Spring 2013 Arts and Sciences LECTURE Teaching Evaluation

Course: GEOL4444-01/GEOL5444-01: Geohydrology

Instructor: Ye Li, Ye Zhang *

1 - Please comment on the Ye Zhang'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.

Return Rate 7/10 (70%)

- Very good prepared; interesting topics; good interaction with students; explain things very clearly;

- Professor Zhang tried her best to prepare each class. The teaching materials widen our visions and help us explore our research interest in future. Additionally, the invited talks provided us with more opportunities to understand the abstract theories better. Quiz, assignments and labs also effectively enhanced our learning in the class.
- She is a great professor. Her class slides are perfect. It can show the context of the class clearly.
- good
- Ye Zhang has mastered this material which makes it easy for her to explain well through the various materials we used throughout the semester. Lecture combined with lab, quizzes and assignments were very effective in trying to gain an understanding of the key concepts behind geohydrology. The only improvement I can suggest is for her to slow down during lecture sometimes.
- Overall, Ye Zhang's course was well organized and the students responsibilities were made clear. This course could be improved with a little bit more homework. The labs could be improved by including some actual lab work instead of filling out worksheets with previously collected data. For example, for the grain size distribution lab we could have actually measured some grain size distributions with a sample, some sieves, an some scales. Also, is it feasible to obtain (buy/build) an instrument for performing a Darcy Test?

- - Dedication

I really like how the professor (Ye Zhang) reads EACH and EVERY step of our homework. Few professors devote this much time to grading everyday homework problems, and it is very refreshing. This careful grading makes me very happy and proud of my work when I receive full marks. The professor is among the most dedicated I have met, and deserves recognition for that.

-Mistakes:

The professor's method of deducting points for mistakes is different from any other method I have experienced. The professor deducts between ~70% and ~100% of the possible points on a problem for having the wrong sign(+/-) or value, and between ~30% and ~50% for a difficult to read number (or an equation that a student just didn't finish writing out) ON AN INTERMEDIATE STEP, regardless of reaching the right answer later on in the problem. The magnitude of these deductions is not proportional to the mistake they represent.

I am familiar with the everything-or-nothing method that entry-level math classes use. That method seems more fair than the professor's current method, because all points are clearly located in a single answer. Currently the number of points deducted for mistakes seems unsystematic and unpredictable. No homework, or quiz has the point-value of the question listed. This would be helpful to students because we do not know what the professor considers important, and thus where we should spend our time. (I do NOT recommend the professor switching methods -- the everything-or-nothing method is dangerous in the hands of a merciless grader.)

-Teaching

The professor makes good power-points, and explains them in class, whereas other professors just read them to the students. The professor is evidently an expert, and excited about her research. This enthusiasm sets her above the common "garden variety" professor.

The professor is a very good mathematician. Unfortunately, this means she falls-back to a math-proof style of explaining ideas when a systemic/conceptual method is too difficult to explain.

The professor does not communicate in a way that respects the human condition. She does not make a clear distinction between when she is doing a proof for personal edification, and when she expects us to know something for the tests/homework. She says that these concepts are marked as "important" in the power point, but I rarely saw that "important" notice.

The class would be significantly improved if, at the start of the year, she issued a one-page "summary of equations" that we would be responsible for. There would only need to be the equations on this page, no explanations, and no obvious duplicates. Everyone can see that D=M/V is the same as V=M/D. I tired to make a sheet like this as we went, and it worked out rather well, but it was difficult to gauge what the professor felt to be important.

Possibly due to a closer working-relationship, or similar work-style, or cultural norms, students from her group seem to have a significantly easier time meeting the professor's expectations, than students from outside her group.

The professor should stop saying "Don't be confused!" When on a simple topic this is insulting, and when on a difficult topic it does nothing to help us become "unconfused".

-Summary

This professor could easily be a great asset to the geology department. I am amazed by her enthusiasm, dedication, and expert knowledge. She falls short on explaining ideas as concepts rather than proofs. Also limiting the professor's quality are her computer-like parsing of answers (with no room for benevolent interpretation), and lack of human-friendly communication.

Spring 2013 Arts and Sciences LECTURE Teaching Evaluation

Course: GEOL4444-01/GEOL5444-01 : Geohydrology

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Pe	rcent Res	ponses			Mear	ns	
Excellent	(5)	4	44.44%					4.22	4.25	_	4.28
Good	(4)	4	44.44%								
Satisfactory	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Poor	(2)	1	11.11%								
Unsatisfactory	(1)	0	0.00%]							
				0 25	50	75	100	Question	College benchma		epartment enchmark
Return Rate	Mean	STD		College benchmark		Mean	STD	Departme benchma		Mean	STE
9/10 (90%)	4.22	0.97		14,356		4.25	0.93	624		4.28	0.90

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage		Percent Resp	onses			Means	5			
Excellent	(5)	4	44.44%					4.00	4.26		4.24		
Good	(4)	3	33.33%					•					
Satisfactory	(3)	1	11.11%										
Poor	(2)	0	0.00%										
Unsatisfactory	(1)	1	11.11%										
	·			0	25 50	75	100	Question	College benchmar		epartmen enchmark		
Return Rate	Mean	STD		College benchmark		Mean STD		Mean STD		Departme benchma		Mean	ST
9/10 (90%)	4.00	1.32			14,336	4.26	0.92	622	ark	4.24	0.9		

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Perce	ent Resp	onses			Mea	ns	
Excellent	(5)	5	55.56%					-9-	487		400
Good	(4)	3	33.33%					4.33	4.37		4.39
Satisfactory	(3)	0	0.00%								
Poor	(2)	1	11.11%								
Unsatisfactory	(1)	0	0.00%								
				0 25	50	75	100	Question	College benchm		epartme enchma
Return Rate	Mean	STD		College ben	chmark	Mean	STD	Departme		Mean	SI
						<u> </u>		benchma	ark		
9/10 (90%)	4.33	1.00		14,331 4.3		4.37	0.93	621		4.39	0.9

Spring 2013 Arts and Sciences LECTURE Teaching Evaluation

Course: GEOL4444-01/GEOL5444-01 : Geohydrology

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	P	ercent Resp	onses			Mean	ıs	
Yes	(2)	7	77.78%					1.78	1.38		1.46
No	(1)	2	22.22%						Ů		
	·			_							
				0 25	5 50	75 100		Question	College		epartment enchmark
Return Rate	Mean	STD		College	benchmark	Mean	STD	Department		Mean	STI
								benchm	ark		
9/10 (90%)	1.78	0.44		14,312		1.38	0.49	626		1.46	0.50

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Res	ponses			Mea	ns	
Excellent	(5)	4	57.14%				4.29	4.54		4.60
Good	(4)	2	28.57%					4.34		4.00
Satisfactory	(3)	0	0.00%							
Poor	(2)	1	14.29%							
Unsatisfactory	(1)	0	0.00%							
				0 25 50	75	100	Question	College		epartmen enchmark
Return Rate	Mean	STD		College benchmark	Mean	STD	Departme		Mean	STI
							benchm	ark		
7/10 (70%)	4.29	1.11		5,807	4.54	0.82	307		4.60	0.8

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent	t Resp	onses			Mea	ns	
Excellent	(5)	5	55.56%						- 9 -		-
Good	(4)	2	22.22%					4.33	4.34		4.31
Satisfactory	(3)	2	22.22%								
Poor	(2)	0	0.00%								
Unsatisfactory	(1)	0	0.00%								
				0 25 50		75	100	Question	College benchm		epartment enchmark
Return Rate	Mean	STD		College benchmark		Mean STD		Departm		Mean	STD
								benchm			
9/10 (90%)	4.33	0.87		14,326		4.34	0.86	620		4.31	0.87

Spring 2013 Arts and Sciences LECTURE Teaching Evaluation

Course: GEOL4444-01/GEOL5444-01 : Geohydrology

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage		Perce	nt Resp	onses			Mean	S	
Excellent	(5)	3	33.33%						4.00	4.23		4.28
Good	(4)	5	55.56%						•			
Satisfactory	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Poor	(2)	0	0.00%]								
Unsatisfactory	(1)	1	11.11%									
	·			0	25	50	75	100	Question	College benchmar		epartment enchmark
Return Rate	Mean	STD		Colleg	ge benc	hmark	Mean	STD	Departme		Mean	STE
9/10 (90%)	4.00	1.22			14,332		4.23	0.98	619	II K	4.28	0.94

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage		Perce	ent Resp	onses			Mea	าร	
Most definitely	(4)	4	44.44%						3.22	3.40		3.45
Probably	(3)	4	44.44%									3.43
Probably not	(2)	0	0.00%									
Definitely not	(1)	1	11.11%	_								
				0	25	50	75 100		Question	College		epartment enchmark
Return Rate	Mean	STD		College benchmark Mean STD		Departm		Mean	STD			
									benchm	ark		
9/10 (90%)	3.22	0.97			14,292	2	3.40	0.85	618		3.45	0.80

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage		Perce	ent Resp	onses			Mea	ns	
Over 90%	(5)	9	100.00%						5.00	4.64		4.70
90%	(4)	0	0.00%							4.04		4.70
75%	(3)	0	0.00%									
50%	(2)	0	0.00%									
25%	(1)	0	0.00%	0 25 50								
				0 25 50		75	100	Question Colle bench			Department Denchmark	
Return Rate	Mean	STD		College benchmark		Mean STD		Departme		Mean	STD	
	_						1		benchm			
9/10 (90%)	5.00	0.00			13,48	9	4.64	0.71	1 522		4.70	0.70

Spring 2013 Arts and Sciences LECTURE Teaching Evaluation

Course: GEOL4444-01/GEOL5444-01 : Geohydrology

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Resp	onses			Mean	s	
Very interested	(3)	6	66.67%				2.67	2.36		2.51
Somewhat interested	(2)	3	33.33%							
Not interested at all	(1)	0	0.00%							
				0 25 50	100	Question	College		epartment enchmark	
Return Rate	Mean	STD		College benchmark Mean STD		STD			Mean	STE
9/10 (90%)	2.67	0.50		13,463			benchma 518	IFK	2.51	0.61
9/10 (90%)	2.07	0.50		13,463	2.36	0.69	310		2.51	0.6

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	F	Percent Res	onses			Mea	ns	
A great deal	(5)	6	66.67%					4.44	4.17	_	4.06
A good deal	(4)	1	11.11%					4.44			•
Moderate	(3)	2	22.22%								
A little	(2)	0	0.00%]							
/ery little	(1)	0	0.00%								
				0 2	25 50	75	100	Question	College benchma		epartmen enchmark
Return Rate	Mean	STD		College benchmark Mean		Mean	STD			Mean	STI
								benchma	ark		
9/10 (90%)	4.44	0.88		1	13,512	4.17	0.82	519		4.06	0.9

Response Option Weight Frequency Percentage Percent Responses Means	13 - What grade do you expect to receive in this cou	ırse?									
B	Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Resp	onses			Mean	S	
C (3) 1 11.11%	Α	(5)	4	44.44%							
D	В	(4)	4	44.44%				4.33	4.32		4.38
F (1) 0 0.00% 0 25 50 75 100 Question College benchmark Return Rate Mean STD College benchmark Mean STD Department benchmark Mean STD STD	С	(3)	1	11.11%							
Return Rate Mean STD College benchmark Mean STD College benchmark Mean STD Department benchmark STD STD Department benchmark STD STD STD Department benchmark STD STD STD STD Department benchmark STD	D	(2)	0	0.00%							
Return Rate Mean STD College benchmark Mean STD Department benchmark STD STD Department benchmark STD STD	F	(1)	0	0.00%							
benchmark					0 25 50	75	100	Question			
	Return Rate	Mean	STD		College benchmark	Mean STD				Mean	STD
9/10 (90%) 4.33 0.71 13,471 4.32 0.78 516 4.38 0.79				ı		1			K		
	9/10 (90%)	4.33	0.71		13,471	4.32	0.78	516		4.38	0.79

Spring 2013 Arts and Sciences LECTURE Teaching Evaluation

Course: GEOL4444-01/GEOL5444-01 : Geohydrology

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses				Means			
Freshman	(1)	0	0.00%					4.67			
Sophomore	(2)	0	0.00%					•			
Junior	(3)	0	0.00%						2.73		2.87
Senior	(4)	3	33.33%						•	1	•
Graduate Student	(5)	6	66.67%								
Other	(6)	0	0.00%								
				0 25 5	75		100	Question	Colleg benchm		epartment enchmark
Return Rate	Mean	STD		College benchmark		an	STD	Department benchmark		Mean	STD
2//2 (222/)			1						ark		
9/10 (90%)	4.67	0.50		13,491		73	1.37	523		2.87	1.44