

Clemson University Student Evaluation of Teaching

Evaluation Report for Jens Oberheide teaching PHYS 8150 001 during Spring Semester 2014
 Respondents = 14; Enrolled = 18; Response rate = 78%

University Questions(3686)

G1. The instructor clearly communicated what I was expected to learn.

Type: How much

Not at all					Very much	NR
1	2	3	4	5		
0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.14%)	8 (57.14%)	5 (35.71%)		0 (0.00%)
Focus	Mean	Stdev	Median	Observations		
Class	4.286	0.611	4	14		
Same Level	4.154	1.156	5	26		
Same Discipline	3.766	1.118	4	1401		

G2. The instructor made the relevance of the course material clear.

Type: How much

Not at all					Very much	NR
1	2	3	4	5		
0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.14%)	3 (21.43%)	10 (71.43%)		0 (0.00%)
Focus	Mean	Stdev	Median	Observations		
Class	4.643	0.633	5	14		
Same Level	4.385	0.697	4.5	26		
Same Discipline	3.782	1.116	4	1396		

G3. The course was well organized.

Type: How much

Not at all					Very much	NR
1	2	3	4	5		
0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (21.43%)	11 (78.57%)		0 (0.00%)
Focus	Mean	Stdev	Median	Observations		
Class	4.786	0.426	5	14		
Same Level	3.654	1.325	4	26		
Same Discipline	3.946	1.061	4	1399		

G4. There was a positive interaction between the class and the instructor.

Type: How much

Not at all					Very much	NR
1	2	3	4	5		
0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.14%)	6 (42.86%)	7 (50.00%)		0 (0.00%)
Focus	Mean	Stdev	Median	Observations		
Class	4.429	0.646	4.5	14		
Same Level	4.308	0.970	5	26		
Same Discipline	3.679	1.229	4	1397		

G5. The instructor's teaching methods helped me understand the course material.

Type: How much

Not at all					Very much	NR
1	2	3	4	5		
0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (14.29%)	6 (42.86%)	6 (42.86%)		0 (0.00%)
Focus	Mean	Stdev	Median	Observations		
Class	4.286	0.726	4	14		
Same Level	3.846	1.255	4	26		
Same Discipline	3.303	1.324	3	1394		

G6. The instructor's verbal communication skills helped me understand the course material.

Type: How much

Not at all					Very much	NR
1	2	3	4	5		
0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.14%)	9 (64.29%)	4 (28.57%)		0 (0.00%)
Focus	Mean	Stdev	Median	Observations		
Class	4.214	0.579	4	14		
Same Level	4.077	1.129	4	26		
Same Discipline	3.198	1.396	3	1396		

G7. The instructor clearly explained what was expected on assignments and tests

Type: How much

Not at all					Very much	NR
1	2	3	4	5		
0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (28.57%)	3 (21.43%)	7 (50.00%)		0 (0.00%)
Focus	Mean	Stdev	Median	Observations		
Class	4.214	0.893	4.5	14		
Same Level	4.538	0.859	5	26		
Same Discipline	3.779	1.164	4	1396		

G8. The instructor kept me informed about my progress in the course.

Type: How much

Not at all					Very much	NR
1	2	3	4	5		
0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.14%)	3 (21.43%)	10 (71.43%)		0 (0.00%)
Focus	Mean	Stdev	Median	Observations		
Class	4.643	0.633	5	14		
Same Level	4.269	1.002	4.5	26		
Same Discipline	4.123	1.036	4	1393		

G9. The feedback I received on assignments and tests gave me the opportunity to improve my performance.

Type: How much

Not at all					Very much	NR
1	2	3	4	5		
0 (0.00%)	1 (7.14%)	2 (14.29%)	6 (42.86%)	5 (35.71%)		0 (0.00%)
Focus	Mean	Stdev	Median	Observations		
Class	4.071	0.917	4	14		
Same Level	4.231	1.032	5	26		
Same Discipline	3.476	1.274	4	1388		

G10. Overall, the instructor is an effective teacher.

Type: How much

Not at all					Very much	NR
1	2	3	4	5		
0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.14%)	9 (64.29%)	4 (28.57%)	0 (0.00%)	
Focus	Mean	Stdev	Median	Observations		
Class	4.214	0.579	4	14		
Same Level	4.115	1.107	4	26		
Same Discipline	3.576	1.242	4	1393		

G11. The instructor's grading procedures gave a fair evaluation of my understanding of the material.

Type: How much

Not at all					Very much	NR
1	2	3	4	5		
1 (7.14%)	1 (7.14%)	2 (14.29%)	6 (42.86%)	4 (28.57%)	0 (0.00%)	
Focus	Mean	Stdev	Median	Observations		
Class	3.786	1.188	4	14		
Same Level	4.462	0.859	5	26		
Same Discipline	3.939	1.069	4	1387		

G12. How much work did you put into this course relative to your other courses?

Type: How much

Not at all					Very much	NR
1	2	3	4	5		
0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.14%)	5 (35.71%)	8 (57.14%)	0 (0.00%)	
Focus	Mean	Stdev	Median	Observations		
Class	4.500	0.650	5	14		
Same Level	3.885	0.909	4	26		
Same Discipline	3.909	0.930	4	1396		

G13. How difficult was this course for you relative to your other courses?

Type: How much

Not at all					Very much	NR
1	2	3	4	5		
0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.14%)	9 (64.29%)	4 (28.57%)	0 (0.00%)	
Focus	Mean	Stdev	Median	Observations		
Class	4.214	0.579	4	14		
Same Level	3.560	0.917	4	25		
Same Discipline	3.930	0.946	4	1388		

G14. To what extent was this course a requirement for you?

Type: How much

Not at all					Very much	NR
1	2	3	4	5		
0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.14%)	2 (14.29%)	11 (78.57%)	0 (0.00%)	
Focus	Mean	Stdev	Median	Observations		
Class	4.714	0.611	5	14		
Same Level	4.538	0.761	5	26		
Same Discipline	4.612	0.806	5	1382		

G15. Was this course in your major?

Type: Yes - No

Yes	No	NR
13 (92.86%)	1 (7.14%)	0 (0.00%)

G16. Was this course team-taught?

Type: Yes - No

Yes	No	NR
1 (7.14%)	13 (92.86%)	0 (0.00%)

G17. Please indicate your satisfaction with the availability of the instructor outside the classroom by choosing one response from the scale. In selecting your rating, consider the instructor's availability via established office hours, appointments, and other opportunities for face-to-face interaction as well as via telephone, email, fax and other means.

Type: Satisfaction

Very Dissatisfied				Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	NR
0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (14.29%)	12 (85.71%)	0 (0.00%)
Focus	Mean	Stdev	Median	Observations
Class	3.857	0.363	4	14
Same Level	3.654	0.562	4	26
Same Discipline	3.312	0.750	3	1399

G18. Please comment on the strengths of the instructor and the course.

Type: Essay

Student Comments

- #1 - Strengths:* Instructor's emphasis on fundamentals and problem solving using just the know-how of most essential fundamentals. * The recitation and oral homework sessions which give an opportunity for face to face interaction, looking at the concepts from a physical perspective and revisiting the basics.
- #2 - His course is well organized so I feel comparatively comfortable following things he discuss in the classroom. Also his pace is quite good so that I can grasp as much as can.
- #3 - Dr. Oberheide is a very organized professor. His class notes follow a line of thinking and his homework prepared us to the exams. Though his hand writing is really bad. It is somewhat really hard to understand the difference between r's and k's, and o's and thetas. He could give more practical applications to specific research topics to make us more interested.
- #4 - I always love the problems you assign us. I think they help me learn a lot of subject matter and the recitation added this sem was even greater. I liked the way you made us work on the problems and the fact that the materials you had on recitation always helped during the homeworks and assessments.
- #5 - Prof Oberheide always knew the content of his lectures very well and didn't hesitate to answer any questions. His open door policy was also very useful. The recitation lectures were extremely helpful as it gave me a chance to discuss challenging problems with Prof Oberheide and other students.
- #6 - Very well structured and organized; I always knew when something was due, and what was expected.
- #7 - Dr. Oberheide was sure to let us know the physical significance of what we were studying instead of just drowning us in a sea of math. He was very clear about what was required and was always available outside of class.
- #8 - Recitation helped to illustrate how to apply the course material. Good since Pathria, the main textbook, is lacking in examples.
- #9 - The lectures are, for the most part, explained clearly. When solving problems, he places a strong emphasis on the general process for solving all problems of a given type.
- #10 - The individual oral homework sessions were extremely helpful, as was the structure of the recitation sessions. It is particular effective for me to work in a group with the instructor available to provide help.
- #12 - thank you Dr.O
- #13 - very careful and show great efforts to improve the course
- #14 - Always willing to help, and does a good job at doing so.

G19. Please comment on the weaknesses of the instructor and the course.

Type: Essay

Student Comments

- #1 - No weakness of course as such, however the time allocated for the entire course material is less for effective discussions of concepts outside statistical mechanics.
- #2 - Doesn't always do all the maths relates to the subject. I don't blame him for that but rather we have too little time in a semester to do study everything thoroughly.
- #4 - Everything is good abt the way u teach. The only thing I wish was if u elaborated more on the physics of the material.
- #5 - I would've liked more time devoted to the statistical mechanics portion (specifically the quantum statistics) of the course because it pertains to my research interests. However, I'm sure everyone, including myself, needed the thermodynamics review at the beginning.
- #6 - Grading was too harsh to be useful. I think the point system that you use to grade each problem should be further divided- if a problem was actually attempted it should not receive a zero unless it is very, very wrong.
- #9 - The instructor places a strong emphasis on precision. Alone, this would not be an issue, but the number of points subtracted for an error is often not proportional to the severity of the mistake.

G20. Please comment on any teaching methods you found particularly helpful, and suggest alternative methods that you feel would improve the course.

Type: Essay

Student Comments

- #1 - The Recitation session and Oral homework were particularly helpful. If the questions for recitation session is posted a day earlier, students might have some time to think about the approach before they come for the class.
- #2 - The concept of recitation class has been a blessing, learn a lot about problem solving skill. I regret why this was not during last semester.
- #5 - The procedure of the recitation sessions was very helpful. It allowed me to find an approach and compare/discuss it with the other students. If my approach was incorrect, I would modify it and move on using another student's or Prof Oberheide's suggestions. Making and correcting mistakes is one of the best ways to learn.
- #6 - The oral homework presentations were very useful, although stress-inducing. It requires a more critical look at a previous problem that was not fully understood, therefore ensuring the concept was learned.
- #7 - I did like the recitation sessions we had.
- #9 - The interviews are very instructive, although they can be quite lengthy.
- #10 - Recitations and oral homework sessions were helpful.
- #14 - Oral discussions were helpful. Recitations were helpful.

G21. I would recommend this instructor to a friend. Yes or no? Why?

Type: Essay

Student Comments

- #1 - Yes
- #2 - Of course yes, he has very thorough conceptual knowledge. Time may not permit him to do everything in the classroom but whenever I have visited him in his office, I have never been disappointed. He stresses on the physics of the problem rather than the maths.
- #3 - Yes. He is a fair, interested, helpful instructor and I don't see why not...
- #4 - Yes
- #5 - Absolutely. This is the 4th semester I've been taught by Prof Oberheide (now you probably know who this is!) I can say without a doubt that he knows the material like the back of his hand. He is very approachable and is almost always available in his office for any questions regarding notes, homework, tests, etc.
- #6 - Yes
- #7 - Yes. Dr. Oberheide is very professional and teaches the course material well.
- #9 - Yes, I would recommend this instructor to a friend. Although the grading is very harsh, anyone who takes this course will learn the material well.

#10 - Yes; thorough and willing to approach problems in various ways
#12 - yes, really helpful
#13 - yes
#14 - Yes.