September 6, 2017

Dr. Christopher Atkinson
Asst. Prof. of Mathematics

NUMERICAL SUMMARY OF STUDENT RATING OF TEACHING

S17
Math 1102.2 Calculus II
(23/29)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	5.47	5.42	5.74
2.	5.17	4.93	5.52
3.	5.05	4.97	5.48
4.	5.58	5.54	5.65
5.	5.24	5.08	5.65

S17
Math 2111.1 Linear Algebra
(14/23)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	5.56	5.55	5.71
2.	5.53	5.20	5.29
3.	5.33	5.17	5.21
4.	5.68	5.66	5.86
5.	5.40	5.33	5.57

F16
Math 1101.2 Calculus I
(21/27)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	5.53	5.55	5.81
2.	5.14	5.02	5.38
3.	5.09	5.06	5.24
4.	5.64	5.64	5.52
5.	5.25	5.17	5.24

F16
Math 2101 Calculus III
(12/17)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	5.55	5.49	5.67
2.	5.31	5.21	5.67
3.	5.30	5.12	5.58
4.	5.66	5.61	5.92
5.	5.35	5.37	6.00

S16
Math 2212.1 Intro to Knot Theor.
(19/19)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	5.50	5.43	5.89
2.	5.24	5.08	5.63
3.	5.23	5.00	5.47
4.	5.67	5.66	5.89
5.	5.35	5.25	5.89

S16
Math 3231 Abstract Algebra
(11/12)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	5.50	5.43	5.55
2.	5.24	5.08	5.27
3.	5.23	5.00	5.18
4.	5.67	5.66	5.91
5.	5.35	5.25	5.55

F15
Math 1013
(12/18)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	5.51	5.53	5.17
2.	5.26	5.17	4.83
3.	5.24	5.15	4.58
4.	5.65	5.63	5.50
5.	5.37	5.37	4.75

F15
Math 1101.2
(25/26)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	5.52	5.63	5.75
2.	5.08	5.11	5.24
3.	5.03	5.06	5.12
4.	5.60	5.65	5.60
5.	5.16	5.24	5.08

F15
Math 2101.1
(16/20)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	5.51	5.53	5.94
2.	5.26	5.17	5.69
3.	5.24	5.15	5.69
4.	5.65	5.63	5.94
5.	5.37	5.37	5.75

S15
Single Semester Leave

F14
Math 1013.1
(19/21)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	5.57	5.59	5.68
2.	5.34	5.31	5.11
3.	5.35	5.26	5.21
4.	5.71	5.77	5.79
5.	5.37	5.39	5.58
6.	5.10	5.08	5.11

F14
Math 1102.1
(19/22)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	5.57	5.59	5.79
2.	5.34	5.31	5.58
3.	5.35	5.26	5.63
4.	5.71	5.77	5.84
5.	5.37	5.39	5.58
6.	5.10	5.08	5.42

F14
Math 2111.1
(15/25)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	5.52	5.61	5.20
2.	5.11	5.04	5.20
3.	5.03	5.02	5.33
4.	5.60	5.61	5.80
5.	5.24	5.19	5.73
6.	4.89	4.66	5.33

S14
Math 1102.1
(25/29)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	5.50	5.50	5.25
2.	5.20	5.10	4.88
3.	5.10	5.10	4.54
4.	5.60	5.60	5.38
5.	5.30	5.20	4.88
6.	4.90	4.80	4.00

S14
Math 2101.1
(22/27)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	5.50	5.50	5.57
2.	5.30	5.20	5.24
3.	5.30	5.20	5.38
4.	5.70	5.70	5.81
5.	5.30	5.40	5.67
6.	5.10	5.10	5.29

Chris Atkinson, Assistant Professor of Mathematics
Numerical Summary of Student Rating of Teaching

F13
Math 1012.1
(25/32)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	5.50	5.42	5.56
2.	5.10	4.85	4.88
3.	5.03	4.77	4.84
4.	5.58	5.49	5.64
5.	5.17	4.93	4.88
6.	4.87	4.49	4.00

F13
Math 2111.1
(25/29)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	5.50	5.42	5.00
2.	5.10	4.85	4.44
3.	5.03	4.77	5.04
4.	5.58	5.49	5.80
5.	5.17	4.93	4.92
6.	4.87	4.49	4.40

F13
Math 3211.1
(10/10)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	5.54	5.69	5.60
2.	5.30	5.73	4.70
3.	5.30	5.28	4.90
4.	5.69	5.69	5.90
5.	5.30	5.38	5.30
6.	5.00	5.01	5.00

S13
Math 1102.1
(30/33)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	5.52	5.46	5.41
2.	5.16	4.90	5.21
3.	5.12	4.88	5.34
4.	5.61	5.56	5.55
5.	5.27	5.04	5.34
6.	4.96	4.76	4.52

S13
Math 3231
(8/12)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	5.52	5.53	5.75
2.	5.26	5.25	4.75
3.	5.25	5.16	5.50
4.	5.64	5.63	6.00
5.	5.32	5.26	5.13
6.	5.07	4.91	4.50

F12
Math 1012.3
(23/26)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	5.46	5.27	5.32
2.	5.04	4.73	4.82
3.	5.02	4.74	4.77
4.	5.55	5.42	5.23
5.	5.18	4.91	5.23
6.	4.88	4.48	4.32

F12
Math 1101.4
(16/22)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	5.49	5.55	5.63
2.	5.26	5.32	5.50
3.	5.27	5.18	5.50
4.	5.64	5.70	5.81
5.	5.29	5.28	5.63
6.	5.00	4.97	5.19

University of Minnesota, Morris
Division of Science and Mathematics

Interpreting the Student Rating of Teaching (SRT) Summary

Each term students at UMM are given an opportunity to evaluate their classroom experiences by means of a Student Rating of Teaching questionnaire. Student responses are tabulated and numerical averages are summarized in a compact report for each faculty member. This document describes how the questions and rating scales have changed over the years and should be attached to that report in order to allow proper interpretation of the report.

The courses are listed in reverse chronological order, term by term, for each year. They are identified by course number and an abbreviated course title. Beneath the course number you will find two numbers separated by a slash: the first figure is the number of students responding to the questionnaire; the second figure is the number of students enrolled in the course. The figures listed in the vertical columns represent the average of the scores given by respondents to each of the questions. The first column, labeled "Campus", lists the campus norm for courses with a comparable number of respondents during the same term. The second column, labeled "Div", lists the Divisional norm for courses with a comparable number of respondents for the same term. The third column, labeled 'Prof", lists the average student response to each statement for the course.

RATING SCALE (Fall 2015 onward)

The five statements that the students rated were:

1. The instructor was well prepared for class.
2. The instructor presented the subject matter clearly.
3. The instructor provided feedback intended to improve my course performance.
4. The instructor treated me with respect.
5. I would recommend this instructor to other students.

The six-point rating scale for the six statements is:
1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Somewhat Disagree
4 = Somewhat Agree
5 = Agree
6 = Strongly Agree

EXAMPLE:

Math 1xxx Ubiquitous Math (35/40)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	4.8	5.0	5.0
2.	4.7	5.1	5.1
3.	4.9	5.5	5.5
4.	4.8	4.9	5.0
5.	5.0	5.0	5.2

RATING SCALE (Fall 2008 through Spring 2015)

The six statements that the students rated were:

1. The instructor was well prepared for class.
2. The instructor presented the subject matter clearly.
3. The instructor provided feedback intended to improve my course performance.
4. The instructor treated me with respect.
5. I have a deeper understanding of the subject matter as a result of this course.
6. My interest in the subject matter was stimulated by this course.

The six-point rating scale for the six statements is:
1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Somewhat Disagree
4 = Somewhat Agree
5 = Agree
6 = Strongly Agree

EXAMPLE:

Phys 1003 Quantum Mechanics
67/81

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	4.8	5.0	5.0
2.	4.7	5.1	5.1
3.	4.9	5.5	5.5
4.	4.8	4.9	5.0
5.	5.0	5.0	5.2
6.	5.2	5.1	4.7

RATING SCALE (Fall 1993 through Spring 2008)

The five questions to which the students responded were:

1. How would you rate the instructor's overall teaching ability?
2. How would you rate the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter?
3. How would you rate the instructor's respect and concern for students?
4. How would you rate the physical environment in which you take this class, especially the classroom facilities, including your ability to see, hear, concentrate and participate?
5. How much would you say you learned in this course?

The 7-point rating scale for the 5 questions is:

Questions 1 through 4	Question 5
1 = very poor	1 = almost nothing
4 = satisfactory	4 = amount expected
7 = exceptional	7 = an exceptional amount

EXAMPLE:

Phys 1003 Quantum Mechanics
67/81

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	4.8	5.0	5.8
2.	4.7	5.1	5.6
3.	4.9	5.5	6.5
4.	4.8	4.9	6.0
5.	5.5	5.0	5.2

RATING SCALE (Fall 1986 through Spring 1993)

The six statements to which the students responded were

1. The instructor conducted the course so as to effectively encourage learning.
2. The instructor's evaluation of my work was fair.
3. The instructor was readily available for help outside of class.
4. As a teacher, the instructor compares favorably with other UMM instructors.
5. The course was intellectually and/or artistically stimulating.
6. Overall, this course compares favorably with other courses at UMM.

The six-point rating scale for the six statements is:
1=strongly disagree
2=disagree
3=somewhat disagree
4=somewhat agree
5=agree
6=strongly agree

EXAMPLE

Phys 1003 Quantum Mechanics (67/81)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	3.8	4.0	4.0
2.	3.7	4.1	4.1
3.	3.9	4.5	4.5
4.	3.8	3.9	4.0
5.	4.0	4.0	4.2
6.	3.7	4.2	4.3

RATING SCALE (before Fall 1986)

The six statements to which the students responded were:

1. Course was intellectually or aesthetically stimulating.
2. Teaching techniques were effective in helping reach course objectives.
3. Evaluation of work was fair.
4. Atmosphere in course was conducive to learning.
5. Instructor was accessible and available for consultation.
6. Comparison of instructor with other teachers at UMM.

The five-point rating scale for the first five statements is:
1=strongly disagree
2=disagree
3=neutral
4=agree
5=strongly agree

The-five-point rating scale for statement six is:
1=among the very worst
2=below average
3=about average
4=above average
5=among the very best

EXAMPLE:

Phys 1003 Quantum Mechanics (67/81)

	Campus	Div	Prof
1.	3.8	4.0	4.0
2.	3.7	4.1	4.1
3.	3.9	4.5	4.5
4.	3.8	3.9	4.0
5.	4.0	4.0	4.2
6.	3.7	4.2	4.3