



## Course Evaluation Results

### CHEM 442 - Physical Chemistry I

Section A, Lecture (Brett McGuire)

M W F, 9am, 163 Noyes Laboratory

Fall, 2018

Evaluations were completed by **7** out of **14** students (50.0%).

For the purpose of generating percentile rankings, this course is considered to have a class size of "Small", a course type of "Required", and an instructor type of "Instructor".

Click a plus or minus symbol to expand or collapse an open-ended item.

**Congratulations!**

**You have made it onto the List of Teachers Ranked as Excellent By Their Students!**

### Demographic Items

#### Class Status:

Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Other	Omitted
-	-	29% (2)	71% (5)	-	-	-

#### This course was:

Elective	Required, But a Choice	Specifically Required	Omitted
-	-	100% (7)	-

#### This course was in my:

Major	Minor	Other	Omitted
100% (7)	-	-	-

#### What was your pre-course opinion of the instructor?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	100% (7)	-	-

#### What was your pre-course opinion of the course?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	86% (6)	14% (1)	-

#### Expected grade in the course:

A	B	C	D	F	Omitted
71% (5)	29% (2)	-	-	-	-

**Global Items****Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	-	-	-	100% (7)	-	<b>5.00</b>	0.00	99	95

**Rate the overall quality of this course. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	-	-	14% (1)	86% (6)	-	<b>4.86</b>	0.38	99	94

**How much have you learned in this course? [Very Little ... A Great Deal]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	-	-	29% (2)	71% (5)	-	<b>4.71</b>	0.49	92	89

**Departmental Core Items****CHEM Lecture****Did instructor hold your interest and provide atmosphere conducive to learning? [Rarely ... Frequently]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	29% (2)	71% (5)	-	<b>4.71</b>	0.49	89

**How well prepared was instructor for presentations and class work? [Poorly Organized ... Well Prepared]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	-	100% (7)	-	<b>5.00</b>	0.00	95

**How would you characterize instructor's oral delivery in lectures or discussions? [Awkward ... Clear, Effective]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	14% (1)	86% (6)	-	<b>4.86</b>	0.38	93

**Was the instructor's use of blackboard and other materials (handouts, etc.) effective? [Confusing, Inadequate ... Very Helpful]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	14% (1)	86% (6)	-	<b>4.86</b>	0.38	97

**How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain? [Very Poor ... Excellent]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	29% (2)	71% (5)	-	<b>4.71</b>	0.49	85

**What was the instructor's attitude; how did the instructor deal with you? [Unfair, Disdainful ... Fair And Impartial]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	-	100% (7)	-	<b>5.00</b>	0.00	95

**Did instructor perceive and respond to student difficulties with course material? [Oblivious, Unaware ... Aware, Helpful]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	14% (1)	86% (6)	-	<b>4.86</b>	0.38	94

**How accessible was the instructor for student conferences about the course? [Never Available ... Available Regularly]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	14% (1)	86% (6)	-	<b>4.86</b>	0.38	95

**How suitable was the pace of the course (number of topics, depth of coverage)? [Too Slow, Too Little ... Too Fast, Too Much]**

1	3	5	3	1	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	57% (4)	43% (3)	-	-	<b>4.14</b>	1.07	82

**How suitable was the level of the course (sophistication of topics and/or methods)? [Too Slow, Too Easy ... Too Fast, Too Much]**

1	3	5	3	1	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	57% (4)	43% (3)	-	-	<b>4.14</b>	1.07	79

**How well did examination questions reflect content and emphasis of the course? [Poorly Related ... Well Related]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	29% (2)	71% (5)	-	<b>4.71</b>	0.49	94

**Were graded examinations returned with explanations of errors or right answers? [Never ... Always]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	14% (1)	-	14% (1)	71% (5)	-	<b>4.43</b>	1.13	83

**If this is a lab course, did the lab reports help you in learning the material? [Rarely ... Frequently]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	29% (2)	-	14% (1)	57% (4)	<b>3.67</b>	1.15	68

**If this is a lab course, were lab reports graded fairly and promptly? [Rarely ... Frequently]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	29% (2)	-	14% (1)	57% (4)	<b>3.67</b>	1.15	53

**Describe your personal effort in course (attendance, preparation, participation). [I Was A Goof-off ... I Tried Very Hard]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	43% (3)	57% (4)	-	<b>4.57</b>	0.53	89

#### Rating Scale Item Means

	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.</b>					<b>5.00</b>
<b>Rate the overall quality of this course.</b>					<b>4.86</b>
<b>How much have you learned in this course?</b>					<b>4.71</b>
<b>Did instructor hold your interest and provide atmosphere conducive to learning?</b>					<b>4.71</b>
<b>How well prepared was instructor for presentations and class work?</b>					<b>5.00</b>
<b>How would you characterize instructor's oral delivery in lectures or discussions?</b>					<b>4.86</b>
<b>Was the instructor's use of blackboard and other materials (handouts, etc.) effective?</b>					<b>4.86</b>
<b>How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain?</b>					<b>4.71</b>
<b>What was the instructor's attitude; how did the instructor deal with you?</b>					<b>5.00</b>
<b>Did instructor perceive and respond to student difficulties with course material?</b>					<b>4.86</b>
<b>How accessible was the instructor for student conferences about the course?</b>					<b>4.86</b>
<b>How suitable was the pace of the course (number of topics, depth of coverage)?</b>					<b>4.14</b>
<b>How suitable was the level of the course (sophistication of topics and/or methods)?</b>					<b>4.14</b>
<b>How well did examination questions reflect content and emphasis of the course?</b>					<b>4.71</b>
<b>Were graded examinations returned with explanations of errors or right answers?</b>					<b>4.43</b>
<b>If this is a lab course, did the lab reports help you in learning the material?</b>					<b>3.67</b>
<b>If this is a lab course, were lab reports graded fairly and promptly?</b>					<b>3.67</b>
<b>Describe your personal effort in course (attendance, preparation, participation).</b>					<b>4.57</b>

= below 3.0 / = 3.0 - 4.0 / = above 4.0

#### ICES Open-Ended Items

##### What are the major strengths of the instructor/course?

- He was always available to help, and I appreciate how laid back he was. He made weekly lectures feel less stressful, and it was a relatively inviting environment. He is very passionate, and this shows.
- We can review the lectures whenever we want to.
- His ability to notice where students are confused on a topic, and clarify/explain to the students in an easily-understandable way. Also, often very available to meet outside of the predetermined office hours.
- Very informative lectures
- well organized and structured course, well prepared and friendly instructor
- The instructor did a phenomenal job explaining new topics in a succinct yet clear way during the prelectures. The problem sets were also well-written, guiding the students through the questions and topics without giving the answer away.

##### What do you suggest to improve the course?

- I think that the flipped lecture system had advantages and disadvantages. I would suggest maybe switching teaching methods every so often. Flipped classroom was ok, but I also thought the change of pace with the lecture in class was beneficial. Maybe change things up a bit more. Also, I felt like we got overviews in the lectures and then very in depth questions on the problem sets. Sooo this meant that I watched the easy stuff worked out but then had to struggle through the complex and confusing stuff by myself at home because there was no way I would get to it in class and office hours. Maybe working through problems together as a class would be helpful too.
- It may be better for the instructor to use several minutes to review the video lecture in class.
- Continue to call on students to present/work through homework problems on the board. Despite the fact that no students had particular questions on any of the work, it is a good way to check the understanding of the student body. During this semester, he stopped asking for students to present problems, and it was reflected that the students would not attempt the homework until the day before submission. Overall, this showed lack of participation of a few students.
- More example problems in lectures.
- more clarification and explanation of topics learned near end of course
- No suggestions at this time.

**Please comment on the grading procedures in the course.**

- fair
- It's very fair.
- Grading was fair and impartial
- fair grading
- Always fair and clear.