

Engineering Spring 2018 Course Evaluation Report for SP2018.E37.MEMS.101.02 - Introduction to Mechanical Engineering and Mechanical Design (Ruth Okamoto)

Project Title: WashU Spring 2018 Course Evaluations

Project Audience: 6
Responses Received: 4
Response Ratio: 66.67%

Report Comments

Welcome to WashU Course Evaluations. Below you will find response data from the specified course/instructor pairing. In the case of multi-instructor courses, separate reports are available. We appreciate your dedication to our learning community at Washington University.

If you have questions, please contact evals@wustl.edu

Please Note: In order to protect student anonymity, reports are not generated for sections with fewer than 4 respondents.

Creation Date: Mon, Jul 02, 2018



Course Administration

Was a course syllabus or a course information sheet distributed or available online?

Options	Count	Percentage
Yes	3	100.00%
No	0	0.00%

Did the syllabus explain the content and administration of the course (e.g., office hours, grading)?


Options	Count	Percentage
Yes	3	100.00%
No	0	0.00%


Early in the semester, did your professor explain the expectations for academic integrity?

Options	Count	Percentage
Yes	3	100.00%
No	0	0.00%

Rating Scale Responses


		Score			
Question	Mean	Median	Response Count	Standard Deviation	
In retrospect, the syllabus was an accurate reflection of how the course was actually taught.	6.33	6.00	3	0.58	
The course matched the course catalog description.	6.67	7.00	3	0.58	






Instructor Evaluation

Overall rating for teaching quality of Ruth Okamoto.





Rating Scale Responses for Ruth Okamoto


		Score			
Question	Mean	Median	Response Count	Standard Deviation	
The instructor made the course interesting.	6.00	6.00	3	1.00	
The instructor was enthusiastic about the course.	7.00	7.00	3	0.00	
The material was covered at a reasonable pace.	6.00	6.00	3	1.00	
The instructor was available to answer questions (through office hours, email, etc.).	7.00	7.00	3	0.00	
The instructor was well-organized and prepared for class.	7.00	7.00	3	0.00	
The instructor explained the course material so that you could understand it.	6.67	7.00	3	0.58	






Course Materials and Assignments

Overall rating of course content.






Rating Scale Responses

		Score			
Question	Mean	Median	Response Count	Standard Deviation	
Textbooks/readings complemented the lectures.	5.00	5.00	3	2.00	
Textbooks/readings were useful.	5.00	5.00	3	2.00	
Assigned homeworks were helpful and relevant to the course.	5.33	5.00	3	0.58	
There was reasonable time to complete assignments.	6.67	7.00	3	0.58	
Assignments were returned within a reasonable period of time.	5.67	6.00	3	1.53	
Comments on graded work were helpful.	5.67	6.00	3	1.53	
Labs were an effective supplement to the course.	7.00	7.00	2	0.00	
The course material drew upon real world applications.	7.00	7.00	3	0.00	








Exams and Grade

Expected grade for this course.

Options	Count	Percentage
A	3	100.00%
В	0	0.00%
С	0	0.00%
D	0	0.00%
F	0	0.00%
Р	0	0.00%

Rating Scale Responses

		Score		
Question	Mean	Median	Response Count	Standard Deviation
Exams reflected material taught.	N/A	N/A	0	N/A
Adequate time was given to complete exams.	N/A	N/A	0	N/A
Your grades to this point accurately reflect your understanding of the material.	6.00	6.00	3	0.00
The grading system was consistent and equitable.	6.00	7.00	3	1.73





Overall

About how many hours per week did you spend on this course outside of class?

Options	Count	Percentage
0	2	66.67%
1-3	1	33.33%
4-6	0	0.00%
7-9	0	0.00%
10-12	0	0.00%
13-15	0	0.00%
Over 15	0	0.00%

What percentage of the lectures did you attend?

Options	Count	Percentage
0%	0	0.00%
10%	0	0.00%
20%	0	0.00%
30%	0	0.00%
40%	0	0.00%
50%	0	0.00%
60%	0	0.00%
70%	0	0.00%
80%	0	0.00%
90%	0	0.00%
100%	3	100.00%

Would you recommend this course to others?

