

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%											
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%								
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	

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%						4.47	4.29	4.24
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%											
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%								
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%								
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

UWYO: Arts & Sciences

Fall 2016 Arts and Sciences Teaching Evaluations

Course: Discussion: MATH-2210-25: Discussion : MATH-2210-25 : 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.

- Sometimes I felt he just complicated the subject more than it was already confusing us, and docked our grades for some pretty petty things. He also was giving mini lectures in the class instead of helping us get through the questions
- Andrew was fun to work with and he really helped clear up concepts that were hard to understand.
- Hes different but decent
- With this being a discussion class and just doing review problems he was very good. He always had an answer to the questions and did it in a way that made the concept stick a little better.
- When a student asks questions or says they do not know how to start this don't be condescending. They are asking for your help not to be put down by you. You are supposed to be here to help us understand. Not make us feel like we can't do this on our own.
- He was very helpful in discussions and explained key points that we needed to fully understand before each class.
- Andrew was a super valuable tool in my success in Calc 3. His discussions were so useful in actual practice of the concepts. Andrew was very helpful in answering question, but never handed anything to us. He always helped in the process of discovery on our own and never gave us the answers. I really think Andrew truly cared about our success.
- Andrew had an interesting style of instruction. For a discussion teacher, I think it was great. He comes across condescending, but if you ask for clarification or for help then he knows how to walk you through the problem, to where you are essentially the one solving it yourself.
- Great job! very knowledgeable. Very fair grading on discussion work! He was able to anticipate our struggle areas.
- This is the third semester that I have had the pleasure of having Mr. herring as a teacher, last semester I felt like he didn't quite care enough but it seems now that he really uped his game, he has made a great contribution to my learning and I know I am for the better.
- Effective teacher.
- Andrew is really helpful for specific questions. If you have a question about a problem that requires a particular concept he can explain it very well. However sometimes he will go over something at the beginning of the discussion without much context and that can be confusing sometimes.
- Andrew was a great discussion instructor overall. He helped clear anything up and would occasionally do a mini lecture in discussion if it was clear there was something we didn't completely understand. His grading was fair, and he always had a good attitude towards the students.
- I felt this class was taught excellently, and Mr. Herring was always helpful with questions about the subject, I very much enjoyed this professor and would gladly take any other class offered by him.
- Overall I found my questions answered thoroughly in this discussion. I had many questions, and Andrew always managed to coax the answers out of me rather than simply answering them immediately. He effectively taught supplemental material in a way that incorporated our background knowledge and furthered understanding of material from lectures.
- Over-all excellent discussion TA, however more concrete explanations would help more than the metaphor examples would.
- He instructed the class well
- The teacher was very excited about the material, which made learning much easier. The assignments were very well planned and went with lecture nicely.
- Stop grading discussion problems by picking a random one out of a group, it encourages students to find who is the best at a certain material and to mooch and copy. When you're offering help in class, slow down a bit and explain more thoroughly, you sometimes move a little too fast to be understood. Try to be more active during discussion, walk around instead of sitting, try to find problems people are having when doing their work. Otherwise, you're doing well.
- I think that a brief overview of the weekly material should be done at the beginning of each discussion each week. I say this because at times I had no idea what was going on and a little push off would have helped immensely.

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

Andrew Herring

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means		
Excellent	(5)	13	43.33%								
Good	(4)	10	33.33%								
Satisfactory	(3)	4	13.33%								
Poor	(2)	3	10%								
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
30/38 (78.95%)	4.10	0.99	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-2210-25: Discussion : MATH-2210-25 : 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)	10	33.33%								
Good			(4)	11	36.67%								
Satisfactory			(3)	7	23.33%								
Poor			(2)	1	3.33%								
Unsatisfactory			(1)	1	3.33%								
						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	
30/38 (78.95%)		3.93	1.01	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)	12	42.86%								
Good			(4)	9	32.14%								
Satisfactory			(3)	5	17.86%								
Poor			(2)	1	3.57%								
Unsatisfactory			(1)	1	3.57%								
						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	
28/38 (73.68%)		4.07	1.05	4.00	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)	3	10.34%								
No			(1)	26	89.66%								
						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	
29/38 (76.32%)		1.10	0.31	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)	2	50%								
Good			(4)	1	25%								
Satisfactory			(3)	0	0%								
Poor			(2)	1	25%								
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	
4/38 (10.53%)		4.00	1.41	4.50	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-2210-25: Discussion : MATH-2210-25 : 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	50%								
Good			(4)	12	40%								
Satisfactory			(3)	3	10%								
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	
30/38 (78.95%)		4.40	0.67	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)	13	43.33%											
Good				(4)	11	36.67%											
Satisfactory				(3)	5	16.67%											
Poor				(2)	1	3.33%											
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			
30/38 (78.95%)		4.20	0.85	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)	16	53.33%									
Probably				(3)	10	33.33%									
Probably not				(2)	2	6.67%									
Definitely not				(1)	2	6.67%									
								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	
30/38 (78.95%)		3.33	0.88	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)	27	90%														
90%				(4)	2	6.67%														
75%				(3)	1	3.33%														
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						
30/38 (78.95%)		4.87	0.43	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-2210-25: Discussion : MATH-2210-25 : 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)	11	36.67%								
Somewhat interested			(2)	17	56.67%								
Not interested at all			(1)	2	6.67%								
						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	
30/38 (78.95%)		2.30	0.60	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)	8	26.67%								
A good deal				(4)	19	63.33%								
Moderate				(3)	3	10%								
A little				(2)	0	0%								
Very little				(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
30/38 (78.95%)		4.17	0.59	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)	4	13.33%											
B				(4)	14	46.67%											
C				(3)	12	40%											
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			
30/38 (78.95%)		3.73	0.69	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)	4	13.33%								
Sophomore				(2)	16	53.33%								
Junior				(3)	10	33.33%								
Senior				(4)	0	0%								
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
30/38 (78.95%)		2.20	0.66	2.00	15,003		2.61	1.34	3.00	2,443		2.21	1.21	2.00