

eEvaluate Report - Fall 2010

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2414-015

Section Title: Disc-PHYS 2414-001

Instructor: Carolyn Bertsche

Total Enrollment: 32

Course Level: Lower 0000 - 2000

Section Size: Medium 26-59

Question	Level	Mean Response	Median Response	Standard Deviation	ZScore	Responses	Percent #1	Percent #2	Percent #3	Percent #4	Percent #5	Dept Rank	College Rank
1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	INDIVIDUAL	3.60000	4	0.63246		15	0.00	0.00	46.67	46.67	6.67	51.22	50.56
	DEPARTMENT	3.42398	3	1.07074		684	5.99	10.53	35.09	31.87	16.52		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.49653	4	1.11334	-0.09	7,057	6.39	9.85	31.93	31.39	20.45		
	COLLEGE	3.74594	4	1.05235	0.14	33,712	3.92	7.27	25.95	36.00	26.85		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	3.93333	4	0.79881		15	0.00	6.67	13.33	60.00	20.00	58.54	57.87
	DEPARTMENT	3.68413	4	1.17087		687	5.24	12.08	21.54	31.30	29.84		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.73566	4	1.19596	-0.17	7,044	5.64	10.42	23.14	26.35	34.45		
	COLLEGE	3.99115	4	1.11189	0.05	33,659	3.47	7.69	18.35	27.21	43.27		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.40000	5	0.73679		15	0.00	0.00	13.33	33.33	53.33	78.05	82.02
	DEPARTMENT	3.77386	4	1.17020		681	4.99	9.40	24.08	26.28	35.24		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.86090	4	1.13334	-0.48	7,038	4.28	7.94	22.65	27.68	37.45		
	COLLEGE	3.94200	4	1.12187	-0.41	33,637	3.74	7.61	20.70	26.59	41.35		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	3.73333	4	0.79881		15	0.00	6.67	26.67	53.33	13.33	65.85	57.02
	DEPARTMENT	3.44396	4	1.16659		687	7.13	12.81	29.99	28.68	21.40		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.53599	4	1.20619	-0.16	7,030	6.77	12.33	29.08	24.17	27.65		
	COLLEGE	3.78772	4	1.14111	0.05	33,593	4.30	9.30	24.27	27.59	34.54		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	3.46667	4	1.06010		15	0.00	26.67	13.33	46.67	13.33	65.85	50.84
	DEPARTMENT	3.20354	3	1.25124		678	11.50	16.52	31.12	21.83	19.03		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.38095	3	1.31701	-0.07	7,014	11.41	14.00	26.39	21.50	26.70		
	COLLEGE	3.66169	4	1.26105	0.15	33,614	7.84	10.78	22.74	24.62	34.01		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	3.86667	4	0.99043		15	0.00	13.33	13.33	46.67	26.67	68.29	63.20
	DEPARTMENT	3.47275	4	1.21158		679	7.81	13.25	26.95	27.84	24.15		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.51240	4	1.26177	-0.28	7,018	8.54	13.35	24.59	25.38	28.14		
	COLLEGE	3.75565	4	1.21157	-0.09	33,583	6.16	10.28	20.81	27.34	35.41		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	3.80000	4	1.01419		15	0.00	13.33	20.00	40.00	26.67	51.22	49.72
	DEPARTMENT	3.61347	4	1.18269		683	6.73	9.81	26.79	28.70	27.96		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.70044	4	1.17295	-0.08	7,027	5.37	10.36	24.98	27.47	31.83		
	COLLEGE	3.86004	4	1.13740	0.05	33,660	4.07	8.76	21.95	27.54	37.69		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	3.33333	3	0.72375		15	0.00	6.67	60.00	26.67	6.67	46.34	32.69
	DEPARTMENT	3.30859	3	1.00333		687	5.24	11.94	41.48	29.40	11.94		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.52478	4	1.02517	0.19	5,972	4.07	9.28	35.35	32.72	18.59		
	COLLEGE	3.69760	4	1.00060	0.36	32,285	3.01	7.44	29.39	37.12	23.05		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.26667	3	0.70373		15	0.00	6.67	66.67	20.00	6.67	65.85	52.43
	DEPARTMENT	3.16204	3	0.76186		685	2.04	9.20	66.13	15.77	6.86		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.30454	3	0.81995	0.05	5,973	1.74	7.38	59.97	20.49	10.41		
	COLLEGE	3.42941	3	0.83424	0.20	32,312	1.26	5.69	55.01	24.96	13.09		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	3.20000	3	0.67612		15	0.00	6.67	73.33	13.33	6.67	56.10	40.45
	DEPARTMENT	3.11241	3	0.98997		685	6.42	15.33	48.18	20.73	9.34		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.35448	3	1.04212	0.15	5,958	4.45	13.51	40.18	25.86	16.00		
	COLLEGE	3.49871	3	1.04120	0.29	32,259	3.48	11.73	35.75	29.51	19.53		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	3.20000	3	0.67612		15	0.00	6.67	73.33	13.33	6.67	34.15	31.72
	DEPARTMENT	3.27485	3	1.15955		684	7.75	17.11	31.87	26.46	16.81		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.50872	4	1.18170	0.26	5,962	6.54	12.75	28.95	26.82	24.94		
	COLLEGE	3.67761	4	1.14144	0.42	32,265	4.88	10.40	26.02	29.51	29.20		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	4.40000	5	0.73679		15	0.00	0.00	13.33	33.33	53.33	34.15	45.31
	DEPARTMENT	4.39124	5	0.84045		685	0.73	2.92	10.22	28.76	57.37		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.39245	5	0.88137	-0.01	5,960	1.29	3.46	8.79	27.63	58.83		
	COLLEGE	4.43801	5	0.84231	0.05	32,216	1.03	2.96	8.14	26.95	60.93		

eEvaluate Report - Fall 2010

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2414-015

Section Title: Disc-PHYS 2414-001

Instructor: Carolyn Bertsche

Total Enrollment: 32

Course Level: Lower 0000 - 2000

Section Size: Medium 26-59

Question

1. What were the strong points of the course?
2. What were the weak points of the course?
3. What should the instructor do to improve their teaching?
4. What is your overall opinion of this course?

Comment

1. It was fun! That's really it, I mean, it is physics, and it's for non-majors. And we just worked group problems every day. But that helped a lot, so I would say that's a strong point. Yay!
 2. It wasn't the case in my group (because it didn't bother me), but non-contributing members can really wreck a group. Especially if all of those members stayed up the entire previous night studying for their o-chem tests. Then they were worthless in solving problems. Also, the people who input grades. I know Callie didn't input the grades, this isn't a mark against her, but the people who DID input grades really suck. Our group made numerous 10/10s, and consistently, they would input that I made a 7.5, 8.5, or 9.5. Seriously, not even close to the 1 and the 0. Not sure if they just pick random numbers or what, but it's annoying to constantly have to ask that my grade be updated to reflect our ACTUAL score and not some arbitrary number pulled from the ether.
 3. Try not to send such patronizing emails? Yes, it gets extremely old when students ask the same questions over and over. It's a fact of life, though, that some college students will go through their 4-7 years in a haze, never check email, etc. Not all of us are like that, though.
 4. It was fun! My group was actually a pretty cool bunch, and Callie was always fun in class!
1. The TAs' office hours were very helpful. Callie was always really enthusiastic about the subject which helped keep me interested longer.
 2. I don't like physics..
 3. ???
 4. Well I don't like physics so I was not a fan of the course.
1. Callie was very willing to help, this was very much appreciated
 2. none
 3. none
 4. Callie was a very good discussion leader
1. Carolyn Bertsche was a great TA!! this course helped break up concepts to better understand them!
 - 2.
 - 3.
 - 4.
1. Working in groups and having a problem which reinforced the lecture material
 2. The TA could have been more helpful to students during the actual discussion
 3. Be more helpful to students during the group problem
 4. I hated physics, but I feel that there were plenty of options to bring the grade back up
1. A discussion section is particularly useful because it requires you to actually do the work (as opposed to finding homework answers online).
 2. The ability of each person in every group varied, so I felt like at some points the weaker students were left behind.
 3. Some of the problems were a little difficult to accomplish in the time allotted, and usually were not allowed to be turned in late. This made time a big factor in finishing, resulting in often sloppy or rushed work. Perhaps allowing the assignment to be turned in later or easier problems to accomplish in the time would really help.
 4. I really like this course, it helped me understand concepts I was unsure about in lecture. Also, I really like working with other people; I made some new friends.
1. Mini lectures were good. She explained things very well.
 2. There wasn't a way to make group members contribute equally.
 3. Callie rocks.
 4. CALLIE WAS THE BEST TA I HAVE EVER HAD!

eEvaluate Report - Fall 2010

1. The problem sets were very well designed, giving you a step-by-step way of looking at the problem.
2. Although I don't like admitting it, I relied too heavily on other partners in my group to help figure out the questions.
3. Callie did a great job of instructing. However, she does have an admittedly amusing tendency to become somewhat condescending and sarcastic while still sounding cheerful.
4. Great.

1. It helped to work in groups.
2. The grading was a little tough. Tiny points were taken off and seemed a nit-picky.
3. It would help if the grader wasn't so specific.
4. It was a good course. Grading was tough at points.

1. We wooked with fellow students.
2. We kept the same groups the entire semester. I would have liked to interact with different poeple in the class, and feed off of different minds.
3. Teaching is already pretty good.
4. I liked it.

eEvaluate Report - Fall 2010

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2414-016

Section Title: Disc-PHYS 2414-001

Instructor: Carolyn Bertsche

Total Enrollment: 31

Course Level: Lower 0000 - 2000

Section Size: Medium 26-59

Question	Level	Mean Response	Median Response	Standard Deviation	ZScore	Responses	Percent #1	Percent #2	Percent #3	Percent #4	Percent #5	Dept Rank	College Rank
1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	INDIVIDUAL	3.53846	3	1.05003		13	0.00	15.38	38.46	23.08	23.08	48.78	46.63
	DEPARTMENT	3.42398	3	1.07074		684	5.99	10.53	35.09	31.87	16.52		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.49653	4	1.11334	-0.04	7,057	6.39	9.85	31.93	31.39	20.45		
	COLLEGE	3.74594	4	1.05235	0.20	33,712	3.92	7.27	25.95	36.00	26.85		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	3.76923	4	1.09193		13	0.00	15.38	23.08	30.77	30.77	43.90	45.23
	DEPARTMENT	3.68413	4	1.17087		687	5.24	12.08	21.54	31.30	29.84		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.73566	4	1.19596	-0.03	7,044	5.64	10.42	23.14	26.35	34.45		
	COLLEGE	3.99115	4	1.11189	0.20	33,659	3.47	7.69	18.35	27.21	43.27		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.15385	4	0.89872		13	0.00	7.69	7.69	46.15	38.46	65.85	67.14
	DEPARTMENT	3.77386	4	1.17020		681	4.99	9.40	24.08	26.28	35.24		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.86090	4	1.13334	-0.26	7,038	4.28	7.94	22.65	27.68	37.45		
	COLLEGE	3.94200	4	1.12187	-0.19	33,637	3.74	7.61	20.70	26.59	41.35		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	3.76923	4	1.16575		13	7.69	7.69	7.69	53.85	23.08	68.29	62.08
	DEPARTMENT	3.44396	4	1.16659		687	7.13	12.81	29.99	28.68	21.40		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.53599	4	1.20619	-0.19	7,030	6.77	12.33	29.08	24.17	27.65		
	COLLEGE	3.78772	4	1.14111	0.02	33,593	4.30	9.30	24.27	27.59	34.54		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	3.46154	4	1.39137		13	7.69	23.08	15.38	23.08	30.77	63.42	50.56
	DEPARTMENT	3.20354	3	1.25124		678	11.50	16.52	31.12	21.83	19.03		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.38095	3	1.31701	-0.06	7,014	11.41	14.00	26.39	21.50	26.70		
	COLLEGE	3.66169	4	1.26105	0.16	33,614	7.84	10.78	22.74	24.62	34.01		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	3.84615	4	1.06819		13	0.00	15.38	15.38	38.46	30.77	65.85	61.52
	DEPARTMENT	3.47275	4	1.21158		679	7.81	13.25	26.95	27.84	24.15		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.51240	4	1.26177	-0.26	7,018	8.54	13.35	24.59	25.38	28.14		
	COLLEGE	3.75565	4	1.21157	-0.07	33,583	6.16	10.28	20.81	27.34	35.41		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.15385	4	0.89872		13	0.00	7.69	7.69	46.15	38.46	73.17	74.16
	DEPARTMENT	3.61347	4	1.18269		683	6.73	9.81	26.79	28.70	27.96		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.70044	4	1.17295	-0.39	7,027	5.37	10.36	24.98	27.47	31.83		
	COLLEGE	3.86004	4	1.13740	-0.26	33,660	4.07	8.76	21.95	27.54	37.69		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	3.61538	4	1.12090		13	0.00	23.08	15.38	38.46	23.08	70.73	56.96
	DEPARTMENT	3.30859	3	1.00333		687	5.24	11.94	41.48	29.40	11.94		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.52478	4	1.02517	-0.09	5,972	4.07	9.28	35.35	32.72	18.59		
	COLLEGE	3.69760	4	1.00060	0.08	32,285	3.01	7.44	29.39	37.12	23.05		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.23077	3	0.83205		13	7.69	0.00	53.85	38.46	0.00	53.66	46.93
	DEPARTMENT	3.16204	3	0.76186		685	2.04	9.20	66.13	15.77	6.86		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.30454	3	0.81995	0.09	5,973	1.74	7.38	59.97	20.49	10.41		
	COLLEGE	3.42941	3	0.83424	0.24	32,312	1.26	5.69	55.01	24.96	13.09		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	3.53846	3	0.87706		13	0.00	7.69	46.15	30.77	15.38	90.24	70.23
	DEPARTMENT	3.11241	3	0.98997		685	6.42	15.33	48.18	20.73	9.34		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.35448	3	1.04212	-0.18	5,958	4.45	13.51	40.18	25.86	16.00		
	COLLEGE	3.49871	3	1.04120	-0.04	32,259	3.48	11.73	35.75	29.51	19.53		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	3.84615	4	0.98710		13	0.00	7.69	30.77	30.77	30.77	87.81	71.52
	DEPARTMENT	3.27485	3	1.15955		684	7.75	17.11	31.87	26.46	16.81		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.50872	4	1.18170	-0.29	5,962	6.54	12.75	28.95	26.82	24.94		
	COLLEGE	3.67761	4	1.14144	-0.15	32,265	4.88	10.40	26.02	29.51	29.20		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	4.69231	5	0.63043		13	0.00	0.00	7.69	15.38	76.92	75.61	74.76
	DEPARTMENT	4.39124	5	0.84045		685	0.73	2.92	10.22	28.76	57.37		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.39245	5	0.88137	-0.34	5,960	1.29	3.46	8.79	27.63	58.83		
	COLLEGE	4.43801	5	0.84231	-0.30	32,216	1.03	2.96	8.14	26.95	60.93		

eEvaluate Report - Fall 2010

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2414-016

Section Title: Disc-PHYS 2414-001

Instructor: Carolyn Bertsche

Total Enrollment: 31

Course Level: Lower 0000 - 2000

Section Size: Medium 26-59

Question

1. What were the strong points of the course?
2. What were the weak points of the course?
3. What should the instructor do to improve their teaching?
4. What is your overall opinion of this course?

Comment

1. Being able to work through questions step by step
 2. The teacher was somewhat rude when it came to asking her questions and would usually respond with you should be using your book im not here to teach you. News flash honey, yea you are you're supposed to help us and I don't mean hand feed us everything but a little help would have been nice
 3. Teach.
 4. It would have been more beneficial if the teacher was more helpful
1. Being able to do group discussions to comprehend the material better.
 2. there were not any weak points
 3. She was great
 4. It was a great class, I obtained alot of information from the class.
1. Small group work, wonderful instructor.
 2. Ran out of time on assignments occasionally.
 3. Nothing, excellent instruction.
 4. Very good, one of the best GA's I've ever had.
1. I enjoyed working in groups on a problem as it allowed me to better understand the concepts covered in lecture.
 2. Not enough time to complete the problems, I believe a 75 or 80 minute period would be better.
 3. Nothing!
 4. AMAZING
1. The groups that we had were helpful because if I didn't understand what we were doing, then someone in the group could also help me if Callie was busy helping another group. It was good to bring all the member of our group's ideas together.
 2. Sometimes I felt like we didn't have enough time to finish the assignments in class.
 - 3.
 4. It was a helpful hour outside of lecture to try to understand the material better.
1. It helps to better understand physics with group problems.
 2. None.
 3. Nothing, she was very helpful in explaining and answering questions.
 4. It was good to better understand physics concepts.
1. It was extra practice problems.
 2. There was not really much teaching. We were just expected to work through the material with what we learned from our lecture teacher, and the group problems were much more in depth than the examples done in lecture 90% of the time. It could become very frustrating. Also, I found that in many groups, the work was done by one or two students and the others in the group still got credit for the work done.
 3. I don't know if it was the way the course was set up or if it was just the TA but there was really hardly any "teaching" going on in this class. We basically got our assignment and worked with other students, and the teacher was there if there was questions. I would have preferred more instruction from the TA rather than working in groups.
 4. No one enjoys going.

eValuate Report - Fall 2010

1. Many opportunities for points, homework and group work was very effective in giving students extra practice. There were many help sessions to help struggling students.

2. no weak points, just difficult material

3. no advice

4. very well organized course, homework was very relevant and effective, good instructors, but very difficult material

1.

2.

3. Try to more directly answer questions instead of giving students a riddle to solve.

4.

eValue Report - Fall 2010

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2414-019

Section Title: Disc-PHYS 2414-001

Instructor: Carolyn Bertsche

Total Enrollment: 29

Course Level: Lower 0000 - 2000

Section Size: Medium 26-59

Question	Level	Mean Response	Median Response	Standard Deviation	ZScore	Responses	Percent #1	Percent #2	Percent #3	Percent #4	Percent #5	Dept Rank	College Rank
1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	INDIVIDUAL	3.75000	4	0.96531		12	0.00	8.33	33.33	33.33	25.00	68.29	60.67
	DEPARTMENT	3.42398	3	1.07074		684	5.99	10.53	35.09	31.87	16.52		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.49653	4	1.11334	-0.23	7,057	6.39	9.85	31.93	31.39	20.45		
	COLLEGE	3.74594	4	1.05235	-0.00	33,712	3.92	7.27	25.95	36.00	26.85		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	3.91667	4	0.90034		12	0.00	8.33	16.67	50.00	25.00	56.10	56.74
	DEPARTMENT	3.68413	4	1.17087		687	5.24	12.08	21.54	31.30	29.84		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.73566	4	1.19596	-0.15	7,044	5.64	10.42	23.14	26.35	34.45		
	COLLEGE	3.99115	4	1.11189	0.07	33,659	3.47	7.69	18.35	27.21	43.27		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.41667	5	0.79296		12	0.00	0.00	16.67	25.00	58.33	85.37	83.43
	DEPARTMENT	3.77386	4	1.17020		681	4.99	9.40	24.08	26.28	35.24		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.86090	4	1.13334	-0.49	7,038	4.28	7.94	22.65	27.68	37.45		
	COLLEGE	3.94200	4	1.12187	-0.42	33,637	3.74	7.61	20.70	26.59	41.35		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	3.66667	4	0.77850		12	0.00	0.00	50.00	33.33	16.67	58.54	51.41
	DEPARTMENT	3.44396	4	1.16659		687	7.13	12.81	29.99	28.68	21.40		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.53599	4	1.20619	-0.11	7,030	6.77	12.33	29.08	24.17	27.65		
	COLLEGE	3.78772	4	1.14111	0.11	33,593	4.30	9.30	24.27	27.59	34.54		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	3.83333	4	0.93744		12	0.00	8.33	25.00	41.67	25.00	82.93	69.94
	DEPARTMENT	3.20354	3	1.25124		678	11.50	16.52	31.12	21.83	19.03		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.38095	3	1.31701	-0.34	7,014	11.41	14.00	26.39	21.50	26.70		
	COLLEGE	3.66169	4	1.26105	-0.14	33,614	7.84	10.78	22.74	24.62	34.01		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	3.83333	4	1.02986		12	0.00	8.33	33.33	25.00	33.33	63.42	60.67
	DEPARTMENT	3.47275	4	1.21158		679	7.81	13.25	26.95	27.84	24.15		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.51240	4	1.26177	-0.25	7,018	8.54	13.35	24.59	25.38	28.14		
	COLLEGE	3.75565	4	1.21157	-0.06	33,583	6.16	10.28	20.81	27.34	35.41		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.08333	4	0.90034		12	0.00	0.00	33.33	25.00	41.67	68.29	68.82
	DEPARTMENT	3.61347	4	1.18269		683	6.73	9.81	26.79	28.70	27.96		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.70044	4	1.17295	-0.33	7,027	5.37	10.36	24.98	27.47	31.83		
	COLLEGE	3.86004	4	1.13740	-0.20	33,660	4.07	8.76	21.95	27.54	37.69		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	3.58333	3	0.99620		12	0.00	8.33	50.00	16.67	25.00	65.85	54.37
	DEPARTMENT	3.30859	3	1.00333		687	5.24	11.94	41.48	29.40	11.94		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.52478	4	1.02517	-0.06	5,972	4.07	9.28	35.35	32.72	18.59		
	COLLEGE	3.69760	4	1.00060	0.11	32,285	3.01	7.44	29.39	37.12	23.05		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.33333	3	0.65134		12	0.00	0.00	75.00	16.67	8.33	75.61	58.90
	DEPARTMENT	3.16204	3	0.76186		685	2.04	9.20	66.13	15.77	6.86		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.30454	3	0.81995	-0.04	5,973	1.74	7.38	59.97	20.49	10.41		
	COLLEGE	3.42941	3	0.83424	0.12	32,312	1.26	5.69	55.01	24.96	13.09		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	3.50000	3	0.79772		12	0.00	0.00	66.67	16.67	16.67	82.93	65.70
	DEPARTMENT	3.11241	3	0.98997		685	6.42	15.33	48.18	20.73	9.34		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.35448	3	1.04212	-0.14	5,958	4.45	13.51	40.18	25.86	16.00		
	COLLEGE	3.49871	3	1.04120	-0.00	32,259	3.48	11.73	35.75	29.51	19.53		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	3.50000	4	1.24316		12	8.33	8.33	33.33	25.00	25.00	56.10	45.31
	DEPARTMENT	3.27485	3	1.15955		684	7.75	17.11	31.87	26.46	16.81		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.50872	4	1.18170	0.01	5,962	6.54	12.75	28.95	26.82	24.94		
	COLLEGE	3.67761	4	1.14144	0.16	32,265	4.88	10.40	26.02	29.51	29.20		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	3.91667	4	1.16450		12	8.33	0.00	16.67	41.67	33.33	9.76	13.59
	DEPARTMENT	4.39124	5	0.84045		685	0.73	2.92	10.22	28.76	57.37		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.39245	5	0.88137	0.54	5,960	1.29	3.46	8.79	27.63	58.83		
	COLLEGE	4.43801	5	0.84231	0.62	32,216	1.03	2.96	8.14	26.95	60.93		

eEvaluate Report - Fall 2010

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2414-019

Section Title: Disc-PHYS 2414-001

Instructor: Carolyn Bertsche

Total Enrollment: 29

Course Level: Lower 0000 - 2000

Section Size: Medium 26-59

Question

1. What were the strong points of the course?
2. What were the weak points of the course?
3. What should the instructor do to improve their teaching?
4. What is your overall opinion of this course?

Comment

1. This was one of the best discussion sections I have ever been enrolled in as a student. The TA took time to ensure students were on task and working correctly. Independent thinking was encouraged, while still making progress with sometimes difficult material.

2. none.

3. teaching was excellent!

4. I enjoyed the Discussion and learned from it. I was also grateful for the office hours in which the entire class could work as a group. This was a very well managed course!

1. The T.A. was friendly, easy to talk to, and prompt and knowledgeable in answering questions.

2. All assignments were completed with a "get it over with" attitude, no one really wanted to do the assignments and wanted to complete them as soon as possible.

3. Offer background information about the group assignment and how/why it applies to what the students are currently learning in the classroom.

4. I really enjoyed the discussion course because it allowed me to learn physics from the perspectives of my peers and not just the instructors.

1. Callie was very nice and patient when explaining things.

Also, good idea to move office hours into a classroom

2. Sometimes other students were more helpful in office hours because Callie was too busy

3.

4.

1. Sometimes explanations of group problems made perfect sense...

Great in office hours

Was a great mentor to have

2. Sometimes explanations of group problems didn't make sense at all...

3. Switch the groups up, the "leaders" in my group always took over the group problems

4. Had a lot of fun and learned a lot, especially about working in a group with pushy people. Thanks Carolyn for your help!!

1. Working together to figure out the problems. And Callie was the strongest point of this course. She was very patient and understanding when helping us students.

2. The grading was too picky sometimes.

3. The instructor is great and I cannot think of any improvements.

4. It was very helpful to my understanding of physics

1. The assignments were in conjunction to the lectures in class.

2. The material was hard to understand at times.

3. To help the students understand the assignment.

4. It was good and the assignments helped us understand more about the material.

1. Callie was a great asset to the learning of the subject at hand and she was very helpful.

2. Nothing

3. Nothing

4. It was a great way to learn outside of lecture

eEvaluate Report - Fall 2010

1. She held office hours to help us finish group problems and work on homework.
2. When a group did not understand part of the problem she couldn't always explain it so that they understood.
3. Take more time to explain hard concepts.
4. This course was not very good. The problems were supposed to be easy but when we had a question we usually didn't get a straight answer. Frustrating!

1. Available for help when needed.
2. none
3. none
4. It was a nice application with the lecture.

1. Helping the students.
2. none
3. Have better explanations and examples but overall pretty good.
4. Not bad.

eEvaluate Report - Fall 2010

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2414-020

Section Title: Disc-PHYS 2414-001

Instructor: Carolyn Bertsche

Total Enrollment: 32

Course Level: Lower 0000 - 2000

Section Size: Medium 26-59

Question	Level	Mean Response	Median Response	Standard Deviation	ZScore	Responses	Percent #1	Percent #2	Percent #3	Percent #4	Percent #5	Dept Rank	College Rank
1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	INDIVIDUAL	3.10526	3	0.87526		19	5.26	10.53	57.89	21.05	5.26	21.95	25.28
	DEPARTMENT	3.42398	3	1.07074		684	5.99	10.53	35.09	31.87	16.52		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.49653	4	1.11334	0.35	7,057	6.39	9.85	31.93	31.39	20.45		
	COLLEGE	3.74594	4	1.05235	0.61	33,712	3.92	7.27	25.95	36.00	26.85		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	3.57895	4	1.07061		19	0.00	21.05	21.05	36.84	21.05	24.39	36.24
	DEPARTMENT	3.68413	4	1.17087		687	5.24	12.08	21.54	31.30	29.84		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.73566	4	1.19596	0.13	7,044	5.64	10.42	23.14	26.35	34.45		
	COLLEGE	3.99115	4	1.11189	0.37	33,659	3.47	7.69	18.35	27.21	43.27		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.05263	4	0.77986		19	0.00	5.26	10.53	57.89	26.32	51.22	60.11
	DEPARTMENT	3.77386	4	1.17020		681	4.99	9.40	24.08	26.28	35.24		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.86090	4	1.13334	-0.17	7,038	4.28	7.94	22.65	27.68	37.45		
	COLLEGE	3.94200	4	1.12187	-0.10	33,637	3.74	7.61	20.70	26.59	41.35		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	3.47368	3	0.96427		19	0.00	15.79	36.84	31.58	15.79	41.46	41.01
	DEPARTMENT	3.44396	4	1.16659		687	7.13	12.81	29.99	28.68	21.40		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.53599	4	1.20619	0.05	7,030	6.77	12.33	29.08	24.17	27.65		
	COLLEGE	3.78772	4	1.14111	0.28	33,593	4.30	9.30	24.27	27.59	34.54		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	2.84211	3	1.11869		19	10.53	31.58	26.32	26.32	5.26	17.07	27.25
	DEPARTMENT	3.20354	3	1.25124		678	11.50	16.52	31.12	21.83	19.03		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.38095	3	1.31701	0.41	7,014	11.41	14.00	26.39	21.50	26.70		
	COLLEGE	3.66169	4	1.26105	0.65	33,614	7.84	10.78	22.74	24.62	34.01		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	3.10526	3	0.93659		19	5.26	15.79	47.37	26.32	5.26	19.51	30.62
	DEPARTMENT	3.47275	4	1.21158		679	7.81	13.25	26.95	27.84	24.15		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.51240	4	1.26177	0.32	7,018	8.54	13.35	24.59	25.38	28.14		
	COLLEGE	3.75565	4	1.21157	0.54	33,583	6.16	10.28	20.81	27.34	35.41		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	3.26316	3	1.19453		19	10.53	10.53	36.84	26.32	15.79	19.51	25.84
	DEPARTMENT	3.61347	4	1.18269		683	6.73	9.81	26.79	28.70	27.96		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.70044	4	1.17295	0.37	7,027	5.37	10.36	24.98	27.47	31.83		
	COLLEGE	3.86004	4	1.13740	0.52	33,660	4.07	8.76	21.95	27.54	37.69		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	3.10526	3	0.73747		19	0.00	15.79	63.16	15.79	5.26	26.83	20.39
	DEPARTMENT	3.30859	3	1.00333		687	5.24	11.94	41.48	29.40	11.94		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.52478	4	1.02517	0.41	5,972	4.07	9.28	35.35	32.72	18.59		
	COLLEGE	3.69760	4	1.00060	0.59	32,285	3.01	7.44	29.39	37.12	23.05		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	2.63158	3	0.95513		19	15.79	21.05	47.37	15.79	0.00	0.00	1.94
	DEPARTMENT	3.16204	3	0.76186		685	2.04	9.20	66.13	15.77	6.86		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.30454	3	0.81995	0.82	5,973	1.74	7.38	59.97	20.49	10.41		
	COLLEGE	3.42941	3	0.83424	0.96	32,312	1.26	5.69	55.01	24.96	13.09		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	2.78947	3	0.91766		19	15.79	5.26	63.16	15.79	0.00	21.95	11.00
	DEPARTMENT	3.11241	3	0.98997		685	6.42	15.33	48.18	20.73	9.34		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.35448	3	1.04212	0.54	5,958	4.45	13.51	40.18	25.86	16.00		
	COLLEGE	3.49871	3	1.04120	0.68	32,259	3.48	11.73	35.75	29.51	19.53		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	3.26316	3	1.09758		19	5.26	21.05	26.32	36.84	10.53	41.46	35.28
	DEPARTMENT	3.27485	3	1.15955		684	7.75	17.11	31.87	26.46	16.81		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.50872	4	1.18170	0.21	5,962	6.54	12.75	28.95	26.82	24.94		
	COLLEGE	3.67761	4	1.14144	0.36	32,265	4.88	10.40	26.02	29.51	29.20		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	4.26316	4	0.65338		19	0.00	0.00	10.53	52.63	36.84	29.27	34.30
	DEPARTMENT	4.39124	5	0.84045		685	0.73	2.92	10.22	28.76	57.37		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.39245	5	0.88137	0.15	5,960	1.29	3.46	8.79	27.63	58.83		
	COLLEGE	4.43801	5	0.84231	0.21	32,216	1.03	2.96	8.14	26.95	60.93		

eEvaluate Report - Fall 2010

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2414-020

Section Title: Disc-PHYS 2414-001

Instructor: Carolyn Bertsche

Total Enrollment: 32

Course Level: Lower 0000 - 2000

Section Size: Medium 26-59

Question

1. What were the strong points of the course?
2. What were the weak points of the course?
3. What should the instructor do to improve their teaching?
4. What is your overall opinion of this course?

Comment

1. The questions matched what we were learning. Callie knew all about the questions and knew how to help us.
 2. The graders would sometimes pick apart our answers to try to take away half credit.
 3. Not much, these recesitation classes are more for practice.
 4. The course was somewhat helpful, though not nearly as important as lecture. I mostly like it because it boosted my grade in physics.
1. It was nice meeting with a group to work on things.
 2. Callie tended to treat us like children. It IS an adult class.
 3. Don't get so bent out of shape when life is more interesting than the class.
 4. EH.
1. Good TA to help with discussion
 2. very hard tests, homework, and overall hard course
 3. Nothing
 4. Okay
1. easily understandable problems
 2. was maybe too easy
 3. have problems that involve more thinking
 4. easy and helpful
1. Callie always provided clear explanations concerning the concepts covered in the lecture hall, and she was always willing to offer her help for any questions I had.
 2. Not applicable.
 3. I can offer no suggestions!
 4. I had an exceedingly high opinion of this course, as Callie was of great value as an instructor.
1. She was very good about answering questions and was nice.
 2. It was hard and they needed way more people during help lab/tutoring hours because one or two people to help all the students was just really unproductive and frustrating.
 3. Explain things different ways so it might be easier to understand.
 4. Really hard but pretty fair. Sometimes the test questions were like nothing we covered or practiced in class.
1. Group problems were not overly difficult
 2. Sometimes felt like this section was not important compared to the lecture class
 3. More involvement or lecture, felt like the point of the class was to finish a worksheet every week and the TA was just there for any questions
 4. OK course, everything I used in this class I learned very well in lecture. I felt like this section was just a 50 minute block I had to go to in order to work on worksheets that are 10% of my grade.
1. -Reinforced lecture information
 2. -Small window in which to complete assignments
 3. -Teach more before starting the problems
 4. -I didn't really benefit from it. The lecture and lab are sufficient

eValuate Report - Fall 2010

1. Getting to work with other students on problems was helpful for thinking through the physics.

2.

3.

4. The discussion wasn't exciting or boring. We just did a problem in our group and then left. Carolyn was helpful when needed.

1. Not changing the groups help to make discussions less awkward.

2. She could not answer questions. She would eventually just end up telling us what the answer should be. My group would occasionally have to stay after because she had not reached our discussion group and her advice on how to work the problem was not helpful.

3. Learn how to respond.

4. It was a waste of time.

1. I really enjoyed working with a group. Mine especially because great friends and were able to answer my questions without making me feel ignorant.

2. Cally was rude at times.

3. I think the reviewing was fine, I just wish the she didnt seem to have an attitude towards her students.

4. I really did enjoy it most of the time

1. it helped understand the material of the lecture course.

2. no make ups when it was a course that needed to be attended at all times and sometimes could not attend because of other matters than being sick or in other health critical needs

3. overall i liked everything. i would tell her to make everyone more involved in the group because that's what teaches the course, group discussion. if one is not participating or involved in the assignment that one is not learning or helping others out.

4. i liked it

1. It was once a week discussion with no homework.

2. Sometimes the graders were too specific and counted off points for trivial things.

3. Help students more.

4. I was okay.

1. The specific strong points of this course are largely non-existent. Ms. Bertsche is a competent, and generally pleasant person.

2. Ms. Bertsche was often rude to students who asked her for her office hour times, and sent a rather course email in which she informed us that we were to "act like responsible college students." She was quite frustrated with us.

3. Ms. Bertsche was a competent instructor for the discussion section, though she seriously needs to consider the manner with which she interacts with her students. The rude, mocking tone is unacceptable!!!

4. I was reasonably impressed with the course, though the instructor was, at times, quite rude, the grading seemed, to some extent, arbitrary, and the entire process was too structured with respect to the problems we did.

1. I enjoyed getting to work with a group because I felt I learned more helping each other figure out the problem and it was beneficial for the tests.

2.

3. Sometimes she wasn't entirely sure if what we had done was correct and said she would "get back to us."

4. Overall she was pretty good about answering the questions and correcting us when we were wrong except for a few occasions where she didn't know for sure if we had the right concept.

1. Short. Easy problems.

2. Poor TA.

3. Be nice. Encourage talking.

4. Good course, conceptually.

1. The problems we solved were very relevant to the lecture and helped to clarify any confusion. The instructor answered questions very well.

2. Some of the problems were too repetitive so I lost interest in the problem.

3. The instructor should keep doing what they are doing.

4. This was a very good course that really helped with my understanding of physics.