# Individual Report - Fall 2014 for CSCI 638-01 13418 Non-Linear Programming (Frans Schalekamp)

## Arts & Sciences Student Course Evaluations Fall 2014

Project Audience 7
Responses Received 6
Response Ratio 85.71%

**Creation Date**    Thu, Jan 08, 2015

# Computer Science (CSCI) Summary

| Question | This Course | | | | This Instructor | | | | This Evaluation Form | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Median | Response Count | Standard Deviation | Mean | Median | Response Count | Standard Deviation | Mean | Median | Response Count | Standard Deviation |
| Were expectations made clear by the instructor in assignments and test? | 4.67 | 5.00 | 6 | 0.52 | 4.67 | 5.00 | 6 | 0.52 | 3.89 | 4.00 | 537 | 1.11 |
| Were tests & assignments given representative of materials? | 4.83 | 5.00 | 6 | 0.41 | 4.83 | 5.00 | 6 | 0.41 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 537 | 1.04 |
| Was grading fair and consistent? | 4.83 | 5.00 | 6 | 0.41 | 4.83 | 5.00 | 6 | 0.41 | 3.87 | 4.00 | 535 | 1.10 |
| Were helpful comments made in evaluating tests and graded work? | 4.83 | 5.00 | 6 | 0.41 | 4.83 | 5.00 | 6 | 0.41 | 3.50 | 4.00 | 536 | 1.28 |
| Was the instructor receptive to questions and approachable for help? | 4.83 | 5.00 | 6 | 0.41 | 4.83 | 5.00 | 6 | 0.41 | 4.07 | 4.00 | 535 | 1.14 |
| How well was the instructor prepared for class? | 4.67 | 5.00 | 6 | 0.52 | 4.67 | 5.00 | 6 | 0.52 | 4.37 | 5.00 | 537 | 0.86 |
| How well did the instructor know the subject material? | 4.83 | 5.00 | 6 | 0.41 | 4.83 | 5.00 | 6 | 0.41 | 4.63 | 5.00 | 537 | 0.67 |
| Rate the usefulness of the text. | 4.17 | 4.00 | 6 | 0.41 | 4.17 | 4.00 | 6 | 0.41 | 3.55 | 4.00 | 534 | 1.16 |
| Rate course difficulty compared to other W&M courses. | 3.33 | 3.50 | 6 | 0.82 | 3.33 | 3.50 | 6 | 0.82 | 3.59 | 4.00 | 537 | 0.94 |
| How would you rate this instructor's overall teaching effectiveness? | 4.83 | 5.00 | 6 | 0.41 | 4.83 | 5.00 | 6 | 0.41 | 3.78 | 4.00 | 537 | 1.12 |
| **Overall** | 4.58 | - | - | 0.65 | 4.58 | - | - | - | 3.93 | - | - | - |

### Were expectations made clear by the instructor in assignments and test?

| Options | Score | Count | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | 1 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Fair | 2 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Average | 3 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Good | 4 | 2 | 33.33% |
| Excellent | 5 | 4 | 66.67% |

| Statistics | Value |
|---|---|
| Response Count | 6 |
| Mean | 4.67 |
| Median | 5.00 |
| Standard Deviation | +/-0.52 |

### Were tests & assignments given representative of materials?

| Options | Score | Count | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | 1 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Fair | 2 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Average | 3 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Good | 4 | 1 | 16.67% |
| Excellent | 5 | 5 | 83.33% |

| Statistics | Value |
|---|---|
| Response Count | 6 |
| Mean | 4.83 |
| Median | 5.00 |
| Standard Deviation | +/-0.41 |

### Was grading fair and consistent?

| Options | Score | Count | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | 1 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Fair | 2 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Average | 3 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Good | 4 | 1 | 16.67% |
| Excellent | 5 | 5 | 83.33% |

| Statistics | Value |
|---|---|
| Response Count | 6 |
| Mean | 4.83 |
| Median | 5.00 |
| Standard Deviation | +/-0.41 |

### Were helpful comments made in evaluating tests and graded work?

| Options | Score | Count | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | 1 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Fair | 2 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Average | 3 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Good | 4 | 1 | 16.67% |
| Excellent | 5 | 5 | 83.33% |

| Statistics | Value |
|---|---|
| Response Count | 6 |
| Mean | 4.83 |
| Median | 5.00 |
| Standard Deviation | +/-0.41 |

### Was the instructor receptive to questions and approachable for help?

| Options | Score | Count | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | 1 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Fair | 2 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Average | 3 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Good | 4 | 1 | 16.67% |
| Excellent | 5 | 5 | 83.33% |

| Statistics | Value |
|---|---|
| Response Count | 6 |
| Mean | 4.83 |
| Median | 5.00 |
| Standard Deviation | +/-0.41 |

### How well was the instructor prepared for class?

| Options | Score | Count | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | 1 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Fair | 2 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Average | 3 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Good | 4 | 2 | 33.33% |
| Excellent | 5 | 4 | 66.67% |

| Statistics | Value |
|---|---|
| Response Count | 6 |
| Mean | 4.67 |
| Median | 5.00 |
| Standard Deviation | +/-0.52 |

## How well did the instructor know the subject material?

| Options | Score | Count | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | 1 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Fair | 2 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Average | 3 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Good | 4 | 1 | 16.67% |
| Excellent | 5 | 5 | 83.33% |

| Statistics | Value |
|---|---|
| Response Count | 6 |
| Mean | 4.83 |
| Median | 5.00 |
| Standard Deviation | +/-0.41 |

## Rate the usefulness of the text.

| Options | Score | Count | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | 1 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Fair | 2 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Average | 3 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Good | 4 | 5 | 83.33% |
| Excellent | 5 | 1 | 16.67% |

| Statistics | Value |
|---|---|
| Response Count | 6 |
| Mean | 4.17 |
| Median | 4.00 |
| Standard Deviation | +/-0.41 |

## Rate course difficulty compared to other W&M courses.

| Options | Score | Count | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Easiest | 1 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Easy | 2 | 1 | 16.67% |
| Average | 3 | 2 | 33.33% |
| Difficult | 4 | 3 | 50.00% |
| Most Difficult | 5 | 0 | 0.00% |

| Statistics | Value |
|---|---|
| Response Count | 6 |
| Mean | 3.33 |
| Median | 3.50 |
| Standard Deviation | +/-0.82 |

## How would you rate this instructor's overall teaching effectiveness?

| Options | Score | Count | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | 1 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Below Average | 2 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Average | 3 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Above Average | 4 | 1 | 16.67% |
| Excellent | 5 | 5 | 83.33% |

| Statistics | Value |
|---|---|
| Response Count | 6 |
| Mean | 4.83 |
| Median | 5.00 |
| Standard Deviation | +/-0.41 |

## Please comment on the outstanding strengths/weaknesses of the instructor and the course.

| Students |
|---|
| Professor Schalekamp is conscientious of his students and a stimulating professor to learn math from. He is a major asset to the department. |
| The material could be considered by some to be dry and repetitive but the way the instructor presents it for this class makes it enjoyable because he encourages exploration into the field as opposed to just "write what I say and regurgitate it later." |
| I really appreciate that Frans teaches at the pace of the class's understanding rather than at the pace of the material. He is always receptive to when the class is struggling with something, and it really helps when he reviews a topic. I like the balance of theory in class and application in assignments. It may help to include more examples with numbers sometimes. |
| The difference in notation between the class and the textbook was confusing, although I preferred the instructor's. |
| Not only does Professor Schalekamp have a mastery of the subject matter, he is also very effective at breaking it down the often difficult material in a manner that I can easily understand it. |
| Really approachable and genuine! Always available for assistance and really knows how to set students at ease. |