




Overall indicators

Global Index

2. Instructor Evaluation


3. Course Evaluation



Survey Results

Legend


Question text




n=No. of responses  
 av.=Mean  
 md=Median  
 dev.=Std. Dev.  
 ab.=Abstention

2. Instructor Evaluation


2.1) Instructor created an environment that was conducive to learning.




2.2) Instructor gave clear explanations.




2.3) Instructor used helpful examples and illustrations.




2.4) Instructor consistently followed grading criteria.




2.5) Instructor provided useful feedback.



2.6) Instructor provided timely feedback.




2.7) Instructor made herself or himself available for assistance outside of class.




### 3. Course Evaluation


3.1) Outside class activities (readings, assignments, homework, problem sets, etc.) helped me to understand the subject.




3.2) In-class activities (lecture, discussion, handouts, group-work, etc.) contributed to my understanding of the subject.




3.3) This course challenged me intellectually.



3.4) Course grading criteria were communicated clearly.




3.5) Course objectives were met.




### 4. Additional Questions


4.1) Instructor encouraged participation.




4.2) Instructor was respectful to students.




4.3) Examinations were a good test of my knowledge.



4.4) Overall, considering its content, design and structure, this course was excellent.



4.5) Instructor was an effective teacher.



# Profile

Subunit: **A&S-MATH**  
 Name of the instructor: **MARTIN MOHLENKAMP**  
 Name of the course: **Numer Analysis Linear Alg**  
 (Name of the survey)

Values used in the profile line: Mean

## 2. Instructor Evaluation

2.1) Instructor created an environment that was conducive to learning.	STRONGLY DISAGREE						STRONGLY AGREE	n=5	av.=4.80	md=5.00	dev.=0.45
2.2) Instructor gave clear explanations.	STRONGLY DISAGREE						STRONGLY AGREE	n=5	av.=4.60	md=5.00	dev.=0.55
2.3) Instructor used helpful examples and illustrations.	STRONGLY DISAGREE						STRONGLY AGREE	n=5	av.=4.80	md=5.00	dev.=0.45
2.4) Instructor consistently followed grading criteria.	STRONGLY DISAGREE						STRONGLY AGREE	n=5	av.=4.80	md=5.00	dev.=0.45
2.5) Instructor provided useful feedback.	STRONGLY DISAGREE						STRONGLY AGREE	n=5	av.=4.80	md=5.00	dev.=0.45
2.6) Instructor provided timely feedback.	STRONGLY DISAGREE						STRONGLY AGREE	n=5	av.=4.60	md=5.00	dev.=0.55
2.7) Instructor made herself or himself available for assistance outside of class.	STRONGLY DISAGREE						STRONGLY AGREE	n=5	av.=4.80	md=5.00	dev.=0.45

## 3. Course Evaluation

3.1) Outside class activities (readings, assignments, homework, problem sets, etc.) helped me to understand the subject.	STRONGLY DISAGREE						STRONGLY AGREE	n=5	av.=4.80	md=5.00	dev.=0.45
3.2) In-class activities (lecture, discussion, handouts, group-work, etc.) contributed to my understanding of the subject.	STRONGLY DISAGREE						STRONGLY AGREE	n=5	av.=4.80	md=5.00	dev.=0.45
3.3) This course challenged me intellectually.	STRONGLY DISAGREE						STRONGLY AGREE	n=5	av.=4.60	md=5.00	dev.=0.55
3.4) Course grading criteria were communicated clearly.	STRONGLY DISAGREE						STRONGLY AGREE	n=5	av.=4.80	md=5.00	dev.=0.45
3.5) Course objectives were met.	STRONGLY DISAGREE						STRONGLY AGREE	n=5	av.=4.60	md=5.00	dev.=0.55

## 4. Additional Questions

4.1) Instructor encouraged participation.	STRONGLY DISAGREE						STRONGLY AGREE	n=5	av.=4.80	md=5.00	dev.=0.45
4.2) Instructor was respectful to students.	STRONGLY DISAGREE						STRONGLY AGREE	n=5	av.=4.80	md=5.00	dev.=0.45
4.3) Examinations were a good test of my knowledge.	STRONGLY DISAGREE						STRONGLY AGREE	n=5	av.=4.60	md=5.00	dev.=0.55
4.4) Overall, considering its content, design and structure, this course was excellent.	STRONGLY DISAGREE						STRONGLY AGREE	n=5	av.=4.60	md=5.00	dev.=0.55
4.5) Instructor was an effective teacher.	STRONGLY DISAGREE						STRONGLY AGREE	n=5	av.=4.60	md=5.00	dev.=0.55

## Comments Report

---

### 5. Open Response

<sup>5.1)</sup> What do you consider to be the greatest **STRENGTH** of the **INSTRUCTOR**?

- Approached some of the content without knowing the answer, but otherwise super helpful with code and theory.
- Brand new way to educate students
- Dr. Mohlenkamp's greatest strength is his patience with his students.
- His profound knowledge of the subject, efficient time management, well designed course structure, and above all, his friendly behavior with all students.

5.2) What do you consider to be the greatest **WEAKNESS** of the **INSTRUCTOR**? Suggestions for improvement?

- None.
- Poor blackboard written.....
- Wanted us to work together but didn't give us any collaborative work.

5.3) What do you consider to be the greatest **STRENGTH** of the **COURSE**? (texts, content, etc.)?

- Good balance of programming and proofs
- Teach me how to do Latex and Python
- Teaching how the ideas and materials are practically applied in the field of linear algebra, which improves insight and skills for research.
- This course did not only help us put our programming skills to work but, many topics of linear algebra were covered into detail. We learnt how to analyze and verify the content of academic papers as well. That was a good bonus.

5.4) What do you consider to be the greatest **WEAKNESS** of the **COURSE**? Suggestions for improvement?

- Could use a consistent primary resource for topics and concepts covered. Not a textbook, but perhaps an online source containing all materials whose contents are verified for correctness. Online contents such as Wikipedia or those found by google search cannot always be used reliably.
- I'd like to see one of the projects working with actual data, like solving a linear equation using the method and interpreting it.
- Lack of structured learning materials