

UWYO: Arts & Sciences

Fall 2016 Arts and Sciences Teaching Evaluations

Course: Discussion: MATH-2210-21: Discussion : MATH-2210-21 : Andrew Herring
Instructor: Andrew Herring *

1 - Please comment on the Andrew Herring's teaching effectiveness, assignments, materials used in the course, methods (what was done best, as well as what can be improved) and anything else about this course.

- very knowledgeable in regards to the course material. made himself available to students to ask for help.
- The packets for each discussion were super helpful for learning the material and I really liked having a set amount of time to sit down and work over them with other students. It helped me learn a lot. I liked how Andrew started every discussion section with comments or tips.
- I felt like the discussions were being treated as weekly quizzes rather than in-class worksheets designed to help us learn. In-part I felt this way because the worksheets were being graded more strictly than I felt was necessary. An example of this would be the following: A deduction of 10% for not including equal signs when breaking computing an equation into multiple steps spread over several rolls on the paper. This would mean for a worksheet with 8 problems, that forgetting or not bothering to put an equal sign on each roll of a problem is almost as bad as getting every aspect of the problem completely wrong. In addition, I felt that Andrew was hesitant in pointing out what steps you were missing when you solved a problem incorrectly when asked during class. I feel that he has improved on this somewhat as the semester has went on however. It is entirely possible that I missed the point of discussion however, and maybe they are meant to be weekly quizzes designed to test us. If that's the case then you can ignore my comments above, and to some extent my negative scores below.
- Andrew was a Very good SI instructor and explained the material very well I order to gain a high understanding of the material.
- I believe Andrew did an excellent job teaching and walking us through problems. However, due to the time restraint as well as the number of people asking questions, it was sometimes difficult to ask him questions. The assignments we were given were challenging and his method of teaching was helpful because he made you think critically without just giving you the mechanism of finishing a problem. He made you truly understand the concepts being taught.
- He is very helpful without giving the answer to the question. He gives you a path to take to reach the correct answer and this method I feel is very useful.
- Andrew doesn't do much lecture due to the structure of a discussion section. He is helpful when discussing problems with an individual group, but sometimes poses questions to the classes as a whole or has conversation to the class as a whole that is confusing regarding the subject material.
- He is very helpful and nice. Thanks to his support through out the semester I think I will do better then I expect.
- Very helpful and professional in conducting discussion.
- Andrew I see a strong speaker and effective teacher. He is always open to help on discussion problems while not giving students a direct answer.
- Ties in nicely with lecture. Some material is skipped over though. If you miss something small on a problem you miss a whole problem and it sucks.
- Does a pretty good job of explaining the material.
- Andrew was a very effective instructor for this course. I asked him an unbelievable amount of questions and he always answered them politely and sufficiently.
- I thoroughly enjoyed Andrews teachings. I struggled with this content this semester and he helped me have a better understanding throughout the class. At times his explanation was even more clear than Dr. Angevine.
- Andrew Herring is a good TA and the way he explains the problem or the solution is really easy to understand
- Great.
- Andrew was very helpful when asking questions and he was always willing to explain questions if people did not understand them. He is friendly and approachable which is nice because there were many times in the discussion that i needed to ask questions and i felt confident in asking them
- Andrew is very smart and makes it challenging but yet helping, when a question as a student is present.
- Andrew is a very interesting person and is extremely knowledgeable about the material, however he struggles explaining the content to those with less knowledgeable. Andrew also can become very frustrated with the class when we don't immediately understand a new concept. I would recommend Andrew to a friend but I would hope he becomes better at explaining these difficult concepts.
- He's pretty good. He was very helpful whenever we had questions. He didn't just give the answer but he usually asked us more questions to get us to the right place.

2 - How would you evaluate the presentation of materials in this course?

Andrew Herring

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means		
Excellent	(5)	14	41.18%						4.26	4.24	4.00
Good	(4)	16	47.06%								
Satisfactory	(3)	3	8.82%								
Poor	(2)	1	2.94%								
Unsatisfactory	(1)	0	0%								
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	College benchmark	Department benchmark
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median	College benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	Department benchmark	Mean	STD	Median
34/39 (87.18%)	4.26	0.75	4.00	19,127	4.24	0.95	5.00	2,452	4.00	1.10	4.00

UWYO: Arts & Sciences

Fall 2016 Arts and Sciences Teaching Evaluations

Course: Discussion: MATH-2210-21: Discussion : MATH-2210-21 : Andrew Herring

Instructor: Andrew Herring *

3 - How clear was the basis for evaluating students in this class?

Andrew Herring

Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means			
Excellent			(5)	9	26.47%								
Good			(4)	17	50%								
Satisfactory			(3)	7	20.59%								
Poor			(2)	1	2.94%								
Unsatisfactory			(1)	0	0%								
						0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	College benchmark	Department benchmark
Return Rate		Mean	STD	Median	College benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	Department benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	
34/39 (87.18%)		4.00	0.78	4.00	18,987	4.24	0.94	5.00	2,452	4.03	1.05	4.00	

4 - How would you evaluate the instructor's interaction with students during this class?

Andrew Herring

Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means			
Excellent			(5)	17	50%								
Good			(4)	14	41.18%								
Satisfactory			(3)	3	8.82%								
Poor			(2)	0	0%								
Unsatisfactory			(1)	0	0%								
						0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	College benchmark	Department benchmark
Return Rate		Mean	STD	Median	College benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	Department benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	
34/39 (87.18%)		4.41	0.66	4.50	19,074	4.34	0.97	5.00	2,449	4.06	1.18	4.00	

5 - Did you make arrangements for an office visit with Andrew Herring during this semester?

Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means		
Yes			(2)	3	8.82%							
No			(1)	31	91.18%							
						0255075100				Instructor	College benchmark	Department benchmark
Return Rate		Mean	STD	Median	College benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	Department benchmark	Mean	STD	Median
34/39 (87.18%)		1.09	0.29	1.00	19,840	1.27	0.44	1.00	2,440	1.33	0.47	1.00

6 - If, and only if, you answered yes to the previous question, how would you evaluate the Andrew Herring's interaction with you during office visit(s)?

Response Option				Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means				
Excellent				(5)	3	100%									
Good				(4)	0	0%									
Satisfactory				(3)	0	0%									
Poor				(2)	0	0%									
Unsatisfactory				(1)	0	0%									
								0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	College benchmark	Department benchmark
Return Rate		Mean	STD	Median	College benchmark		Mean	STD	Median	Department benchmark		Mean	STD	Median	
3/39 (7.69%)		5.00	0.00	5.00	5,752		4.52	0.86	5.00	863		4.29	1.10	5.00	

UWYO: Arts & Sciences

Fall 2016 Arts and Sciences Teaching Evaluations

Course: Discussion: MATH-2210-21: Discussion : MATH-2210-21 : Andrew Herring

Instructor: Andrew Herring *

7 - How would you rate Andrew Herring in making the course intellectually challenging?

Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means			
Excellent			(5)	15	45.45%						4.36	4.29	4.24
Good			(4)	15	45.45%								
Satisfactory			(3)	3	9.09%								
Poor			(2)	0	0%								
Unsatisfactory			(1)	0	0%								
						0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	College benchmark	Department benchmark
Return Rate		Mean	STD	Median	College benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	Department benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	
33/39 (84.62%)		4.36	0.65	4.00	18,886	4.29	0.87	4.00	2,441	4.24	0.93	4.00	

8 - What is your overall assessment of the instruction in this course?

Andrew Herring

Response Option				Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means			
Excellent				(5)	14	41.18%						4.24	4.25	3.98
Good				(4)	15	44.12%								
Satisfactory				(3)	4	11.76%								
Poor				(2)	1	2.94%								
Unsatisfactory				(1)	0	0%								
							0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	College benchmark	Department benchmark
Return Rate		Mean	STD	Median	College benchmark		Mean	STD	Median	Department benchmark		Mean	STD	Median
34/39 (87.18%)		4.24	0.78	4.00	18,960		4.25	0.99	5.00	2,455		3.98	1.16	4.00

9 - Would you recommend this instructor to others?

Andrew Herring

Response Option				Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means												
Most definitely				(4)	17	50%						3.47	3.40	3.16									
Probably				(3)	16	47.06%																	
Probably not				(2)	1	2.94%																	
Definitely not				(1)	0	0%																	
												0	25	50	75	100	Instructor		College benchmark		Department benchmark		
Return Rate		Mean		STD		Median		College benchmark		Mean		STD		Median		Department benchmark		Mean		STD		Median	
34/39 (87.18%)		3.47		0.56		3.50		18.927		3.40		0.83		4.00		2.446		3.16		0.97		3.00	

10 - What percentage of time have you attended this class?

Response Option				Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means						
Over 90%				(5)	33	97.06%											
90%				(4)	0	0%											
75%				(3)	1	2.94%											
50%				(2)	0	0%											
25%				(1)	0	0%											
							0	25	50	75	100	Instructor		College benchmark		Department benchmark	
Return Rate		Mean	STD	Median	College benchmark		Mean	STD	Median	Department benchmark		Mean	STD	Median			
34/39 (87.18%)		4.94	0.34	5.00	14,982		4.65	0.71	5.00	2,441		4.56	0.83	5.00			

UWYO: Arts & Sciences

Fall 2016 Arts and Sciences Teaching Evaluations

Course: Discussion: MATH-2210-21: Discussion : MATH-2210-21 : Andrew Herring

Instructor: Andrew Herring *

11 - In comparison to other classes you have taken at UW, how interested are you in the subject matter covered in this class?

Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means			
Very interested			(3)	8	23.53%								
Somewhat interested			(2)	23	67.65%								
Not interested at all			(1)	3	8.82%								
						0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	College benchmark	Department benchmark
Return Rate		Mean	STD	Median	College benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	Department benchmark	Mean	STD	Median	
34/39 (87.18%)		2.15	0.56	2.00	14,953	2.31	0.70	2.00	2,433	2.09	0.71	2.00	

12 - As honestly as possible, rate the effort you have put into this class?

Response Option				Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means			
A great deal				(5)	14	41.18%								
A good deal				(4)	15	44.12%								
Moderate				(3)	5	14.71%								
A little				(2)	0	0%								
Very little				(1)	0	0%								
0255075100								Instructor		College benchmark		Department benchmark		
Return Rate		Mean	STD	Median	College benchmark		Mean	STD	Median	Department benchmark		Mean	STD	Median
34/39 (87.18%)		4.26	0.71	4.00	15,003		4.19	0.80	4.00	2,441		4.23	0.80	4.00

13 - What grade do you expect to receive in this course?

Response Option				Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses			Means				
A				(5)	8	24.24%								
B				(4)	19	57.58%								
C				(3)	5	15.15%								
D				(2)	1	3.03%								
F				(1)	0	0%								
							0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	College benchmark	Department benchmark
Return Rate		Mean	STD	Median	College benchmark		Mean	STD	Median	Department benchmark		Mean	STD	Median
33/39 (84.62%)		4.03	0.73	4.00	14,951		4.32	0.78	4.00	2,426		3.98	0.90	4.00

14 - What is your class standing?

Response Option				Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means				
Freshman				(1)	0	0%									
Sophomore				(2)	24	70.59%									
Junior				(3)	8	23.53%									
Senior				(4)	2	5.88%									
Graduate Student				(5)	0	0%									
Other				(6)	0	0%									
								0	25	50	75	100	Instructor	College benchmark	Department benchmark
Return Rate		Mean	STD	Median	College benchmark		Mean	STD	Median	Department benchmark		Mean	STD	Median	
34/39 (87.18%)		2.35	0.60	2.00	15,003		2.61	1.34	3.00	2,443		2.21	1.21	2.00	