

# eEvaluate Report - Fall 2012

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2514-011

Section Title: Disc-PHYS 2514-010

Instructor: Carolyn Bertsche

Total Enrollment: 42

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	4.00000	4	0.76696		18	0.00	0.00	27.78	44.44	27.78	69.81	71.98
	DEPARTMENT	3.61461	4	0.99989		890	2.81	7.75	36.52	31.01	21.91		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.68158	4	1.04678	-0.30	6,793	3.83	7.74	29.57	34.15	24.70		
	COLLEGE	3.80457	4	1.03007	-0.19	34,646	3.17	6.69	25.65	35.50	28.99		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	4.22222	5	0.94281		18	0.00	5.56	16.67	27.78	50.00	54.72	62.36
	DEPARTMENT	3.99663	4	1.07646		889	2.92	6.75	20.25	27.90	42.18		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.94576	4	1.14668	-0.24	6,785	4.36	7.97	18.50	27.06	42.11		
	COLLEGE	4.06741	4	1.09188	-0.14	34,577	3.29	6.66	16.71	26.67	46.66		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.50000	5	0.70711		18	0.00	0.00	11.11	27.78	61.11	79.25	81.59
	DEPARTMENT	4.10349	4	1.00812		889	2.14	5.17	17.77	30.03	44.88		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.01475	4	1.09073	-0.44	6,778	3.20	6.68	19.49	26.69	43.94		
	COLLEGE	3.98025	4	1.11563	-0.47	34,540	3.78	6.84	20.05	26.24	43.09		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	4.27778	4	0.66911		18	0.00	0.00	11.11	50.00	38.89	75.47	82.14
	DEPARTMENT	3.77401	4	1.05975		885	3.05	7.80	28.25	30.51	30.40		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.73202	4	1.14145	-0.48	6,758	4.29	10.31	25.44	27.82	32.14		
	COLLEGE	3.87634	4	1.10821	-0.36	34,489	3.51	8.29	22.41	28.64	37.16		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	4.00000	4	0.84017		18	0.00	0.00	33.33	33.33	33.33	73.58	71.43
	DEPARTMENT	3.49887	3	1.18617		888	6.42	12.27	32.55	22.52	26.24		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.56716	4	1.25492	-0.34	6,767	8.05	11.90	25.73	23.92	30.40		
	COLLEGE	3.73430	4	1.23114	-0.22	34,516	6.71	10.03	22.25	25.14	35.87		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	4.16667	4	0.78591		18	0.00	0.00	22.22	38.89	38.89	66.04	71.70
	DEPARTMENT	3.73596	4	1.12989		890	4.38	9.33	26.18	28.54	31.57		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.70865	4	1.21516	-0.38	6,772	6.63	10.10	22.55	27.22	33.51		
	COLLEGE	3.81745	4	1.18956	-0.29	34,500	5.64	9.00	20.71	27.28	37.37		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.38889	5	0.77754		18	0.00	0.00	16.67	27.78	55.56	81.13	81.59
	DEPARTMENT	3.91638	4	1.05495		885	2.49	6.78	24.86	28.36	37.51		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.87678	4	1.12171	-0.46	6,760	3.89	7.88	22.83	27.46	37.94		
	COLLEGE	3.91732	4	1.12100	-0.42	34,505	3.84	7.66	21.27	27.38	39.85		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	3.55556	3	0.78382		18	0.00	0.00	61.11	22.22	16.67	47.17	42.61
	DEPARTMENT	3.51977	3	0.94108		885	1.92	9.83	38.76	33.33	16.16		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.62141	4	1.00472	0.07	6,519	3.18	8.18	32.98	34.67	21.00		
	COLLEGE	3.74908	4	0.98435	0.20	32,481	2.51	6.76	28.77	37.20	24.75		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	2.94118	3	1.14404		17	11.76	17.65	47.06	11.76	11.76	22.64	11.93
	DEPARTMENT	3.19774	3	0.81585		885	1.81	10.06	64.52	13.79	9.83		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.29867	3	0.82430	0.43	6,529	1.72	7.37	61.23	18.70	10.98		
	COLLEGE	3.43255	3	0.83578	0.59	32,521	1.17	5.56	55.72	23.96	13.59		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	3.50000	3	0.70711		18	0.00	0.00	61.11	27.78	11.11	58.49	50.85
	DEPARTMENT	3.39706	3	0.96462		884	2.49	11.54	45.25	25.23	15.50		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.49509	3	1.03133	-0.00	6,520	3.65	10.40	38.07	28.56	19.33		
	COLLEGE	3.58982	4	1.04164	0.09	32,449	3.22	10.18	33.30	30.99	22.31		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	3.88889	4	0.83235		18	0.00	0.00	38.89	33.33	27.78	66.04	63.92
	DEPARTMENT	3.58192	4	1.03955		885	2.82	10.62	34.80	29.04	22.71		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.63896	4	1.14081	-0.22	6,520	4.98	10.57	28.02	28.42	28.01		
	COLLEGE	3.75160	4	1.13277	-0.12	32,456	4.42	9.52	24.56	29.46	32.03		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	4.77778	5	0.54832		18	0.00	0.00	5.56	11.11	83.33	62.26	76.99
	DEPARTMENT	4.60565	5	0.70820		885	0.68	1.36	4.97	22.71	70.28		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.47792	5	0.82713	-0.36	6,522	1.07	2.62	7.42	25.21	63.68		
	COLLEGE	4.50279	5	0.80397	-0.34	32,425	0.92	2.48	6.84	24.91	64.85		

# eEvaluate Report - Fall 2012

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2514-011

Section Title: Disc-PHYS 2514-010

Instructor: Carolyn Bertsche

Total Enrollment: 42

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. Carolyn is very helpful whenever we had questions.

2. None

3. None

4. I enjoyed discussion very much, Carolyn is always a joy in discussion, and promoted teamwork well.

1. She was always prepared.

2. The worksheets were too long- I don't think I ever finished one on time.

3. Make the worksheets more concise? Or at least have less work to do.

4. It was okay.

1. Cally's always perky attitude made it easy to learn, and her a pleasure to learn from.

2.

3.

4. Very helpful, allowed us to apply what we learned in an actual problem.

1. working in groups

2. working by myself

3. nothing

4. It was good got a lot of help

1.

2.

3.

4. Awesome TA!

1. Letting us be able to pick our groups and getting credit for just showing up.

2. The difficulty of the discussions.

3. Teach better. Listen to the students questions and understand what they aren't understanding.

4. It was okay.

1. It helped me with problems i didnt know how to do from class

2. There are none

3. Nothing, she is an excellent teacher.

4. It was very helpful and went along well with the main physics lecture

1. This course reinforced your learning from lecture but provided new examples and problems. And you are able to take what you learned from discussion and apply it to the homework and quizzes.

2. There was not enough time to usually finish the discussions. Sometimes the were not worded clearly.

3. Maybe take control of the class a little more, and show an example or to before starting the material.

4. It was a really helpful class that reinforced my learning.

## eValuate Report - Fall 2012

1. Work was worded in a way that was easy to understand.

2. None

3. Nothing that I cOULD think of.

4. It was a very good cOURse that focused on the topics that I needed to know.

1. The clarification of exercises.

2. Not many weak points.

3. Possibly give more feedback when we ask about a certain part of the discussion problem. Or give us better hints as to if we are on the right track and where we should look next.

4. Pretty helpful in the re establishing of the content of the course. Overall an okay class nothing, big or drastic to complain about.

1. Callie's ability to understand our struggles and weak areas of instruction and respond in useful manners.

2. scheduling of review sessions.

3. I dont have any suggestions.

4. Great!

# eValue Report - Fall 2012

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2514-012

Section Title: Disc-PHYS 2514-010

Instructor: Carolyn Bertsche

Total Enrollment: 47

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	4.13043	4	0.75705		23	0.00	0.00	21.74	43.48	34.78	81.13	81.04
	DEPARTMENT	3.61461	4	0.99989		890	2.81	7.75	36.52	31.01	21.91		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.68158	4	1.04678	-0.43	6,793	3.83	7.74	29.57	34.15	24.70		
	COLLEGE	3.80457	4	1.03007	-0.32	34,646	3.17	6.69	25.65	35.50	28.99		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	4.43478	4	0.58977		23	0.00	0.00	4.35	47.83	47.83	64.15	75.82
	DEPARTMENT	3.99663	4	1.07646		889	2.92	6.75	20.25	27.90	42.18		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.94576	4	1.14668	-0.43	6,785	4.36	7.97	18.50	27.06	42.11		
	COLLEGE	4.06741	4	1.09188	-0.34	34,577	3.29	6.66	16.71	26.67	46.66		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.17391	4	0.77765		23	0.00	0.00	21.74	39.13	39.13	49.06	55.77
	DEPARTMENT	4.10349	4	1.00812		889	2.14	5.17	17.77	30.03	44.88		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.01475	4	1.09073	-0.15	6,778	3.20	6.68	19.49	26.69	43.94		
	COLLEGE	3.98025	4	1.11563	-0.17	34,540	3.78	6.84	20.05	26.24	43.09		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	4.13043	4	0.75705		23	0.00	0.00	21.74	43.48	34.78	66.04	73.90
	DEPARTMENT	3.77401	4	1.05975		885	3.05	7.80	28.25	30.51	30.40		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.73202	4	1.14145	-0.35	6,758	4.29	10.31	25.44	27.82	32.14		
	COLLEGE	3.87634	4	1.10821	-0.23	34,489	3.51	8.29	22.41	28.64	37.16		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	4.08696	4	0.84816		23	0.00	0.00	30.43	30.43	39.13	77.36	74.73
	DEPARTMENT	3.49887	3	1.18617		888	6.42	12.27	32.55	22.52	26.24		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.56716	4	1.25492	-0.41	6,767	8.05	11.90	25.73	23.92	30.40		
	COLLEGE	3.73430	4	1.23114	-0.29	34,516	6.71	10.03	22.25	25.14	35.87		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	4.30435	4	0.76484		23	0.00	0.00	17.39	34.78	47.83	75.47	79.95
	DEPARTMENT	3.73596	4	1.12989		890	4.38	9.33	26.18	28.54	31.57		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.70865	4	1.21516	-0.49	6,772	6.63	10.10	22.55	27.22	33.51		
	COLLEGE	3.81745	4	1.18956	-0.41	34,500	5.64	9.00	20.71	27.28	37.37		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.30435	4	0.70290		23	0.00	0.00	13.04	43.48	43.48	66.04	75.82
	DEPARTMENT	3.91638	4	1.05495		885	2.49	6.78	24.86	28.36	37.51		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.87678	4	1.12171	-0.38	6,760	3.89	7.88	22.83	27.46	37.94		
	COLLEGE	3.91732	4	1.12100	-0.35	34,505	3.84	7.66	21.27	27.38	39.85		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	4.09091	4	0.68376		22	0.00	0.00	18.18	54.55	27.27	90.57	83.81
	DEPARTMENT	3.51977	3	0.94108		885	1.92	9.83	38.76	33.33	16.16		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.62141	4	1.00472	-0.47	6,519	3.18	8.18	32.98	34.67	21.00		
	COLLEGE	3.74908	4	0.98435	-0.35	32,481	2.51	6.76	28.77	37.20	24.75		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.21739	3	0.90235		23	4.35	4.35	69.57	8.70	13.04	58.49	44.60
	DEPARTMENT	3.19774	3	0.81585		885	1.81	10.06	64.52	13.79	9.83		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.29867	3	0.82430	0.10	6,529	1.72	7.37	61.23	18.70	10.98		
	COLLEGE	3.43255	3	0.83578	0.26	32,521	1.17	5.56	55.72	23.96	13.59		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	3.78261	4	0.79524		23	0.00	0.00	43.48	34.78	21.74	86.79	77.27
	DEPARTMENT	3.39706	3	0.96462		884	2.49	11.54	45.25	25.23	15.50		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.49509	3	1.03133	-0.28	6,520	3.65	10.40	38.07	28.56	19.33		
	COLLEGE	3.58982	4	1.04164	-0.19	32,449	3.22	10.18	33.30	30.99	22.31		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.21739	4	0.79524		23	0.00	0.00	21.74	34.78	43.48	90.57	84.38
	DEPARTMENT	3.58192	4	1.03955		885	2.82	10.62	34.80	29.04	22.71		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.63896	4	1.14081	-0.51	6,520	4.98	10.57	28.02	28.42	28.01		
	COLLEGE	3.75160	4	1.13277	-0.41	32,456	4.42	9.52	24.56	29.46	32.03		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	4.90909	5	0.42640		22	0.00	0.00	4.55	0.00	95.45	88.68	94.03
	DEPARTMENT	4.60565	5	0.70820		885	0.68	1.36	4.97	22.71	70.28		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.47792	5	0.82713	-0.52	6,522	1.07	2.62	7.42	25.21	63.68		
	COLLEGE	4.50279	5	0.80397	-0.51	32,425	0.92	2.48	6.84	24.91	64.85		

# eEvaluate Report - Fall 2012

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2514-012

Section Title: Disc-PHYS 2514-010

Instructor: Carolyn Bertsche

Total Enrollment: 47

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. She was pretty fun and was there when you had a question about the discussion
  2. Can't think of any except I had 10 minutes to get to my organic lab, but that was my fault.
  3. I think a great job
  4. I had fun learning about physics, though I still don't like it.
1. I felt like discussion really helped me mentally solidify the concepts we learned in lecture, which I appreciated tremendously.
  2. I really can't think of anything.
  3. Again, nothing occurs to me...
  4. I liked this course a lot, and I think it helped me a lot.
1. The teacher was very helpful. She always walked around to each group to see if anyone needed help understanding the material.
  2. Very difficult information but she tried her best to help us understand it.
  3. Nothing, she did a good job.
  4. It was okay. Not one of my favorite classes but that wasn't because of the professor or TA it's just difficult to learn.
1. The discussion assignments
  2. the discussion itself
  3. Due a little more explaining and teaching in discussion instead of just giving us an assignment to do in groups.
  4. It was very good and enjoyed it.
1. There are no strong points because its a discussion class
  2. No weak points
  3. Nothing
  4. Good
1. I didnt really kno how to integrate lecture with lab
  2. i wish she explained a little bit more
  3. take time teaching
  4. i didnt understand it
1. Discussions went along with what was taught in class.
  2. none.
  3. nothing.
  4. Discussions were helpful and helped me to understand what was going in class.
1. You guys really know how to keep us the full time.
  2. none
  3. none
  4. yes.

## eValuate Report - Fall 2012

1. Group activities to solve real life physics problems encountered everyday.
2. Group activities.
3. Nothing I can think of.
4. Great.

1. She was always open to answering questions and helping us really understand what we were doing.
2. Sometimes when everyone had questions it would take a while for her to get around the room to answer everyone's questions quickly, but that is not her fault. There is only one of her, and Physics takes more than two seconds of explanation.
3. She's good.
4. I found it to be very helpful!

1. Carolyn helped alot of students when having trouble with the discussion problems, she was nice and helpful. Working in teams helped but team work among students. Best TA a student could ask for.
2. None.
3. None.
4. The discussion class was very good, I would give it an A rating.

1. I always learned something i didn't understand before we solve problem in groups
- 2.
- 3.
4. good

1. very helpful on an individual basis
2. see #3
3. she's seems a little edgy. If people didn't quiet down immediately when she said 'we are ready to get started' she would be border line rude to the class. Keep in mind she didn't take a breath between saying we were ready and tell us to listen up in a border line rude way.
4. Academically it was excellent

1. Working on problems together is great for physics.
2. Honestly, meeting more might have been helpful for some people.
3. Keep being charming, funny, and helpful, since it makes class more interesting
4. Great!

1. Group work
2. none
3. nothing
4. Excellent

1. The group exercises that we did during these discussions allowed me to work with my peers and with the TA, Callie, to tackle more challenging problems pertaining to the material being covered at the time in the corresponding lecture course. The problems we solved during discussions helped me understand the course material, and helped me with homework problems and exam problems as well. Callie was very helpful, enthusiastic, and encouraging. She made the discussions enjoyable and created a very positive environment for working through physics problems.
2. There weren't any specific weak points.
3. Callie did a very good job providing the necessary initial explanations to get us started and then answering questions and giving us helpful hints as we worked through problems. She doesn't need to do anything differently.
4. This was a helpful course that provided me with peers and a nice, helpful TA who could answer my questions about physics. I got the extra practice I needed to understand the concepts and do well in the course.

# eEvaluate Report - Fall 2012

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2514-014

Section Title: Disc-PHYS 2514-010

Instructor: Carolyn Bertsche

Total Enrollment: 45

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	4.04545	4	0.78542		22	0.00	0.00	27.27	40.91	31.82	71.70	72.25
	DEPARTMENT	3.61461	4	0.99989		890	2.81	7.75	36.52	31.01	21.91		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.68158	4	1.04678	-0.35	6,793	3.83	7.74	29.57	34.15	24.70		
	COLLEGE	3.80457	4	1.03007	-0.23	34,646	3.17	6.69	25.65	35.50	28.99		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	4.50000	5	0.67259		22	0.00	0.00	9.09	31.82	59.09	75.47	81.04
	DEPARTMENT	3.99663	4	1.07646		889	2.92	6.75	20.25	27.90	42.18		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.94576	4	1.14668	-0.48	6,785	4.36	7.97	18.50	27.06	42.11		
	COLLEGE	4.06741	4	1.09188	-0.40	34,577	3.29	6.66	16.71	26.67	46.66		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.31818	5	0.83873		22	0.00	0.00	22.73	22.73	54.55	56.60	66.48
	DEPARTMENT	4.10349	4	1.00812		889	2.14	5.17	17.77	30.03	44.88		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.01475	4	1.09073	-0.28	6,778	3.20	6.68	19.49	26.69	43.94		
	COLLEGE	3.98025	4	1.11563	-0.30	34,540	3.78	6.84	20.05	26.24	43.09		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	4.18182	5	0.95799		22	0.00	4.55	22.73	22.73	50.00	71.70	76.92
	DEPARTMENT	3.77401	4	1.05975		885	3.05	7.80	28.25	30.51	30.40		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.73202	4	1.14145	-0.39	6,758	4.29	10.31	25.44	27.82	32.14		
	COLLEGE	3.87634	4	1.10821	-0.28	34,489	3.51	8.29	22.41	28.64	37.16		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	4.18182	4	0.90692		22	0.00	4.55	18.18	31.82	45.45	79.25	80.22
	DEPARTMENT	3.49887	3	1.18617		888	6.42	12.27	32.55	22.52	26.24		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.56716	4	1.25492	-0.49	6,767	8.05	11.90	25.73	23.92	30.40		
	COLLEGE	3.73430	4	1.23114	-0.36	34,516	6.71	10.03	22.25	25.14	35.87		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	4.31818	4	0.71623		22	0.00	0.00	13.64	40.91	45.45	79.25	81.04
	DEPARTMENT	3.73596	4	1.12989		890	4.38	9.33	26.18	28.54	31.57		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.70865	4	1.21516	-0.50	6,772	6.63	10.10	22.55	27.22	33.51		
	COLLEGE	3.81745	4	1.18956	-0.42	34,500	5.64	9.00	20.71	27.28	37.37		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.40909	5	0.85407		22	0.00	0.00	22.73	13.64	63.64	83.02	82.69
	DEPARTMENT	3.91638	4	1.05495		885	2.49	6.78	24.86	28.36	37.51		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.87678	4	1.12171	-0.47	6,760	3.89	7.88	22.83	27.46	37.94		
	COLLEGE	3.91732	4	1.12100	-0.44	34,505	3.84	7.66	21.27	27.38	39.85		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	3.81818	4	0.85280		22	0.00	4.55	31.82	40.91	22.73	69.81	62.22
	DEPARTMENT	3.51977	3	0.94108		885	1.92	9.83	38.76	33.33	16.16		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.62141	4	1.00472	-0.20	6,519	3.18	8.18	32.98	34.67	21.00		
	COLLEGE	3.74908	4	0.98435	-0.07	32,481	2.51	6.76	28.77	37.20	24.75		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.54545	3	1.01076		22	0.00	9.09	54.55	9.09	27.27	84.91	80.68
	DEPARTMENT	3.19774	3	0.81585		885	1.81	10.06	64.52	13.79	9.83		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.29867	3	0.82430	-0.30	6,529	1.72	7.37	61.23	18.70	10.98		
	COLLEGE	3.43255	3	0.83578	-0.14	32,521	1.17	5.56	55.72	23.96	13.59		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	3.68182	3	0.94548		22	0.00	4.55	50.00	18.18	27.27	71.70	65.91
	DEPARTMENT	3.39706	3	0.96462		884	2.49	11.54	45.25	25.23	15.50		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.49509	3	1.03133	-0.18	6,520	3.65	10.40	38.07	28.56	19.33		
	COLLEGE	3.58982	4	1.04164	-0.09	32,449	3.22	10.18	33.30	30.99	22.31		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	3.95455	4	0.89853		22	0.00	0.00	40.91	22.73	36.36	73.58	68.18
	DEPARTMENT	3.58192	4	1.03955		885	2.82	10.62	34.80	29.04	22.71		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.63896	4	1.14081	-0.28	6,520	4.98	10.57	28.02	28.42	28.01		
	COLLEGE	3.75160	4	1.13277	-0.18	32,456	4.42	9.52	24.56	29.46	32.03		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	4.86364	5	0.35125		22	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.64	86.36	79.25	88.92
	DEPARTMENT	4.60565	5	0.70820		885	0.68	1.36	4.97	22.71	70.28		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.47792	5	0.82713	-0.47	6,522	1.07	2.62	7.42	25.21	63.68		
	COLLEGE	4.50279	5	0.80397	-0.45	32,425	0.92	2.48	6.84	24.91	64.85		

# eEvaluate Report - Fall 2012

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2514-014

Section Title: Disc-PHYS 2514-010

Instructor: Carolyn Bertsche

Total Enrollment: 45

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 amount of homework given
2. na
3. na
4. I liked it

1. The instructor's willingness to help.
2. Not all group members worked hard.
- 3.

4. The discussion section was very helpful.

1. The smaller groups allowed for discussions that tested our knowledge of the material and allowed others to learn and ask questions at their own pace.
2. Sometimes, specific people in the group were ill-equipped with the necessary social skills to engage in conversations about the physics problem.
- 3.
4. It helped reinforce what I learned in the larger class.

- 1.
2. I think we should have different groups every discussion so we can work with different people.
- 3.
- 4.

1. Having a group discussion helped me to more clearly understand some of the topics that I was struggling with.
2. The groups need to be changed occasionally. I was stuck with a group that rarely allowed me the time to speak or really be involved at all and I was not able to switch.
3. Nothing that I can think of. Keep up the good work!
4. I like the fact that as long as you show up and participate you receive full credit for the day. Being in a group like mine that wouldn't let me participate, I was always worried that we were not always turning in the correct answers.

1. She tried to answer all of our questions.
2. Sometimes too many students needed help, so she rushed through answering each question.
3. Answer most commonly asked questions on the board.
4. Good

1. It helped to explain.
2. The questions could be hard to understand.
3. Nothing really.
4. It was helpful.

1. the problems
2. time constraint
- 3.

nothing

4. I loved callie she did a great job and was always patient and positive!



## eValuate Report - Fall 2012

1. Having Ms. Bertsche answer questions if we got stuck, and easy A's.

2. That Ms. Bertsche can't bilocate. The material is somewhat hard. I'd like to have solid solutions/answers to the work too.

3. No ways that I can think of.

4. For a discussion, it was pretty good. Better than chem recitation.

1. explaining more problem to fix and practicing

2. the time is not enough

3. provide more time

4. good

1. Everything

2. Nothing

3. Nothing

4. Great

1. her discussion of physics was always easy to understand and never too wordy

2. didn't really have one

3. nothing really

4. good

1. The group work allowed me to develop conviction, as I had to repeatedly correct my classmates during group assignments.

Calley the TA gave excellent initial overviews to the physics problems that we would be practicing in each class.

2. I didn't learn much from the discussion sections. They merely increased my proficiency at solving problems that I learned how to work out in the physics lectures.

3. Don't change a thing. The discussion sections did exactly what they were intended to do.

4. It fulfilled its purpose. After each section, my entire group came out with a better understanding of a physics topic that we had already learned in the discussion class.

1. She is great when it comes to problem solving with each student.

2. sometimes it was unclear what she was talking about.

3. try to explain the topic a little bit further instead of just give a 5 min introduction and give us the problem.

4. Very good. She knows what she is talking about. Great attitude towards the students

1. No really strong points. More of just average.

2. it got boring

3. make it interesting. Help the students more

4. it was decent. I did not enjoy going

1. interesting.

2. No weak points.

3. nothing.

4. excellent.

1. I think Callie is a good TA and has a strong teaching ability. She knows a lot of physics and has good discussions with people that are interested in the course. This helps because the work is on a very low level.

2. I think the course material in discussion was easier than the material on the quizzes which did not prepare me well for class exams.

3. I think Callie is very energetic which really helped keep the class interested. She may be able to let the students think a little more before giving the answer, but she is a great teacher.

4. I liked this course and looked forward to it every week. Had a very good experience

# eEvaluate Report - Fall 2012

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2514-017

Section Title: Disc-PHYS 2514-010

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	4.05556	4	0.80237		18	0.00	0.00	27.78	38.89	33.33	73.58	73.35
	DEPARTMENT	3.61461	4	0.99989		890	2.81	7.75	36.52	31.01	21.91		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.68158	4	1.04678	-0.36	6,793	3.83	7.74	29.57	34.15	24.70		
	COLLEGE	3.80457	4	1.03007	-0.24	34,646	3.17	6.69	25.65	35.50	28.99		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	4.50000	5	0.70711		18	0.00	0.00	11.11	27.78	61.11	75.47	81.04
	DEPARTMENT	3.99663	4	1.07646		889	2.92	6.75	20.25	27.90	42.18		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.94576	4	1.14668	-0.48	6,785	4.36	7.97	18.50	27.06	42.11		
	COLLEGE	4.06741	4	1.09188	-0.40	34,577	3.29	6.66	16.71	26.67	46.66		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.44444	5	0.70479		18	0.00	0.00	11.11	33.33	55.56	69.81	76.10
	DEPARTMENT	4.10349	4	1.00812		889	2.14	5.17	17.77	30.03	44.88		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.01475	4	1.09073	-0.39	6,778	3.20	6.68	19.49	26.69	43.94		
	COLLEGE	3.98025	4	1.11563	-0.42	34,540	3.78	6.84	20.05	26.24	43.09		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	4.38889	5	0.69780		18	0.00	0.00	11.11	38.89	50.00	81.13	87.09
	DEPARTMENT	3.77401	4	1.05975		885	3.05	7.80	28.25	30.51	30.40		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.73202	4	1.14145	-0.58	6,758	4.29	10.31	25.44	27.82	32.14		
	COLLEGE	3.87634	4	1.10821	-0.46	34,489	3.51	8.29	22.41	28.64	37.16		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	4.22222	4	0.80845		18	0.00	0.00	22.22	33.33	44.44	81.13	82.42
	DEPARTMENT	3.49887	3	1.18617		888	6.42	12.27	32.55	22.52	26.24		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.56716	4	1.25492	-0.52	6,767	8.05	11.90	25.73	23.92	30.40		
	COLLEGE	3.73430	4	1.23114	-0.40	34,516	6.71	10.03	22.25	25.14	35.87		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	4.16667	5	1.04319		18	0.00	5.56	27.78	11.11	55.56	66.04	71.70
	DEPARTMENT	3.73596	4	1.12989		890	4.38	9.33	26.18	28.54	31.57		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.70865	4	1.21516	-0.38	6,772	6.63	10.10	22.55	27.22	33.51		
	COLLEGE	3.81745	4	1.18956	-0.29	34,500	5.64	9.00	20.71	27.28	37.37		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.33333	5	0.97014		18	0.00	5.56	16.67	16.67	61.11	69.81	77.75
	DEPARTMENT	3.91638	4	1.05495		885	2.49	6.78	24.86	28.36	37.51		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.87678	4	1.12171	-0.41	6,760	3.89	7.88	22.83	27.46	37.94		
	COLLEGE	3.91732	4	1.12100	-0.37	34,505	3.84	7.66	21.27	27.38	39.85		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	3.94444	4	0.93760		18	0.00	5.56	27.78	33.33	33.33	83.02	73.30
	DEPARTMENT	3.51977	3	0.94108		885	1.92	9.83	38.76	33.33	16.16		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.62141	4	1.00472	-0.32	6,519	3.18	8.18	32.98	34.67	21.00		
	COLLEGE	3.74908	4	0.98435	-0.20	32,481	2.51	6.76	28.77	37.20	24.75		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.27778	3	1.40610		18	16.67	5.56	38.89	11.11	27.78	62.26	51.70
	DEPARTMENT	3.19774	3	0.81585		885	1.81	10.06	64.52	13.79	9.83		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.29867	3	0.82430	0.03	6,529	1.72	7.37	61.23	18.70	10.98		
	COLLEGE	3.43255	3	0.83578	0.19	32,521	1.17	5.56	55.72	23.96	13.59		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	3.77778	4	1.06027		18	0.00	11.11	33.33	22.22	33.33	84.91	76.99
	DEPARTMENT	3.39706	3	0.96462		884	2.49	11.54	45.25	25.23	15.50		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.49509	3	1.03133	-0.27	6,520	3.65	10.40	38.07	28.56	19.33		
	COLLEGE	3.58982	4	1.04164	-0.18	32,449	3.22	10.18	33.30	30.99	22.31		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.22222	5	1.00326		18	0.00	11.11	5.56	33.33	50.00	94.34	84.94
	DEPARTMENT	3.58192	4	1.03955		885	2.82	10.62	34.80	29.04	22.71		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.63896	4	1.14081	-0.51	6,520	4.98	10.57	28.02	28.42	28.01		
	COLLEGE	3.75160	4	1.13277	-0.42	32,456	4.42	9.52	24.56	29.46	32.03		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	4.88889	5	0.32338		18	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.11	88.89	86.79	92.61
	DEPARTMENT	4.60565	5	0.70820		885	0.68	1.36	4.97	22.71	70.28		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.47792	5	0.82713	-0.50	6,522	1.07	2.62	7.42	25.21	63.68		
	COLLEGE	4.50279	5	0.80397	-0.48	32,425	0.92	2.48	6.84	24.91	64.85		

# eEvaluate Report - Fall 2012

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2514-017

Section Title: Disc-PHYS 2514-010

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. Helped to understand material.
2. None.
3. Nothing.
4. Awesome.

1. this discussion was good, no changes needed.
2. it was early
- 3.

4. good, wouldn't change anything

1. no
2. no
3. no
4. Nice TA

1. I do not know
2. I do not know
3. Nothing
4. Easy

1. how she responded to our emails when we needed help with hw or have any questions
2. none
3. none
4. great

1. Taught me to solve more difficult physics problems
2. nothing
3. nothing
4. amazing

1. Very much designed for critical thinking.
2. None
3. Nothing
4. This was a very good class to cause critical thinking.

1. Callie is willing to help however she can.
2. None, honestly! Too early ;)
3. Nothing, Callie is great.
4. I had a good time in the course and learned a lot.

## eValuate Report - Fall 2012

1. Engaging.

Good teacher

2. I didn't go like at all.

3. Make it not at 8:30 am

4. Good. I just almost never went.

1. the discussions with other classmates

2. no

3. no

4. it is the class that doesnot require alot reading. you just have to go to the class to discuss the concepts

1. It is interesting.

2. Sometimes it is vague what we need to do.

3. Nothing.

4. Awesome.

1. It helped me work through some interesting problems.

2. Too early in the morning.

3. Nothing.

4. It was ok.

1. The students never felt pressured to rush to the finish of the discussion. You always did what you were capable of.

2. Some students take advantage of others' knowledge in the subject.

3. Take a little more initiative to recognize where certain groups are flagging.

4. Low-stress, engaging discussion that I never really hated. Good work.

1. The class related to what we were learning in lecture. When we did have questions, she would take the time to explain the question.

2. The whole reason for a discussion section is to better understand the material covered in lecture. The method of giving us a very challenging problem and letting us sit there for 50 minutes and attempt to find the answer (which I hardly ever did because I was still unclear about stuff we covered in lecture) was very poor. I wish that instead of giving us a problem to work in a group on, she would have lectured and cleared up some stuff we learned in lecture and then maybe given us an easier, less time consuming problem at the end for us to work on.

3. Teach the material rather than just hand us a challenging problem and tell us to work it out. I don't think this is her fault though, because she is just doing what she is told to do by Dr. Mason.

4. The discussion section was useless for me. I learned nothing and, if anything, it confused me even more on the material. The time spent in discussion could have been better spent reviewing material, not handing out a group problem to do.