Rutgers University Student Instructional Rating Fall 2023

Zeilberger, Doron - ZEILBERG

Graph Theory - 01:640:428:02 Survey Form: *Standard SIRS

Enrollment: 26

University-wide Instructor Questions

Weight of responses: 1=SD (Strongly Disagree), 2=D (Disagree), 3=N (Neutral), 4=A (Agree), 5=SA (Strongly Agree), Resp=Number of Student Responses Weighted Means: Section, Course, Level, Department

SD D Ν Α SA Section Course Resp Level Dept The instructor Doron Zeilberger was prepared for class and presented the 0 1 3 4 4 12 3.92 4.26 4.27 4.28 material in an organized manner. The instructor Doron Zeilberger responded 0 0 0 8 4.23 4.24 4 12 4.67 4.60 effectively to student comments and questions. The instructor Doron Zeilberger generated 0 0 0 2 10 12 4.83 4.70 4.06 4.13 interest in the course material. The instructor Doron Zeilberger had a positive 0 0 attitude toward assisting all 0 1 11 12 4.83 4.60 4.34 4.37 students in understanding course material. The instructor Doron 2 4.29 Zeilberger assigned grades 0 0 0 10 12 4.83 4.55 4.35 fairly. The instructional methods of Doron Zeilberger 2 0 0 1 9 12 4.67 4.58 4.04 4.13 encouraged student learning.

Teaching Effectiveness

Weight of responses: 1=P (Poor), 2=F (Fair), 3=A (Average), 4=G (Good), 5=E (Excellent), Resp=Number of Student Responses

Weighted Means: Section, Course, Level, Department

| | Ρ | F | А | G | Е | Resp | Section | Course | Level | Dept |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|------|---------|--------|-------|------|
| l rate the teaching effectiveness of the instructor Doron Zeilberger as: | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 12 | 4.58 | 4.48 | 4.09 | 4.08 |

University-wide Course Questions

Weight of responses: 1=SD (Strongly Disagree), 2=D (Disagree), 3=N (Neutral), 4=A (Agree), 5=SA (Strongly Agree), Resp=Number of Student Responses

Weighted Means: Section, Course, Level, Department

| | SD | D | N | А | SA | Resp | Section | Course | Level | Dept |
|---|----|---|---|---|----|------|---------|--------|-------|------|
| l learned a great deal in this course. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 12 | 4.75 | 4.65 | 4.23 | 4.11 |
| I had a strong prior interest in the subject matter and wanted to take this course. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 12 | 4.58 | 4.32 | 4.08 | 3.49 |

Course Quality

Weight of responses: 1=P (Poor), 2=F (Fair), 3=A (Average), 4=G (Good), 5=E (Excellent), Resp=Number of Student Responses

Weighted Means: Section, Course, Level, Department

| | Ρ | F | А | G | Е | Resp | Section | Course | Level | Dept |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|------|---------|--------|-------|------|
| l rate the overall quality of the course as: | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 12 | 4.67 | 4.62 | 4.08 | 3.88 |

What do you like best about this course?

These comments are intended for all instructors.

| Comments |
|--|
| Good real quiz in class |
| I loved learning about platonic solids and the practicality of the theorems we were learning like in combinatorial games. |
| Lectures |
| I enjoy the general though process that goes into thinking about Graph Theory. It is interesting to build this dimension of thought especially in the context of proofs. |

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

These comments are intended for all instructors.

Comments

Assign smaller number of assignments

From my perspective, I feel as though professor Zeilberger struggles very heavily to properly teach the higher level proofs within this course. His notation is sloppy and he frequently makes mistakes that are corrected by students in the class. I love his personality, but I think that this is really holding this class back in a lot of ways. I do believe that professor Z is very honest and admits his mistakes and even goes the extra mile to reiterate over proofs that were done very poorly. However, I don't think it makes up for the fact that about 70% of the time I am comprehending the proofs from the textbook and not from his class. I think notation needs to be much more properly defined especially because a lot of students aren't even math majors in this course. Some proofs are just sloppy and they clearly make sense in his mind, but there is an apparent struggle in communicating those concepts across.

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

These comments are unique to the instructor Doron Zeilberger.

| Comments |
|--|
| He made math exciting again |
| The lectures were engaging |
| Professor Zeilberger has definitely encouraged my growth in this class and persistently encouraged students to work hard by preparing them well. |

Other comments or suggestions:

These comments are intended for all instructors.

Comments

I think this course would benefit heavily from focusing a great deal of more time on the second half of the material. The first half is a lot of definitions and basic proofs that aren't difficult to grasp after one or two reads. However, some of the more complicated concepts cannot just be glossed over in a short 10 minute proof filled with 20 minutes of mistakes. The crucial steps that allow the proof to work must be explored in many different angles, not just the one that makes sense in the professor's mind.