

UWYO: Arts & Sciences

Fall 2016 Arts and Sciences Teaching Evaluations

Course: Discussion: MATH-2210-22: Discussion : MATH-2210-22 : 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.

- Andrew was a good instructor for our discussion section. Whenever I had questions, he was able to answer them and clear up whatever I did not understand. I believe I heard Andrew was studying for a PhD, and it's cool because when he was discussing a certain concept or topic in our discussion, he'd pose us questions in such a way so that you could exhaustively prove or disprove concepts, which I find fascinating. I love studying mathematics and the methods of proving theories and proper ways of stating such theories and going about proving them, which Andrew shared with us, and I really enjoyed. One complaint I had was when we formed our group at the beginning of the semester, we had 4 people, then one of them deserted us for another group. MUTINY!!!
- As a discussion TA, he is very effective at explaining the material and helping students through problems without doing the problems for them. I only have one complaint; at least for our discussion group, he seems to find things that are inconsequential to take points off for.
- Andrew is very helpful on the discussion problems. He also is very good at explaining concepts in a different way than Charlie does, something in a better way.
- Andrew's was difficult to follow at times.
- I think he did an excellent job as my TA. I rather enjoyed his enthusiasm for the subject and how he presented information. He was very patient and helpful when asked questions during discussions.
- Good at explaining difficult concepts, nice to have another view on topics.
- Mr. Herring was very adept at explaining the lessons and discussion problems. The grading seemed harsh however.
- He was helpful when asked questions.
- Andrew is a good teacher, he's excellent at explaining things that we don't understand, and it's a joy to be in his class. If there was a possibility to go over tests more before continuing onto the next unit, I think it would help greatly.
- He knew the material well and it helped a lot. He was good about talking through a problem without giving the answer and I appreciated that.
- He was incredibly patient and knowledgeable. I do feel as though too many points were taken off on the packets for small errors.
- Good at explaining the difficult concepts
- Super chill dude that is very excited about math and makes learning fun. I haven't had a grad student teach better than him.
- Herring was helpful and knew the material well. However, his grading was hard and often too picky.
- Wonderful instructor. Andrew was very helpful in discussion. The information he provided us with was both captivating and useful. If there were to be any sort of improvement, I would suggest providing pizza regularly. Only joking, thanks for the amazing semester Andrew.
- Great teacher! I had a really hard time in Charlie's class because he wouldn't give definitions and wouldn't explain why things were happening the way they were, he would only give examples. Andrew helped explain these things to me. I wish I would have figured this out earlier in the semester because Andrew could have helped me when I was struggling at the beginning.
- Andrew is so helpful and an amazing guy. His way of teaching is so unique and professional.
- Great job of interacting with the class, great math jokes. I really appreciated that when asked for help he goes through the problem in such a way that makes the student work towards the answer on their own.
- he is a good aid who knows what he is talking about.
- Andrew has a good grasp and knowledge on the subject matter however when asking him questions he often has an abstract way of explaining the answers which sometimes leaves students more confused. Andrew was good about explaining certain misunderstandings that were common among individuals to the whole class so everyone could better understand the questions and provide feedback regarding any further misunderstandings.
- He did a good job of always answering our questions with out giving the answer away, he helped us work through the problem so that we understood it and could translate it to other problems and exam.
- Andrew was very helpful in discussion in answering questions and guiding us to solve the problems presented to us.
- I love that Calculus now has a discussion portion, because I learn most of the material from the discussions. And Andrew does a good job answering any questions we have.
- In general, Andrew was great at walking us through problems that we had trouble with. A mark of a good educator is that he/she forces the student to think their way through the problem, rather than giving the answer outright. The grading for the course was honestly a bit strange. Initially, I intensely dislike the forced group grading of the section, but because it allowed us to tackle problems more efficiently, I eventually lightened my attitude. In the future, I would suggest optional groups and individual grading, rather than basing the group's grade off of a single person's answers. The grading of the materials didn't feel very definite. Notation mistakes lowered our grade as much as almost completely failing the problem.
- Extremely helpful and knowledgeable with questions. The only thing that could be more effective is working more examples in discussion. Making the discussion questions 1 or 2 problems shorter would allow for time to work at least one example problem.

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

Andrew Herring

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means			
Excellent	(5)	19	54.29%						4.43	4.24	4.00	
Good	(4)	12	34.29%									
Satisfactory	(3)	4	11.43%									
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	
35/40 (87.5%)	4.43	0.70	5.00	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-2210-22: Discussion : MATH-2210-22 : 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)	15	42.86%								
Good			(4)	11	31.43%								
Satisfactory			(3)	7	20%								
Poor			(2)	2	5.71%								
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	
35/40 (87.5%)		4.11	0.93	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)	19	54.29%								
Good			(4)	14	40%								
Satisfactory			(3)	2	5.71%								
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	
35/40 (87.5%)		4.49	0.61	5.00	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)	9	25.71%								
No			(1)	26	74.29%								
						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		
35/40 (87.5%)	1.26	0.44	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)	8	80%									
Good				(4)	2	20%									
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	
10/40 (25%)		4.80	0.42	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-2210-22: Discussion : MATH-2210-22 : 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)	17	50%								
Good			(4)	16	47.06%								
Satisfactory			(3)	1	2.94%								
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		
34/40 (85%)	4.47	0.56	4.50	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)	19	55.88%						4.44	4.25	3.98
Good				(4)	11	32.35%								
Satisfactory				(3)	4	11.76%								
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
34/40 (85%)		4.44	0.70	5.00	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)	20	58.82%						3.53	3.40	3.16
Probably				(3)	12	35.29%								
Probably not				(2)	2	5.88%								
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		
34/40 (85%)		3.53	0.61	4.00	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)	32	94.12%						4.94	4.65	4.56			
90%				(4)	2	5.88%											
75%				(3)	0	0%											
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			
34/40 (85%)		4.94	0.24	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-2210-22: Discussion : MATH-2210-22 : 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)	16	47.06%								
Somewhat interested			(2)	17	50%								
Not interested at all			(1)	1	2.94%								
						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	
34/40 (85%)		2.44	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)	10	28.57%								
A good deal				(4)	18	51.43%								
Moderate				(3)	5	14.29%								
A little				(2)	1	2.86%								
Very little				(1)	1	2.86%								
							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
35/40 (87.5%)		4.00	0.91	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	22.86%						4.06	4.32	3.98
B				(4)	21	60%								
C				(3)	6	17.14%								
D				(2)	0	0%								
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
35/40 (87.5%)		4.06	0.64	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)	3	8.57%								
Sophomore				(2)	21	60%								
Junior				(3)	4	11.43%								
Senior				(4)	4	11.43%								
Graduate Student				(5)	0	0%								
Other				(6)	3	8.57%								
							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
35/40 (87.5%)		2.60	1.31	2.00	15,003		2.61	1.34	3.00	2,443		2.21	1.21	2.00