

UWYO: Arts & Sciences

Spring 2016 Arts and Sciences Teaching Evaluations

Course: Calculus II : MATH-2205-01

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.

Return Rate 28/38 (73.68%)

- Mr.Herring's teaching skills are incredible given he is a graduate student. I would like him to teach a bit higher level mathematics like Calculus III or Applied Differential Equations.
- Was late on posting assignments. Fell behind on imputing grades. Changed due dates when he did fall behind. Would rush the end of chapters before exams and expected us to be prepared on the new information in a day. Overall alright teacher just needs improvements
- Andrew Herring is a good teacher. The only issue is that there is not enough time for instruction of the material.
- Andrew Herring was my teacher last semester,his teaching style change dramatically bad. Andrew would forget to post assignments and post them 2 days before it's due, and teach us the material 1 day before it's due. He graded quizzes harder than other teachers as a result did not support many people to get more than a C. Herring would need to approve on all of these things, something that he did good was helping us understand material.
- He is a very effective teacher-- I had him for Calc I, and have enjoyed his style in Calc II just as much. However, in this course, he has been behind the game significantly on making sure that we know when assignments are due. There have been several times this semester when a MyMathLab due date was pushed back a day or two literally an hour before the original due date, or when he did not give us the written homework assignment until two days before it was due. This was highly frustrating for me as a student, as I always make sure to get things done several hours before the due date, and so I never received the benefits of these due dates being extended, despite the fact that I was only being a good student. Also, there were some students in the class who repeatedly asked very irrelevant questions, who Andrew could have done a better job of shutting down in order to make sure the class covered what it needed to.
- Great teacher presented the material in an effective and understandable way. Quizzes were tough and the mymathlab seemed really unfair. Besides that the class was great.
- Andrew Herring is absolutely an astonishing teacher. The lecture method is very effective (starting with questions/ideas, showing examples, then defining theorems/ideas). Personally I really enjoyed the class and felt like I got a lot out of it. If I could make one suggestion, don't curse. This was rare, but occasionally Andrew would use a curse word throughout the semester. Personally I feel like this is slightly unprofessional and not necessary. Obviously this is an extremely minor point, and possibly only a personal pet peeve. Overall, five out of five stars, would return for more.
- Apart from telling an international student that their question was stupid, the teaching method was good. Administratively, the class wasn't very good.
- Andrew was an overall great instructor, and I wouldn't recommend he change anything as the course material was presented in easy to understand examples with clear reasons. He was also very personable and professional which made coming to an 8 am math class significantly less miserable. 10/10 would recommend, an asset to the math department's teaching staff.
- I love how well Andrew organizes his classes. He makes sure to write on the board what section we are going over, as well as the topic, and that really helps when I take notes. He is great at getting things across, and also hilarious, which makes me pay attention. I really feel like he wants his students to do well, and he is available outside of class a lot.
- Very good teacher, I enjoy and learn a lot from the lectures and often try not to miss them(even though there at 8 am).
- He is/was a very great instructor and helped me learn a lot in a very tough course. He made the class challenging, but fair. He was also very excellent with explaining theorems as well as giving/explaining example problems. Really the only legitimate "complaint" I could say is that every once in a blue moon I couldn't read what he was writing as his hand writing was small at times (although I also was in the back of the class so that was also on me for sitting farther away).
- For the most part with what Andrew was allowed to work with in terms of assignments, materials, and teaching methodology he did great. I wish there were some other supplementary source where I can look at. For instance when Andrew was doing math problems on the board I noticed certain styles that he had that made the problem faster and easier to work with. That style of problem solving simply cannot be seen in either the math book, or my math lab.
- I think Andrew did a good job teaching this semester. I think the surprise quizzes are a good way for people to check how their doing in the class and to keep up attendance though I wish they were worth a smaller proportion of the final grade. The homework/ quizzes were usually graded quickly which was beneficial.
- I enjoyed the way Andrew addressed the class and demonstrated examples of the problems on the board in a fashion that I could easily understand. I would, however, enjoy more time spent working as a class on example or demonstration problems to help get a personal feel of the problems in class.
- He is good teacher.
- I thought that the course was taught extremely well, and that Andrew conveyed the material well and helped give reasoning to the subject matter that we learned.
- I felt like this semester Andrew did a tremendous job on teaching the class, the only true complaint that I might have is the inconsistencies in grading, especially on the quiz's. at the beginning of the semester they were graded more harshly but towards the end they were more treated as a way to work on problems and were good challenges but graded much more lightly.
- I can not say anything about the assignments considering that those are determined by the math department. I enjoy Andrews teaching style and I think his best quality when he comes to teaching is his ability to make connections of the math to the theories.
- He taught everything in a way that was easily understandable and had plenty of time available for us to come in and get the help we needed. He also had reviews before the exams that helped out a ton. The online homework was useless, but most of the written homework was helpful.
- He was so good. His teaching was affective. But for me he wasn't so good in grads. he used to take points from me with no mathematics reason. Fore example, once he gave me 1/3 in a problem as I wrote therefore instead of equal. I did all the mathematics step correct and I didn't forget any step, beside my final answer was correct. He took one point from me as I didn't wrote equal in one step and the other point as I wrote therefore not equal. He just gave me one point for my answer. This happened with me many times. I felt unfair and I talked to him, He told me I'm so carful with the writing style not only mathematics. I have evidence for what I'm saying all the paper with me. Also, once I was sick and I sent him an email telling him I wasn't able to do my math lab, can you please extend the due date for me, he didn't reply for my email and didn't open it to me. Once, I told my friend at the same class, I didn't like Andrew so much, He told me why, he is perfect and very helpful every time I ask him for extending any due date, he help me. I got a chock of this, I was thinking that he is like this with all the students. But honestly, I asked him once to extend the due date for the written homework and He did. Yet, many times I felt he is not fair with me for the grads.
- He is very helpful in office hours, MAC, and mathlab.
- He did very well on preparing material , spend his time with us before the exam, he willing to help student. I hope writing homework assignments can be reduce the quantity, it is so painful to see Andrew need to grade so many homework. In class we really enjoy Andrew enthusiasm, he always teach us in concept instead of the text books. He did try many way to teach us, for example, play team work game that is really helpful for us to learned. Something he can improve I will say he need to write more large size in the board something we can't see in the back but when we inform him he will immediate write in bigger font again. Overall this is an excellent class. I love Teacher Andrew teacher method very much. Good job Andrew keep it on.
- He really seems to enjoy Calculus, and that helps him be a more effective teacher. The first written HW assignment was graded very harshly; it would have been nice to have some warning about that. It was not graded that way in Calculus I. MyMathlab takes a RICHIOUS amount of time, especially for the amount of points that it is worth. I sometimes feel the MyMathlab assignments help me learn the material, but not always, and it is definitely not the most efficient way to learn material.
- Material presented followed the examples from the book, which allowed me to understand and follow the text better, but meant there sometimes weren't enough different examples provided to fully understand the material and homework. Allowed plenty of opportunity for asking relevant questions and active student participation during class, helping student's comprehension. Interacted well with students, and explained how certain ideas were relevant or interesting, creating more interest in mathematics in generals. There were a few students who tended to do a lot of talking, whispering to each other throughout class and repeatedly interrupting Mr. Herring, frequently asking about tangential topics rather than the problem at hand. Personally, this made it harder for me to hear, difficult to follow the lesson due to the interruptions, and was very frustrating. This issue tended to go unchecked and continued throughout the entire semester.
- I really enjoy Andrew's teaching style and it is obvious he cares a great deal about the class and the students. I really liked when we worked out problems in small groups and I think that it may be helpful to do this more. Maybe like on Friday to go back over material to make sure students are understanding. However, I recognize the time restraint to try and get all of the course material taught.
- For the wirtten homework, wish he can let us extent, and can let us retake the quiz.
- I like the way he teachers, he is also a very considerate teacher. Would definitely recommend him to others.

UWYO: Arts & Sciences

Spring 2016 Arts and Sciences Teaching Evaluations

Course: Calculus II : MATH-2205-01

Instructor: Andrew Herring *

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

Andrew Herring

Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means			
Excellent			(5)	18	54.55%						4.33	4.27	4.25
Good			(4)	9	27.27%								
Satisfactory			(3)	5	15.15%								
Poor			(2)	1	3.03%								
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	
33/38 (86.84%)		4.33	0.85	5.00	19,008	4.27	0.92	5.00	1,954	4.25	0.95	5.00	

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

Andrew Herring

Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means			
Excellent			(5)	17	51.52%						4.27	4.28	4.23
Good			(4)	10	30.3%								
Satisfactory			(3)	4	12.12%								
Poor			(2)	2	6.06%								
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	
33/38 (86.84%)		4.27	0.91	5.00	18,871	4.28	0.92	5.00	1,948	4.23	0.94	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	51.52%						4.45	4.38	4.33				
Good				(4)	14	42.42%												
Satisfactory				(3)	2	6.06%												
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				
33/38 (86.84%)		4.45	0.62	5.00	18.873		4.38	0.93	5.00	1.945		4.33	0.97	5.00				

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)	21	63.64%													
No				(1)	12	36.36%													
												0255075100		Instructor		College benchmark		Department benchmark	
Return Rate		Mean	STD	Median	College benchmark		Mean	STD	Median	Department benchmark		Mean	STD	Median					
33/38 (86.84%)		1.64	0.49	2.00	19,509		1.26	0.44	1.00	1,945		1.38	0.49	1.00					

UWYO: Arts & Sciences

Spring 2016 Arts and Sciences Teaching Evaluations

Course: Calculus II : MATH-2205-01

Instructor: Andrew Herring *

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)	15	71.43%								
Good			(4)	5	23.81%								
Satisfactory			(3)	1	4.76%								
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	
21/38 (55.26%)		4.67	0.58	5.00	5,609	4.55	0.84	5.00	797	4.47	0.88	5.00	

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

Response Option			Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means			
Excellent			(5)	19	57.58%								
Good			(4)	10	30.3%								
Satisfactory			(3)	4	12.12%								
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		
33/38 (86.84%)	4.45	0.71	5.00	18,762	4.32	0.85	5.00	1,942	4.41	0.83	5.00		

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

Andrew Herring

Response Option				Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means							
Excellent				(5)	18	54.55%												
Good				(4)	10	30.3%												
Satisfactory				(3)	5	15.15%												
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				
33/38 (86.84%)		4.39	0.75	5.00	18,776		4.27	0.96	5.00	1,944		4.22	1.03	5.00				

9 - Would you recommend this instructor to others?

Andrew Herring

Response Option				Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses			Means				
Most definitely				(4)	22	66.67%								
Probably				(3)	7	21.21%								
Probably not				(2)	3	9.09%								
Definitely not				(1)	1	3.03%								
							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
33/38 (86.84%)		3.52	0.80	4.00	18.772		3.43	0.81	4.00	1,947		3.38	0.87	4.00

UWYO: Arts & Sciences

Spring 2016 Arts and Sciences Teaching Evaluations

Course: Calculus II : MATH-2205-01

Instructor: Andrew Herring *

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

Response Option				Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means			
Over 90%				(5)	26	78.79%								
90%				(4)	3	9.09%								
75%				(3)	3	9.09%								
50%				(2)	1	3.03%								
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
33/38 (86.84%)		4.64	0.78	5.00	14,972		4.66	0.71	5.00	1,928		4.60	0.79	5.00

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)	12	37.5%												
Somewhat interested				(2)	18	56.25%												
Not interested at all				(1)	2	6.25%												
								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				
32/38 (84.21%)		2.31	0.59	2.00	14,976		2.32	0.69	2.00	1,924		2.13	0.70	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)	16	48.48%									
A good deal				(4)	13	39.39%									
Moderate				(3)	3	9.09%									
A little				(2)	0	0%									
Very little				(1)	1	3.03%									
							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	
33/38 (86.84%)		4.30	0.88	4.00	15,000		4.18	0.81	4.00	1,926		4.22	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)	7	21.21%											
B				(4)	10	30.3%											
C				(3)	14	42.42%											
D				(2)	1	3.03%											
F				(1)	1	3.03%											
							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			
33/38 (86.84%)		3.64	0.96	4.00	14,978		4.34	0.76	4.00	1,921		4.03	0.90	4.00			

UWYO: Arts & Sciences

Spring 2016 Arts and Sciences Teaching Evaluations

Course:

Calculus II : MATH-2205-01

Instructor:

Andrew Herring *

14 - What is your class standing?												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means			
Freshman		(1)	16	48.48%								
Sophomore		(2)	11	33.33%								
Junior		(3)	4	12.12%								
Senior		(4)	1	3.03%								
Graduate Student		(5)	0	0%								
Other		(6)	1	3.03%								
					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	
33/38 (86.84%)	1.82	1.10	2.00	15,024	2.73	1.33	3.00	1,932	2.33	1.30	2.00	