REACH CAMBRIDGE TEACHER SELF-EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK FORM 2018

*Your Teaching*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Please **embolden** a number  **5 = strongly *agree***  **1 = strongly *disagree*** | | | | |
| I found the students responsive and engaged. | 1 | 2 | 3 | X | 5 |
| I enjoyed teaching on the course. | 1 | 2 | 3 | X | 5 |
| Which of your sessions/topics do you think were *most* successful, and why?  Black holes and cosmology. The math is limited and the topic is generally considered exciting even before you have studied it.  Which of your sessions/topics do you think were *least* successful, and why?  Calculus, for the inverse of the above reasons. | | | | | |
| Would you be happy to teach the same topics next summer? Are there any additional topics you would be able to teach?  Sure. I can also teach math. | | | | | |
| Are there any areas of teaching where you would personally like to improve or develop for future programmes?  Overall Physics and Astronomy course structure need to be standardized probably? | | | | | |
| Is there anything you feel Reach Cambridge staff could have done better to support your teaching both before & during the course?  *Please mention anything you can think of – handbook & guidelines, equipment, trips, room, discipline, observations & feedback, organisation…*  *BEFORE THE COURSE:*  The students were not filtered for their enthusiasm – if it isn’t hard for them personally (I don’t mean financially hard for the parents, but academically hard for the students) to get a place in the school, then there will be a value misalignment problem. I was absolutely amazed to find students in my class who didn’t seem to be interested in a subject about which they had traveled thousands of miles to learn!  I am also skeptical of the means (I guess there must have been some means?) by which applicants who are insufficiently fluent in English are filtered out.  In Week 1 of Program 1, I was in a tiny room without a proper blackboard and with a wall projector from the `90s. This is not adequate. In Week 2 of Program 2 everything was fine (ARU classroom, very nice!).  The spread of ages in my groups was very, very worrying (13-17 I believe in the worst case). This was actually marketed as a feature of the summer school, with some phrase like “our teaching style”! To the extent that this is a style of teaching, it is a style of teaching badly. My students knew it and the teachers with whom I spoke knew it.  *DURING THE COURSE:*  The other staff (shout-out to Nathan and Ola in my case) were very helpful and oriented toward solving problems fast. Genny appeared to work with superhuman energy to keep things running smoothly. I have no idea how she does it! No complaints. | | | | | |
| Do you have any other comments about your teaching?  Those students who came to Cambridge to learn some physics, learned some physics. | | | | | |

***Your Course(s) (COORDINATORS ONLY)***

|  |
| --- |
| What do you think went particularly well about the course(s) this year? |
| What do you think are the main development points for the course(s) for future summers? |
| Do you think there was a good range of topics taught on the course(s)? Are there any additional topics that you think should definitely be included in future summers? |
| With their student feedback in mind, which of the course teachers do you think should be invited back, and which not? |

***Thank you!***