14	7	0	EXCELLENT	2.143	0.770
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	50	50	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.519

AS802 A1
Withers

<div align="center">

Spring 2011
Course Evaluation Comments

</div>

Course: AS802 A1, Research and Scholarship
Instructor: Withers

1. What were the most positive aspects of the course?
- Great class, we had lots of good discussions.
- The discussions.
- Bringing in outside profs who share their expertise and opinions was nice, especially since many of us don't have much interaction with them otherwise.
- Taught about what to expect for grad. school.
- Every topic was extremely relevant and provided useful information.
- Learning latex and knowing about writing a proposal as well as about job prospects in Astronomy.
- A broad discussion of relevant topics to graduate research.
- It was nice to have other faculty/ members of the department come in to class to give different perspectives.
- Bringing in many different faculty members allowed the class to get a wide range of views in the various topics.
- Good readings, opportunity to hear what opinions or classmates had about grad school, writing, etc.
- The content f the course.

2. What, if any, changes would you recommend for the next offering of the course? Be as specific as possible.
- Do research proposal earlier in semester!
- I wish at least the proposal-writing section had been available to me in my 1st semester.
- The rules given out for writing a proposal as many of us have not been involved in active research.
- Teach in the fall if possible and have research proposals a <u>major</u> component of the course so new students can apply for funding and keep the department from being bogged down.
- Discuss funding proposals <u>before</u> all of the deadlines have passed.
- Assignments (especially the paper and proposal) need to be more structured. Objectives need to be stated at the outset and kept constant.
- Less talking in groups, more lecturing on past experiences from people who have completed grad school.
- Skip small group discussions during class.

3. What, if any, adjustments would you recommend to the instructor's teaching method or style?
- Some of the assignments- review of proposal- not very relevant to us yet.
- None! He's great!
- More structured discussion topics during class would lead to more discussion amongst students.

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

- More instruction, less group discussion.
- None.

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

- Yes.
- Always.
- Useful but sparse.
- Comments on assignments were brief, but sufficient.
- Yes, his feedback helped improve various documents (example, CV).

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

- Frequency was fine.
- Most weeks there were no assignments but when we had them they took a lot of time.
- Some of the assignments were too long and read a lot of research to be done.
- Frequency low but ok.. some assignments seemed incredibly daunting with little real preparation.
- Don't save the biggest assignment for the end of the semester.
- Due to the nature of the course, some assignments will be more time-consuming than others. Professor Wither struck a good balance.
- The frequency was fair; length of assignments was fair.

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

- The text- not so helpful. Some outside things- yes.
- The text was well written and insightful.
- The textbook was not necessary.

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?

- Many schmoozing, writing, being a scientist.
- Latex!
- Too many to list. Every topic brought information that will be invaluable in my future.
- How to write a proposal, using Latex (basic features).
- Learned how to be a better grad student.

9. General Comments:

- This course doesn't feel very useful. It would be better to just give us the information on funding at the start of the school year.
- Perhaps swap 802/803 with Astro Intro so this could be taught in the fall.
- Help us write real research proposals so we an help you do research!!
- Good professor.

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