

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2012

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2514-011

Section Title: Disc-PHYS 2514-010

Instructor: Carolyn Bertsche

Total Enrollment: 34

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	3.43750	4	1.03078		16	6.25	6.25	37.50	37.50	12.50	47.22	31.92
	DEPARTMENT	3.53663	4	1.01165		546	4.21	7.51	37.18	32.60	18.50		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.72157	4	1.03382	0.27	5,161	3.53	6.96	29.20	34.47	25.85		
	COLLEGE	3.85625	4	1.02199	0.41	28,606	2.90	6.36	23.97	35.76	31.01		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	3.81250	4	1.04682		16	0.00	12.50	25.00	31.25	31.25	33.33	33.55
	DEPARTMENT	3.89358	4	1.10964		545	4.04	7.16	21.65	29.72	37.43		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.99748	4	1.08817	0.17	5,155	3.43	6.46	19.34	28.46	42.31		
	COLLEGE	4.13109	4	1.05423	0.30	28,583	2.77	5.80	15.83	26.73	48.86		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	3.18750	3	1.16726		16	12.50	6.25	43.75	25.00	12.50	11.11	8.14
	DEPARTMENT	4.06446	4	1.09405		543	3.31	5.71	19.71	23.76	47.51		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.02100	4	1.06996	0.78	5,144	2.94	6.05	20.45	27.12	43.45		
	COLLEGE	4.00021	4	1.11421	0.73	28,524	3.84	6.58	19.28	26.33	43.98		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	3.68750	4	0.94648		16	0.00	6.25	43.75	25.00	25.00	41.67	40.07
	DEPARTMENT	3.73162	4	1.07269		544	3.86	8.46	25.92	34.19	27.57		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.79067	4	1.11224	0.09	5,145	3.85	8.59	25.64	28.49	33.43		
	COLLEGE	3.93157	4	1.09123	0.22	28,481	3.22	7.56	21.21	28.88	39.13		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	3.18750	3	1.04682		16	6.25	12.50	50.00	18.75	12.50	41.67	26.38
	DEPARTMENT	3.35780	3	1.21965		545	7.71	16.70	30.64	22.02	22.94		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.63528	4	1.23196	0.36	5,141	6.73	11.65	25.42	23.75	32.45		
	COLLEGE	3.79851	4	1.21452	0.50	28,518	6.03	9.54	21.05	25.30	38.08		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	3.31250	4	1.01448		16	6.25	12.50	31.25	43.75	6.25	30.56	25.73
	DEPARTMENT	3.60000	4	1.15746		545	5.32	11.19	29.36	26.42	27.71		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.76463	4	1.18028	0.38	5,145	5.50	9.25	23.42	26.94	34.89		
	COLLEGE	3.88842	4	1.16947	0.49	28,500	5.04	8.31	19.44	27.21	40.01		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	3.62500	4	0.95743		16	0.00	12.50	31.25	37.50	18.75	36.11	29.64
	DEPARTMENT	3.83088	4	1.03923		544	2.76	6.07	29.04	29.60	32.54		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.91694	4	1.10019	0.27	5,141	3.52	7.06	22.70	27.64	39.08		
	COLLEGE	3.97592	4	1.10809	0.32	28,534	3.55	7.29	19.46	27.42	42.28		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	3.06250	3	0.99791		16	6.25	18.75	43.75	25.00	6.25	22.22	12.67
	DEPARTMENT	3.37798	3	0.96266		545	3.49	11.19	42.20	30.28	12.84		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.66979	4	0.98640	0.62	4,803	2.83	7.31	31.69	36.39	21.78		
	COLLEGE	3.79018	4	0.98798	0.74	27,662	2.53	6.35	27.26	37.29	26.57		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	2.75000	3	0.68313		16	6.25	18.75	68.75	6.25	0.00	5.56	2.40
	DEPARTMENT	3.13528	3	0.81648		547	3.11	10.79	62.89	15.90	7.31		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.30393	3	0.83338	0.66	4,830	1.82	7.14	61.39	18.12	11.53		
	COLLEGE	3.44236	3	0.84230	0.82	27,733	1.32	5.33	55.00	24.51	13.85		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	3.12500	3	1.02470		16	6.25	18.75	37.50	31.25	6.25	38.89	20.21
	DEPARTMENT	3.20917	3	1.01293		545	4.77	15.96	45.50	21.10	12.66		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.50062	3	1.03336	0.36	4,814	3.34	11.05	37.60	28.21	19.80		
	COLLEGE	3.61663	4	1.04383	0.47	27,655	3.19	9.59	33.11	30.60	23.51		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	3.06250	3	1.06262		16	6.25	25.00	31.25	31.25	6.25	27.78	16.10
	DEPARTMENT	3.35165	3	1.02848		546	4.21	13.92	39.19	27.84	14.84		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.68368	4	1.11521	0.56	4,821	4.34	9.60	28.17	29.14	28.75		
	COLLEGE	3.80333	4	1.11505	0.66	27,666	4.03	8.70	23.64	30.16	33.47		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	4.56250	5	0.62915		16	0.00	0.00	6.25	31.25	62.50	44.44	51.03
	DEPARTMENT	4.60623	5	0.67503		546	0.37	1.10	5.31	23.99	69.23		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.49387	5	0.80008	-0.09	4,815	0.85	2.28	7.54	25.28	64.05		
	COLLEGE	4.48070	5	0.82058	-0.10	27,647	0.96	2.66	7.45	25.21	63.72		

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2012

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2514-011

Section Title: Disc-PHYS 2514-010

Instructor: Carolyn Bertsche

Total Enrollment: 34

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. Group work
2. too early in the morning
3. Nothing she did good
4. Good

1. She was always available for questions.
2. None
3. Lecture more
4. Average

1. She encouraged independent and group thinking.
2. At times, she would just remain at the front of the class; semi-isolated.
3. I would reccommend her to get more actively involved in each group.
4. This course was good.

1. none
2. She did not seem that interested and caused many students to be uninterested.
3. Be more enthusiastic.
4. It was an average course.

1. The worksheets were good, but sometimes needed more explaining.
2. Didn't feel I learned much in the discussion section.
3. Instead of just doing worksheets, do something like have each person work on the problems at the end of the chapter in the book, especially the conceptual questions. Many times I was trying to do a worksheet where I didn't understand the concept very well and those questions would have helped a lot. After those then give a few exercises similar to the ones on the worksheet, just shorter so we can still finish in class. On the class before the test, I recommend going over a previous or practice test completely, and if anyone has any questions on a specific area, cover it more in depth.
4. Needs Improvement.

1. The course was intended to enhance our understanding of physics by building on what we learned in lecture.
2. The worksheets usually did not correspond to what was being taught in the lecture. In most groups, it seemed like one or two people did all of the work. Attendance was not high enough.
3. The instructor's teaching is adequate.
4. I like the idea of this course and understand its intention, but in practice it did not work very well.

1. Effective group assignments, and great teacher.
2. None.
3. Nothing.
4. AWESOME

1. The instructor was kind and knowledgeable.
2. The content was typically unrelated or tangential to the subject being taught in class, especially as the semester has winded to a close.
3. Nothing, just use different teaching material. Perhaps something like that which we might see on the test.
4. OK.

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2012

1. The strong points were the discussion assignments.
2. Nothing on the assignments was very well explained.
3. I think a class discussion type course would be more useful for physics.
4. I wasn't a fan, but that's because I let myself get behind and then I couldn't catch back up. Don't let my negative review be meaningful because my failure in the course was my fault.

1. instructors were very helpful
2. difficulty vs the lessons
3. maybe explain examples better
4. it was difficult but not because of any inability of the instructors. its just a difficult course.

1. The concepts in the discussion sections were helpful.
2. We often didn't have enough time to fully understand the concept or have the answer explained to us. We would leave unsure if our answer was right or if we were thinking about the problem in the right way. It would be better if we worked shorter problems and had the answers.
3. They were supposed to put up the answers to the discussions online but I never saw them. They could also switch up the groups each time, because sometimes no one in the group understood the concept and we would confuse each other by telling what we thought the right answer was. The instructor would often help guide us in the right direction but we were not always clear at the end.
4. It could have been more helpful than it was. Improve by making sure we actually know the concepts after.

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2012

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2514-013

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	3.75000	4	0.96531		12	0.00	8.33	33.33	33.33	25.00	63.89	49.51
	DEPARTMENT	3.53663	4	1.01165		546	4.21	7.51	37.18	32.60	18.50		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.72157	4	1.03382	-0.03	5,161	3.53	6.96	29.20	34.47	25.85		
	COLLEGE	3.85625	4	1.02199	0.10	28,606	2.90	6.36	23.97	35.76	31.01		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	4.08333	4	0.66856		12	0.00	0.00	16.67	58.33	25.00	66.67	53.10
	DEPARTMENT	3.89358	4	1.10964		545	4.04	7.16	21.65	29.72	37.43		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.99748	4	1.08817	-0.08	5,155	3.43	6.46	19.34	28.46	42.31		
	COLLEGE	4.13109	4	1.05423	0.05	28,583	2.77	5.80	15.83	26.73	48.86		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	3.50000	3	0.90453		12	0.00	8.33	50.00	25.00	16.67	22.22	16.29
	DEPARTMENT	4.06446	4	1.09405		543	3.31	5.71	19.71	23.76	47.51		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.02100	4	1.06996	0.49	5,144	2.94	6.05	20.45	27.12	43.45		
	COLLEGE	4.00021	4	1.11421	0.45	28,524	3.84	6.58	19.28	26.33	43.98		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	3.50000	4	0.79772		12	0.00	8.33	41.67	41.67	8.33	30.56	29.32
	DEPARTMENT	3.73162	4	1.07269		544	3.86	8.46	25.92	34.19	27.57		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.79067	4	1.11224	0.26	5,145	3.85	8.59	25.64	28.49	33.43		
	COLLEGE	3.93157	4	1.09123	0.40	28,481	3.22	7.56	21.21	28.88	39.13		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	3.36364	3	0.80904		11	0.00	9.09	54.55	27.27	9.09	47.22	33.23
	DEPARTMENT	3.35780	3	1.21965		545	7.71	16.70	30.64	22.02	22.94		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.63528	4	1.23196	0.22	5,141	6.73	11.65	25.42	23.75	32.45		
	COLLEGE	3.79851	4	1.21452	0.36	28,518	6.03	9.54	21.05	25.30	38.08		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	3.41667	4	0.90034		12	0.00	16.67	33.33	41.67	8.33	36.11	29.97
	DEPARTMENT	3.60000	4	1.15746		545	5.32	11.19	29.36	26.42	27.71		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.76463	4	1.18028	0.29	5,145	5.50	9.25	23.42	26.94	34.89		
	COLLEGE	3.88842	4	1.16947	0.40	28,500	5.04	8.31	19.44	27.21	40.01		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	3.75000	4	0.62158		12	0.00	0.00	33.33	58.33	8.33	47.22	36.48
	DEPARTMENT	3.83088	4	1.03923		544	2.76	6.07	29.04	29.60	32.54		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.91694	4	1.10019	0.15	5,141	3.52	7.06	22.70	27.64	39.08		
	COLLEGE	3.97592	4	1.10809	0.20	28,534	3.55	7.29	19.46	27.42	42.28		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	3.08333	3	0.51493		12	0.00	8.33	75.00	16.67	0.00	25.00	13.01
	DEPARTMENT	3.37798	3	0.96266		545	3.49	11.19	42.20	30.28	12.84		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.66979	4	0.98640	0.59	4,803	2.83	7.31	31.69	36.39	21.78		
	COLLEGE	3.79018	4	0.98798	0.72	27,662	2.53	6.35	27.26	37.29	26.57		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.08333	3	0.66856		12	0.00	8.33	83.33	0.00	8.33	47.22	27.06
	DEPARTMENT	3.13528	3	0.81648		547	3.11	10.79	62.89	15.90	7.31		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.30393	3	0.83338	0.26	4,830	1.82	7.14	61.39	18.12	11.53		
	COLLEGE	3.44236	3	0.84230	0.43	27,733	1.32	5.33	55.00	24.51	13.85		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	2.75000	3	0.86603		12	8.33	25.00	50.00	16.67	0.00	11.11	6.85
	DEPARTMENT	3.20917	3	1.01293		545	4.77	15.96	45.50	21.10	12.66		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.50062	3	1.03336	0.73	4,814	3.34	11.05	37.60	28.21	19.80		
	COLLEGE	3.61663	4	1.04383	0.83	27,655	3.19	9.59	33.11	30.60	23.51		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	2.91667	3	0.66856		12	0.00	25.00	58.33	16.67	0.00	13.89	9.93
	DEPARTMENT	3.35165	3	1.02848		546	4.21	13.92	39.19	27.84	14.84		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.68368	4	1.11521	0.69	4,821	4.34	9.60	28.17	29.14	28.75		
	COLLEGE	3.80333	4	1.11505	0.80	27,666	4.03	8.70	23.64	30.16	33.47		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	4.41667	5	0.66856		12	0.00	0.00	8.33	41.67	50.00	22.22	33.56
	DEPARTMENT	4.60623	5	0.67503		546	0.37	1.10	5.31	23.99	69.23		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.49387	5	0.80008	0.10	4,815	0.85	2.28	7.54	25.28	64.05		
	COLLEGE	4.48070	5	0.82058	0.08	27,647	0.96	2.66	7.45	25.21	63.72		

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2012

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2514-013

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. How we got into groups to discuss the worksheet given
2. How we worked on worksheets instead of any difficult problems such as those found in the book
3. Maybe work some physics problems similar to those in the book or on tests
4. Overall the discussion class was fair but I didn't feel like it helped me in learning physics very much

1. Instructor was always ready and willing to help.
2. The course did not focus on expanding students' understanding of material taught in lecture, rather it was about busy work. The busy work helped with understanding the material to an extent, but the class could have been more worthwhile had actual discussion occurred instead.
3. Besides changing the objective of the course, not much needed changed.
4. This course was mostly pointless, with the time in class being spent on busy work that only reiterated a specific type of problem. No real discussion or explanations took place.

1. Callie was extremely good at explaining the material.
2. Most of the discussions focused on conservation of momentum and didn't seem to cover other topics
3. Cover more topics than just conservation of momentum
4. I thought the discussion aspect of physics was very helpful

1. working in groups, explanations of problems on the board before students began to work
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

1. The instructor has been very helpful and considerate of the class.
- 2.
3. Try to be more aware of questions that other small groups might have rather than concentrate too much on any one group. Feel free to address the whole class more often (it was always helpful in discussion when the instructor used this method rather than addressing each individual group) since most groups have the same questions about the discussion assignment.
4. The instructor was very good about explaining the material at the beginning of the discussion and answering questions.

1. Discussion helped break down the subjects so they were easier to understand and apply later in class.
2. Didn't always go along with where we were in class.
- 3.
- 4.

1. Callie was very nice and friendly!
2. Can't think of specifics.
3. Nothing, except perhaps more explanation of concepts.
4. Better than lecture.

1. good TA
2. time - early afternoon option should be available!
3. keep it up, callee does a great job
4. good experience, good TA, i feel prepared for phys 2

eValueate Report - Spring 2012

1. Discussion that reinforced the lecture.
2. nothing
3. More practice tests
4. It was good

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2012

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2514-014

Section Title: Disc-PHYS 2514-010

Instructor: Carolyn Bertsche

Total Enrollment: 38

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	3.41176	3	0.79521		17	0.00	5.88	58.82	23.53	11.76	44.44	31.60
	DEPARTMENT	3.53663	4	1.01165		546	4.21	7.51	37.18	32.60	18.50		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.72157	4	1.03382	0.30	5,161	3.53	6.96	29.20	34.47	25.85		
	COLLEGE	3.85625	4	1.02199	0.43	28,606	2.90	6.36	23.97	35.76	31.01		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	3.82353	4	0.95101		17	0.00	11.76	17.65	47.06	23.53	41.67	35.18
	DEPARTMENT	3.89358	4	1.10964		545	4.04	7.16	21.65	29.72	37.43		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.99748	4	1.08817	0.16	5,155	3.43	6.46	19.34	28.46	42.31		
	COLLEGE	4.13109	4	1.05423	0.29	28,583	2.77	5.80	15.83	26.73	48.86		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	3.58824	4	1.32565		17	5.88	17.65	23.53	17.65	35.29	25.00	21.50
	DEPARTMENT	4.06446	4	1.09405		543	3.31	5.71	19.71	23.76	47.51		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.02100	4	1.06996	0.40	5,144	2.94	6.05	20.45	27.12	43.45		
	COLLEGE	4.00021	4	1.11421	0.37	28,524	3.84	6.58	19.28	26.33	43.98		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	3.70588	4	0.91956		17	0.00	11.76	23.53	47.06	17.65	47.22	42.02
	DEPARTMENT	3.73162	4	1.07269		544	3.86	8.46	25.92	34.19	27.57		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.79067	4	1.11224	0.08	5,145	3.85	8.59	25.64	28.49	33.43		
	COLLEGE	3.93157	4	1.09123	0.21	28,481	3.22	7.56	21.21	28.88	39.13		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	3.76471	4	1.09141		17	5.88	5.88	17.65	47.06	23.53	69.44	56.03
	DEPARTMENT	3.35780	3	1.21965		545	7.71	16.70	30.64	22.02	22.94		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.63528	4	1.23196	-0.11	5,141	6.73	11.65	25.42	23.75	32.45		
	COLLEGE	3.79851	4	1.21452	0.03	28,518	6.03	9.54	21.05	25.30	38.08		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	3.70588	4	0.98518		17	0.00	11.76	29.41	35.29	23.53	58.33	42.67
	DEPARTMENT	3.60000	4	1.15746		545	5.32	11.19	29.36	26.42	27.71		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.76463	4	1.18028	0.05	5,145	5.50	9.25	23.42	26.94	34.89		
	COLLEGE	3.88842	4	1.16947	0.16	28,500	5.04	8.31	19.44	27.21	40.01		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.00000	4	0.93541		17	0.00	11.76	5.88	52.94	29.41	58.33	46.58
	DEPARTMENT	3.83088	4	1.03923		544	2.76	6.07	29.04	29.60	32.54		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.91694	4	1.10019	-0.08	5,141	3.52	7.06	22.70	27.64	39.08		
	COLLEGE	3.97592	4	1.10809	-0.02	28,534	3.55	7.29	19.46	27.42	42.28		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	3.29412	3	0.91956		17	5.88	5.88	47.06	35.29	5.88	41.67	23.97
	DEPARTMENT	3.37798	3	0.96266		545	3.49	11.19	42.20	30.28	12.84		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.66979	4	0.98640	0.38	4,803	2.83	7.31	31.69	36.39	21.78		
	COLLEGE	3.79018	4	0.98798	0.50	27,662	2.53	6.35	27.26	37.29	26.57		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	2.70588	3	0.68599		17	5.88	23.53	64.71	5.88	0.00	2.78	0.69
	DEPARTMENT	3.13528	3	0.81648		547	3.11	10.79	62.89	15.90	7.31		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.30393	3	0.83338	0.72	4,830	1.82	7.14	61.39	18.12	11.53		
	COLLEGE	3.44236	3	0.84230	0.87	27,733	1.32	5.33	55.00	24.51	13.85		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	3.18750	3	0.83417		16	0.00	18.75	50.00	25.00	6.25	52.78	26.37
	DEPARTMENT	3.20917	3	1.01293		545	4.77	15.96	45.50	21.10	12.66		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.50062	3	1.03336	0.30	4,814	3.34	11.05	37.60	28.21	19.80		
	COLLEGE	3.61663	4	1.04383	0.41	27,655	3.19	9.59	33.11	30.60	23.51		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	3.11765	3	0.85749		17	5.88	5.88	64.71	17.65	5.88	36.11	18.15
	DEPARTMENT	3.35165	3	1.02848		546	4.21	13.92	39.19	27.84	14.84		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.68368	4	1.11521	0.51	4,821	4.34	9.60	28.17	29.14	28.75		
	COLLEGE	3.80333	4	1.11505	0.61	27,666	4.03	8.70	23.64	30.16	33.47		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	4.88235	5	0.33211		17	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.76	88.24	83.33	90.75
	DEPARTMENT	4.60623	5	0.67503		546	0.37	1.10	5.31	23.99	69.23		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.49387	5	0.80008	-0.49	4,815	0.85	2.28	7.54	25.28	64.05		
	COLLEGE	4.48070	5	0.82058	-0.49	27,647	0.96	2.66	7.45	25.21	63.72		

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2012

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2514-014

Section Title: Disc-PHYS 2514-010

Instructor: Carolyn Bertsche

Total Enrollment: 38

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. worked in groups. relevant to material. smart teacher
2. assignments did little to improve my understanding or learning
3. come up with own material for discussion periods. dont make attendance mandatory
4. fair

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
4. I learned more from my TA than I actually did in the class. I was glad that there was a discussion with this course.

1. The one on one course setting is a must for physics.
2. Small classroom.
- 3.
4. This discussion was excellent.

1. The discussions.
2. Little actual test review.
3. Spend more time discussing matters on tests.
4. Went just as expected.

1. Carolyn is a good Ta. She explains the material we need to know for our homework and works well with the students.
2. There aren't any.
3. Maybe lecture a little bit longer over the subject matter.
4. Great teacher. She doesn't spend too much time lecturing, which gives us the time we need to complete our assignment. I really like Carolyn as a physics TA.

1. The concepts in the class that were introduced followed directly with the lecture and helped me to understand them firmly.
2. We only did a few concepts.
3. Expand and do multiple concepts in the dicussions.
4. It was productive and helped me understand the few concepts we went over.

1. Helped with free body diagrams
- 2.
- 3.
4. I thought it was helpful

- 1.
2. I didn't learn much. Working in groups isn't helpful for everyone.
- 3.
4. Not so great.

eValuate Report - Spring 2012

1. Working with others really helped me understand what we were learning if I was confused.

2. Sometimes we didn't have enough time to finish the in-class assignment.

3. I really enjoyed the instructor's teaching.

4. It was a good class. I liked that Callie went over the lesson before every class and gave us hints on how to do the in-class assignment.

1. She did an awesome job of explaining things and showing us how to work through problems.

2.

3.

4. Love her!

1. She always explained the topic very well before starting assignments. She also did a great job of answering any questions the class asked.

2.

3.

4. I like the small section, and thought the TA did an excellent job explaining the material each week.

1. Graded on completion and group work

2. conceptual questions instead of questions with numbers

3. teach concepts in lecture and do real examples in discussion

4. Didn't enjoy it

1.

2. She was not very patient in explaining concepts to students.

3.

4.

1. Made us use the info in class to solve harder problems that needed lots of different concepts from class. Also made us practice manipulating long formulas of variables which was really good practice.

2. None really.

3. You did a good job.

4. Helpful.

1. -explanations of relevant concepts and equations before we began the worksheets

2. -only things related to the worksheets were discussed. Other physics questions or topics were ignored.

3. -It would be nice if our instructor could teach us the material and answer general questions instead of being forced to give us a worksheet.

4. It was okay. I would definitely prefer for the instructor to be able to talk about things besides the worksheet.

1. The discussions reinforced the material. Callie was also a great, enthusiastic TA.

2. The tests took horrendously long to be returned, and the assignments spent too long on the relatively easy momentum concepts.

3. Any issues I had with the class were not with Callie; she was great.

4. I loved my TA but sadly think I learned more physics in non-calculus AP Physics B than this class.

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2012

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2514-016

Section Title: Disc-PHYS 2514-010

Instructor: Carolyn Bertsche

Total Enrollment: 36

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	3.07692	3	0.95407		13	7.69	15.38	38.46	38.46	0.00	13.89	12.05
	DEPARTMENT	3.53663	4	1.01165		546	4.21	7.51	37.18	32.60	18.50		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.72157	4	1.03382	0.62	5,161	3.53	6.96	29.20	34.47	25.85		
	COLLEGE	3.85625	4	1.02199	0.76	28,606	2.90	6.36	23.97	35.76	31.01		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	3.84615	4	1.06819		13	0.00	7.69	38.46	15.38	38.46	44.44	36.48
	DEPARTMENT	3.89358	4	1.10964		545	4.04	7.16	21.65	29.72	37.43		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.99748	4	1.08817	0.14	5,155	3.43	6.46	19.34	28.46	42.31		
	COLLEGE	4.13109	4	1.05423	0.27	28,583	2.77	5.80	15.83	26.73	48.86		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	2.91667	3	1.08362		12	16.67	0.00	66.67	8.33	8.33	5.56	4.24
	DEPARTMENT	4.06446	4	1.09405		543	3.31	5.71	19.71	23.76	47.51		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.02100	4	1.06996	1.03	5,144	2.94	6.05	20.45	27.12	43.45		
	COLLEGE	4.00021	4	1.11421	0.97	28,524	3.84	6.58	19.28	26.33	43.98		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	3.46154	3	1.33012		13	7.69	15.38	30.77	15.38	30.77	27.78	27.69
	DEPARTMENT	3.73162	4	1.07269		544	3.86	8.46	25.92	34.19	27.57		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.79067	4	1.11224	0.30	5,145	3.85	8.59	25.64	28.49	33.43		
	COLLEGE	3.93157	4	1.09123	0.43	28,481	3.22	7.56	21.21	28.88	39.13		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	2.84615	3	1.28103		13	15.38	23.08	38.46	7.69	15.38	25.00	14.98
	DEPARTMENT	3.35780	3	1.21965		545	7.71	16.70	30.64	22.02	22.94		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.63528	4	1.23196	0.64	5,141	6.73	11.65	25.42	23.75	32.45		
	COLLEGE	3.79851	4	1.21452	0.78	28,518	6.03	9.54	21.05	25.30	38.08		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	3.07692	3	1.32045		13	7.69	30.77	30.77	7.69	23.08	25.00	17.26
	DEPARTMENT	3.60000	4	1.15746		545	5.32	11.19	29.36	26.42	27.71		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.76463	4	1.18028	0.58	5,145	5.50	9.25	23.42	26.94	34.89		
	COLLEGE	3.88842	4	1.16947	0.69	28,500	5.04	8.31	19.44	27.21	40.01		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	3.46154	3	1.19829		13	7.69	0.00	61.54	0.00	30.77	19.44	21.82
	DEPARTMENT	3.83088	4	1.03923		544	2.76	6.07	29.04	29.60	32.54		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.91694	4	1.10019	0.41	5,141	3.52	7.06	22.70	27.64	39.08		
	COLLEGE	3.97592	4	1.10809	0.46	28,534	3.55	7.29	19.46	27.42	42.28		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	3.15385	3	1.06819		13	7.69	15.38	38.46	30.77	7.69	33.33	15.75
	DEPARTMENT	3.37798	3	0.96266		545	3.49	11.19	42.20	30.28	12.84		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.66979	4	0.98640	0.52	4,803	2.83	7.31	31.69	36.39	21.78		
	COLLEGE	3.79018	4	0.98798	0.64	27,662	2.53	6.35	27.26	37.29	26.57		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.07692	3	0.86232		13	7.69	0.00	76.92	7.69	7.69	44.44	26.03
	DEPARTMENT	3.13528	3	0.81648		547	3.11	10.79	62.89	15.90	7.31		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.30393	3	0.83338	0.27	4,830	1.82	7.14	61.39	18.12	11.53		
	COLLEGE	3.44236	3	0.84230	0.43	27,733	1.32	5.33	55.00	24.51	13.85		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	3.15385	3	0.89872		13	0.00	23.08	46.15	23.08	7.69	41.67	21.92
	DEPARTMENT	3.20917	3	1.01293		545	4.77	15.96	45.50	21.10	12.66		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.50062	3	1.03336	0.34	4,814	3.34	11.05	37.60	28.21	19.80		
	COLLEGE	3.61663	4	1.04383	0.44	27,655	3.19	9.59	33.11	30.60	23.51		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	3.00000	3	1.15470		13	7.69	30.77	23.08	30.77	7.69	19.44	12.67
	DEPARTMENT	3.35165	3	1.02848		546	4.21	13.92	39.19	27.84	14.84		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.68368	4	1.11521	0.61	4,821	4.34	9.60	28.17	29.14	28.75		
	COLLEGE	3.80333	4	1.11505	0.72	27,666	4.03	8.70	23.64	30.16	33.47		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	4.84615	5	0.37553		13	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.38	84.62	63.89	84.25
	DEPARTMENT	4.60623	5	0.67503		546	0.37	1.10	5.31	23.99	69.23		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.49387	5	0.80008	-0.44	4,815	0.85	2.28	7.54	25.28	64.05		
	COLLEGE	4.48070	5	0.82058	-0.45	27,647	0.96	2.66	7.45	25.21	63.72		

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2012

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: PHYS 2514-016

Section Title: Disc-PHYS 2514-010

Instructor: Carolyn Bertsche

Total Enrollment: 36

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 teacher clearly stated expectations for each class.
2. The class didn't allow much opportunity to ask about material from lectures.
3. Explaining material from lectures would have been beneficial.
4. At many times, this class seemed like busy work.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
4. A little more hands on with the class would help out most people.

1. The fact that we got to work out the problems in groups
2. some of the groups would have weaker members and would not learn as much from the smarter individuals in the group
3. Talk more about the concepts instead of just being straight forward and saying this is the answer and that's it
4. It was okay, could have been a little more helpful, but overall it was okay

1. The instructor was extremely nice and helpful. She had a sense of humor, which is awesome. Answered every question and provided insights on how to accomplish the material.
2. The material is sometimes really hard to understand.
3. Can not think of any. Our instructor's teaching method seemed fine to me.
4. Enjoyed it. Learned a good amount. Helped review the material from lecture during the week.

1. The worksheets usually corresponded well to lecture and were a good way to practice applying what we learned.
- 2.
3. I thought Callie was great - she was helpful and excited about the material and willing to answer questions.
4. I enjoyed this course

1. The discussion work sheets were a good way of practice.
2. There wasn't really any teaching. We just broke up into groups and went to work.
3. Go into more detail about formulas and the content of the chapter we are covering that week. It also be good to give a recap of the lecture that week.
4. It was somewhat boring but it was nice to be able to leave when we were done with our work.

1. Very good at giving just enough help, but letting students figure it out themselves.
2. Some topics were repetitive.
3. Not much, instructing was spot on.
4. Very helpful to me.

1. Callie offered a good alternative perspective on the content from Physics. She presented the material in a way that she remembered learning it as a student, which helped us think beyond the shallow teachings of the lecture professor (Michael Santos). The class was small and students were able to ask questions and have them answered.
2. Unfortunately the class was only once a week. Also the class often ended early, when I'm sure there could be more to be done.
3. Fill the scheduled time with additional content.
4. A delightful way to spice up Physics

eValueate Report - Spring 2012

1. The course helped to reinforce the concepts learned in the lecture class. The assignments provided were interesting and at least moderately enjoyable. The instructor was readily able to answer questions and provide help on the material.
2. The assignments provided could be somewhat long and complicated in the work was necessary to complete the assignments.
3. The instructor's teaching was satisfactory and I can't think of anything that could be done to improve the teaching from my perspective.
4. Overall this course was the best recitation I've had, and if all recitations were like this I would find my overall opinion of them much higher.

1. It provided an interactive group activity.

2. I disliked the teaching style. The 'mini' lecture before the worksheet never seemed helpful, and it became agrivating when the instructor had to help everyone one at a time.

3. Perhaps more detailed examples before beginning the worksheet would help. Also, more active and involved activities may stimulate the learning environment as opposed to my desire to finish and leave as fast as possible learning the minimum amount of material needed to get out.

4. I would love to take this course again if some of my proposed changes would be made.

1. It was good to be able to work in a group to solve the problems, and I thought that the worksheets themselves were generally well written and focused on the big concepts that we needed to know as well as walking us through the steps we needed to follow to be well prepared to do other problems of similar sort.

2. I felt like there was a lot of repeat (lots of free body diagrams). I would have been helped more if the kinds of problems we did in discussion lined up better with what we were learning in class to reinforce new topics rather than reviewing the old ones and slowly adding onto them. Also, I would have preferred smaller groups (maybe pairs) because on the couple of occasions where I didn't understand the problem, my group didn't slow down to explain it to me.

3. The teaching was fine. I always understood when she explained. I just felt that the things she was explaining didn't contribute to my success in the physics course overall.

4. The discussion group was fine. I didn't feel like it was a waste of my time because any practice is good practice. The physics class overall, however, I really struggled with.