GRS SPRING-2014 AS802 A1 Research & Scholarship

PROFESSOR Paul Withers
NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 5
NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 5
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	2	2	1	0	0	EXCELLENT	1.800	0.837
3. WORKLOAD IN COURSE [(1) LIGHT TO (5) HEAVY]	POOR	0	1	3	1	0	0	EXCELLENT	2.000	0.707
4. OVERALL RATING OF DISCUSSION INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	2	0	0	0	0	3	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
5. OVERALL RATING OF LAB INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	5	0	0	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	N/A	N/A
6. USEFULNESS OF ASSIGNMENTS AND PAPERS	POOR	1	0	0	0	1	3	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500
7. OVERALL COURSE RATING	POOR	0	0	0	0	0	5	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000

II. SECTION B: FACULTY EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
8. EFFECTIVENESS IN EXPLAINING CONCEPTS	POOR	0	0	0	0	0	5	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
9. ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST IN SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	0	0	5	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
10. ENCOURAGEMENT OF CLASS PARTICIPATION	POOR	0	0	0	0	0	5	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
11. FAIRNESS IN GRADING	POOR	0	0	0	2	1	2	EXCELLENT	4.000	1.000
12. PROMPTNESS IN RETURNING ASSIGNMENTS	POOR	0	0	0	0	0	5	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
13. QUALITY OF FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS	POOR	0	0	0	0	0	5	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
14. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE OF CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	0	0	5	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
15. OVERALL RATING OF INSTRUCTOR	POOR	0	0	0	0	0	5	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000

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	1	EXCELLENT	5.000	N/A
17. COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	4	0	0	0	0	1	EXCELLENT	5.000	N/A
18. ABILITY TO CONVEY FACTS AND EXPLAIN KEY CONCEPTS IN A DIGESTIBLE MANNER	POOR	4	0	0	0	0	1	EXCELLENT	5.000	N/A
19. ENTHUSIASM FOR THE SUBJECT AND ABILITY TO STIMULATE STUDENT INTEREST	POOR	5	0	0	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	N/A	N/A
20. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE CLASS TIME	POOR	5	0	0	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	N/A	N/A
21. QUALITY OF EVALUATION OF WORK	POOR	5	0	0	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	N/A	N/A
22. PROMPTNESS OF RETURN OF GRADED ASSIGNMENTS AND COMMUNICATION OF STANDING IN CLASS	POOR	5	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	0	5	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
24. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE USE OF CLASS TIME	POOR	0	0	0	0	1	4	EXCELLENT	4.800	0.447
25. VALUE OF COURSE TOWARD DEVELOPMENT OF INTELLECTUAL SKILLS (CRITICAL ANALYSIS, WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATION, RESEARCH)	POOR	1	0	0	0	1	3	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500
26. LEVEL OF INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION OF THE COURSE	POOR	1	0	0	1	1	2	EXCELLENT	4.250	0.957
27. VALUE OF LAB/DISCUSSION AS A SUPPLEMENT TO THE LECTURE/READING	POOR	5	0	0	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	N/A	N/A
28. PROFESSOR'S PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	0	0	5	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
29. PROFESSOR'S COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	0	0	5	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
30. PROFESSOR'S ENTHUSIASM FOR SUBJECT OF THE COURSE	POOR	0	0	0	0	2	2	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.577
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	1	2	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	1.667	0.577
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	5	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	0	0	0	0	0	5	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000

PROFESSOR Paul Withers
NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 5
NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 5
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	80	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
2. DIFFICULTY OF COURSE [(1) EASY TO (5) DIFFICULT]	POOR	0	40	40	20	0	0	EXCELLENT	1.800	0.837
3. WORKLOAD IN COURSE [(1) LIGHT TO (5) HEAVY]	POOR	0	20	60	20	0	0	EXCELLENT	2.000	0.707
4. OVERALL RATING OF DISCUSSION INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	40	0	0	0	0	60	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
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	20	0	0	0	20	60	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500
7. OVERALL COURSE RATING	POOR	0	0	0	0	0	100	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000

II. SECTION B: FACULTY EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
8. EFFECTIVENESS IN EXPLAINING CONCEPTS	POOR	0	0	0	0	0	100	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
9. ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST IN SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	0	0	100	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
10. ENCOURAGEMENT OF CLASS PARTICIPATION	POOR	0	0	0	0	0	100	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
11. FAIRNESS IN GRADING	POOR	0	0	0	40	20	40	EXCELLENT	4.000	1.000
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	0	0	100	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
14. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE OF CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	0	0	100	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
15. OVERALL RATING OF INSTRUCTOR	POOR	0	0	0	0	0	100	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000

III. SECTION C: TF/TA EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
16. PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	80	0	0	0	0	20	EXCELLENT	5.000	N/A
17. COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	80	0	0	0	0	20	EXCELLENT	5.000	N/A
18. ABILITY TO CONVEY FACTS AND EXPLAIN KEY CONCEPTS IN A DIGESTIBLE MANNER	POOR	80	0	0	0	0	20	EXCELLENT	5.000	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	0	100	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
24. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE USE OF CLASS TIME	POOR	0	0	0	0	20	80	EXCELLENT	4.800	0.447
25. VALUE OF COURSE TOWARD DEVELOPMENT OF INTELLECTUAL SKILLS (CRITICAL ANALYSIS, WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATION, RESEARCH)	POOR	20	0	0	0	20	60	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500
26. LEVEL OF INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION OF THE COURSE	POOR	20	0	0	20	20	40	EXCELLENT	4.250	0.957
27. VALUE OF LAB/DISCUSSION AS A SUPPLEMENT TO THE LECTURE/READING	POOR	100	0	0	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	N/A	N/A
28. PROFESSOR'S PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	0	0	100	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
29. PROFESSOR'S COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	0	0	100	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
30. PROFESSOR'S ENTHUSIASM FOR SUBJECT OF THE COURSE	POOR	0	0	0	0	40	40	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.577
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	40	20	40	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	1.667	0.577
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	100	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	0	0	0	0	0	100	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000

AS 802 A1
Withers

Spring 2014
Course Evaluation Comments

Course: AS 802 A1, Research and Scholarship
Instructor: Paul Withers

1. What were the most positive aspects of the course?
* Don't have to sit through University RCR courses now.
* Incentive to create website + CV. Feedback on website + CV
* It was a good learning experience
* Open group discussions of case studies
* It was a refreshing change of pace. I liked discussions. It was nice to just talk. I liked making a website. The NESSF application was good practice.

2. What, if any, changes would you recommend for the next offering of the course? Be as specific as possible.
* More time and planning for NESSF. Tell us what you're going to use in grading the web page beforehand.
* Get a better feel for the students' past experience before assigning projects. (e.g. we all had CV's + LaTeX experience) Make those assignments more complicated or harder
* More physics case studies. Do the CV before the NESSF
* Be more explicit about the requirements for assignments.

3. What, if any, adjustments would you recommend to the instructor's teaching method or style?
* Be more explicit about what they are looking for.
* None, keep the open discussion.
* I liked the discussions and talks. Prof. Withers was great.

4. Comment on the feedback you received from the instructor of the course. Was it useful?
* Yes, it was good and useful.
* Helpful feedback
* Brief, but helpful
* His comments on assignments were useful. He was very honest and told us how to improve.

5. Comment on the frequency and length of assignments, exams, and lab reports.
* Just the right amount of work for such a class
* NESSF was a bit too much in a short amount of time. Everything else was fine.
* There were a good number of assignments. I liked the NESSF, the website, the CV, and laTeX assignment.
* Good.

6. Comment on the selection and amount of reading. Which readings were the most and which were the least valuable? Why?
* Of course everything was relevant
* Case studies were great

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

AS 802 A1
Withers

- The case studies were nice. More Physics ones and less Bio ones would be good.
- The case studies were not always applicable. Use APA (?) not USA BioMed (?)

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?

- RCR
- I gained skills in research and grant writting
- I have a better understanding of research ethics.
- I am now completely + utterly ethical in practically every way.

9. General Comments:

- I can now use bibtex!
- I really liked this course.
- Please be careful regarding NESSF proposals. We understanding that the mess-up was not your intention, but it was a big blow to morale.

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