

Rutgers University

Summer 2017 Student Instructional Rating Surveys

Course: 01: 640: 300: T6INTROMATHREASONING: Math-300: Introduction to Mathematical Reasoning-2017SU - INTRO MATH REASONING 01: 640: 300: T6

Instructor: David E Molnar, CHLOE URBANSKI *

1 - The instructor was prepared for class and presented the material in an organized manner.

CHLOE URBANSKI

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%		
Disagree	(2)	0	0%		
Neutral	(3)	0	0%		
Agree	(4)	1	16.67%		
Strongly Agree	(5)	5	83.33%		
N/A	(0)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
6/14 (42.86%)	4.83	0.41	5.00		

2 - The instructor generated interest in the course material.

CHLOE URBANSKI

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%		
Disagree	(2)	0	0%		
Neutral	(3)	0	0%		
Agree	(4)	1	16.67%		
Strongly Agree	(5)	5	83.33%		
N/A	(0)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
6/14 (42.86%)	4.83	0.41	5.00		

3 - The instructor responded effectively to student comments and questions.

CHLOE URBANSKI

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%		
Disagree	(2)	0	0%		
Neutral	(3)	0	0%		
Agree	(4)	1	16.67%		
Strongly Agree	(5)	5	83.33%		
N/A	(0)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
6/14 (42.86%)	4.83	0.41	5.00		

Rutgers University



Summer 2017 Student Instructional Rating Surveys

Course: 01: 640: 300: T6INTROMATHREASONING: Math-300: Introduction to Mathematical Reasoning-2017SU - INTRO MATH REASONING 01: 640: 300: T6

Instructor: David E Molnar, CHLOE URBANSKI *



4 - The instructor had a positive attitude toward assisting all students in understanding course material.

CHLOE URBANSKI

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%		
Disagree	(2)	0	0%		
Neutral	(3)	0	0%		
Agree	(4)	0	0%		
Strongly Agree	(5)	6	100%		
N/A	(0)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
6/14 (42.86%)	5.00	0.00	5.00		



5 - The instructor assigned grades fairly.

CHLOE URBANSKI



Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%		
Disagree	(2)	0	0%		
Neutral	(3)	0	0%		
Agree	(4)	0	0%		
Strongly Agree	(5)	6	100%		
N/A	(0)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
6/14 (42.86%)	5.00	0.00	5.00		

6 - The instructional methods encouraged student learning.

CHLOE URBANSKI

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%		
Disagree	(2)	0	0%		
Neutral	(3)	0	0%		
Agree	(4)	2	33.33%		
Strongly Agree	(5)	4	66.67%		
N/A	(0)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
6/14 (42.86%)	4.67	0.52	5.00		

7 - I learned a great deal in this course.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%		
Disagree	(2)	0	0%		
Neutral	(3)	0	0%		
Agree	(4)	1	16.67%		
Strongly Agree	(5)	5	83.33%		
N/A	(0)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
6/14 (42.86%)	4.83	0.41	5.00		

Rutgers University

Summer 2017 Student Instructional Rating Surveys

Course: 01: 640: 300: T6INTROMATHREASONING: Math-300: Introduction to Mathematical Reasoning-2017SU - INTRO MATH REASONING 01: 640: 300: T6

Instructor: David E Molnar, CHLOE URBANSKI *

8 - I had a strong prior interest in the subject matter and wanted to take this course.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0%		4.50
Disagree	(2)	0	0%		
Neutral	(3)	1	16.67%		
Agree	(4)	1	16.67%		
Strongly Agree	(5)	4	66.67%		
N/A	(0)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
6/14 (42.86%)	4.50	0.84	5.00		

9 - I rate the teaching effectiveness of the instructor as:

CHLOE URBANSKI

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
1 = Poor	(1)	0	0%		4.83
2	(2)	0	0%		
3	(3)	0	0%		
4	(4)	1	16.67%		
5 = Excellent	(5)	5	83.33%		
N/A	(0)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
6/14 (42.86%)	4.83	0.41	5.00		

10 - I rate the overall quality of the course as:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
1 = Poor	(1)	0	0%		5.00
2	(2)	0	0%		
3	(3)	0	0%		
4	(4)	0	0%		
5 = Excellent	(5)	6	100%		
N/A	(0)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
6/14 (42.86%)	5.00	0.00	5.00		

11 - What do you like best about this course?

- The way this course was run during the summer is exponentially better than during the school year.
- The material was at least interesting
- I really enjoyed the active learning environment. I had trepidation prior to the course, as I couldn't imagine a math class in this format. I was, however, proven wrong. I found that the active learning environment, and the overall structure of no lecturing, led to an open environment where students learned fundamentals on their own, but solidified the topics with the help of other students and the instructor. This led to me having a very easy time taking in the course materials, much easier than I have in any other math class prior to this. The environment lend itself naturally to group work, which was also quite important. I also enjoyed the work done with LaTeX in this course. I find myself enjoying the newfound ability to be able to type mathematical documents easily.
- I liked how it was an active learning class and operated more like a recitation. I think I got more out of it because of that.

12 - If you were teaching this course, what would you do differently?

- Nothing - I love that it was activity and hands-on based.
- I would prefer a short lecture, maybe 30 minutes to introduce the topic, then a do the workshop
- N/A
- No content quizzes!

Rutgers University

Summer 2017 Student Instructional Rating Surveys

Course: 01: 640: 300: T6INTROMATHREASONING: Math-300: Introduction to Mathematical Reasoning-2017SU -
INTRO MATH REASONING 01: 640: 300: T6

Instructor: David E Molnar,CHLOE URBANSKI *

13 - In what ways, if any, has this course or the instructor encouraged your intellectual growth and progress?

- I am going to get a lot better at math.
- I can do proofs now, in a formal manner. So, I can now understand the logic of proofs in other courses.
- I found that the difficulty of the review problems assigned by my instructor kept me very interested in the material, as they often introduced a new idea or topic within the problems themselves. The challenging nature of the problems also helped keep my attention, and gave me a great deal of satisfaction when I was able to finish them. I believe the active learning environment and challenging nature of the problems was what motivated my intellectual growth and progress the most. Although this is only a summer course, I feel as though I have learned more than I usually do in a regular fall or spring semester.
- She really pushed us to think for ourselves and to work through problems no matter how challenging or foreign they were at first. I think she prepared us well from the get go as for what to expect from each and every class by giving us intro and review assignments as well as introducing us to LaTeX.

14 - Other comments or suggestions:

- Chloe is the best. She should be able to definitely teach 300 again. Loved her enthusiasm for mathematics and her motivation to have everyone have a solid understanding of the material. It made for a great learning environment.
- N/A