

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	3	0	0	0	0	2	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
2. DIFFICULTY OF COURSE [(1) EASY TO (5) DIFFICULT]	POOR	0	1	2	2	0	0	EXCELLENT	2.200	0.837
3. WORKLOAD IN COURSE [(1) LIGHT TO (5) HEAVY]	POOR	1	1	0	3	0	0	EXCELLENT	2.500	1.000
4. OVERALL RATING OF DISCUSSION INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	4	0	0	0	1	0	EXCELLENT	4.000	N/A
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	0	0	0	2	1	2	EXCELLENT	4.000	1.000
7. OVERALL COURSE RATING	POOR	0	0	0	1	3	1	EXCELLENT	4.000	0.707

II. SECTION B: FACULTY EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
8. EFFECTIVENESS IN EXPLAINING CONCEPTS	POOR	0	0	0	0	1	4	EXCELLENT	4.800	0.447
9. ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST IN SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	1	1	3	EXCELLENT	4.400	0.894
10. ENCOURAGEMENT OF CLASS PARTICIPATION	POOR	0	0	0	0	1	4	EXCELLENT	4.800	0.447
11. FAIRNESS IN GRADING	POOR	0	1	0	2	2	0	EXCELLENT	3.000	1.225
12. PROMPTNESS IN RETURNING ASSIGNMENTS	POOR	0	0	0	0	1	4	EXCELLENT	4.800	0.447
13. QUALITY OF FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS	POOR	0	0	0	0	3	2	EXCELLENT	4.400	0.548
14. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE OF CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	0	1	3	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500
15. OVERALL RATING OF INSTRUCTOR	POOR	1	0	0	1	2	1	EXCELLENT	4.000	0.816

III. SECTION C: TF/TA EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
16. PREPARATION FOR CLASS	POOR	5	0	0	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	N/A	N/A
17. COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	5	0	0	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	N/A	N/A
18. ABILITY TO CONVEY FACTS AND EXPLAIN KEY CONCEPTS IN A DIGESTIBLE MANNER	POOR	5	0	0	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	N/A	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	2	3	EXCELLENT	4.600	0.548
24. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE USE OF CLASS TIME	POOR	0	0	0	1	2	2	EXCELLENT	4.200	0.837
25. VALUE OF COURSE TOWARD DEVELOPMENT OF INTELLECTUAL SKILLS (CRITICAL ANALYSIS, WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATION, RESEARCH)	POOR	0	0	1	2	1	1	EXCELLENT	3.400	1.140
26. LEVEL OF INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION OF THE COURSE	POOR	0	0	0	4	0	1	EXCELLENT	3.400	0.894
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	1	0	0	0	1	3	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500
29. PROFESSOR'S COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	1	0	0	0	2	2	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.577
30. PROFESSOR'S ENTHUSIASM FOR SUBJECT OF THE COURSE	POOR	1	0	0	1	1	2	EXCELLENT	4.250	0.957
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	0	1	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	2.000	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	2	0	2	0	1	0	EXCELLENT	2.667	1.155
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	0	4	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	60	0	0	0	0	40	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000
2. DIFFICULTY OF COURSE [(1) EASY TO (5) DIFFICULT]	POOR	0	20	40	40	0	0	EXCELLENT	2.200	0.837
3. WORKLOAD IN COURSE [(1) LIGHT TO (5) HEAVY]	POOR	20	20	0	60	0	0	EXCELLENT	2.500	1.000
4. OVERALL RATING OF DISCUSSION INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	80	0	0	0	20	0	EXCELLENT	4.000	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	40	20	40	EXCELLENT	4.000	1.000
7. OVERALL COURSE RATING	POOR	0	0	0	20	60	20	EXCELLENT	4.000	0.707

II. SECTION B: FACULTY EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
8. EFFECTIVENESS IN EXPLAINING CONCEPTS	POOR	0	0	0	0	20	80	EXCELLENT	4.800	0.447
9. ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST IN SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	20	20	60	EXCELLENT	4.400	0.894
10. ENCOURAGEMENT OF CLASS PARTICIPATION	POOR	0	0	0	0	20	80	EXCELLENT	4.800	0.447
11. FAIRNESS IN GRADING	POOR	0	20	0	40	40	0	EXCELLENT	3.000	1.225
12. PROMPTNESS IN RETURNING ASSIGNMENTS	POOR	0	0	0	0	20	80	EXCELLENT	4.800	0.447
13. QUALITY OF FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS	POOR	0	0	0	0	60	40	EXCELLENT	4.400	0.548
14. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE OF CLASS	POOR	0	0	0	0	20	60	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500
15. OVERALL RATING OF INSTRUCTOR	POOR	20	0	0	20	40	20	EXCELLENT	4.000	0.816

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	40	60	EXCELLENT	4.600	0.548
24. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE USE OF CLASS TIME	POOR	0	0	0	20	40	40	EXCELLENT	4.200	0.837
25. VALUE OF COURSE TOWARD DEVELOPMENT OF INTELLECTUAL SKILLS (CRITICAL ANALYSIS, WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATION, RESEARCH)	POOR	0	0	20	40	20	20	EXCELLENT	3.400	1.140
26. LEVEL OF INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION OF THE COURSE	POOR	0	0	0	80	0	20	EXCELLENT	3.400	0.894
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	20	0	0	0	20	60	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.500
29. PROFESSOR'S COMMAND OF THE SUBJECT	POOR	20	0	0	0	40	40	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.577
30. PROFESSOR'S ENTHUSIASM FOR SUBJECT OF THE COURSE	POOR	20	0	0	20	20	40	EXCELLENT	4.250	0.957
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	80	0	20	0	0	0	EXCELLENT	2.000	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	40	0	40	0	20	0	EXCELLENT	2.667	1.155
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	20	0	0	0	0	80	EXCELLENT	5.000	0.000

**Spring 2014
Course Evaluation Comments**

Course: AS 803 A1, Research Methods

Instructor: Paul Withers

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

- The discussion of the more difficult topics (fitting, ODE's, etc.)
- I learned a few more things in IDL I didn't know before
- I learned how to code in IDL.
- I was introduced to some handy numerical methods I was not aware of.
- I learned a lot of IDL and feel way more comfortable doing coding.

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

- Get a feel for our skill set immediately & skip any unnecessary material. Also, let the students present something code-related that they have used.
- Teach some Python. Make it more about learning useful languages than about how to program mathematical concepts.
- Offer different languages. Less time on general programming
- Maybe more Astronomical image processing. More .fits file assignments.

3. What, if any, adjustments would you recommend to the instructor's teaching method or style?

- Maybe could walk through parts of the daily assignments together? Sometimes I lost focus while working alone.
- None.
- I would recommend being more explicit about what was required from the assignments.
- None.
- I liked Prof. Withers laid back style.

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

- Usually helpful.
- Great feedback.
- I was happy with the feedback.
- Yes, Prof. Withers was very helpful with teaching me code and how to fix my syntax errors.

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

- Fine. Minimal work was good for this class.
- Good amount for course level
- Assignments were reasonable
- There was a good amount of assignments. I thought they were all helpful.

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

- The IDL book is ok. Exelis's website is better

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

AS 803 A1

Withers

- See separate TA/TF comments if applicable.

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

- I know more technical IDL and how to work w/ others who use IDL.
- I know how to code in IDL.
- I now can code in IDL

9. General Comments:

- Maybe include a section or single class of Python! 😊
- It seemed that some homeworks you judged and graded us on requirements we didn't know we had to fulfill. Be more explicit about what you will be looking for in your assignments.