Teval

Teval Report: Student Ratings of Instruction

Teaching and Learning Center | Kansas State University

Faculty Member: **Miller, Joshua** Course Name: **Traditional(11952)**	Course #: **MATH 100**
Hr./Days: **1130 M On Campus** College: **Arts and Sciences**	Term: **Spring 2018**

Responses from 10 of the 21 enrolled (48%)   Offered: 05/04/18 - 05/09/18

Overall Effectiveness

	Number Responding [VL=1, VH=5]						Statistics	
	VL	L	M	H	VH	OMIT	SD[1]	AVG
Obtained Responses								
1. Overall effectiveness as a teacher	0	0	2	4	4	0	0.7	4.2
11. Increased desire to learn about the subject	1	0	3	3	3	0	1.2	3.7
14. Amount learned in the course	0	0	4	3	3	0	0.8	3.9

	Statistics		Comparative Status[2]	
	Raw	Adjusted[3]	Raw	Adjusted[3]
Averages and Comparative Status				
1. Overall effectiveness as a teacher	4.2	4.4	M	HM
11. Increased desire to learn about the subject	3.7	3.8	M	M
14. Amount learned in the course	3.9	3.7	M	M

Ratings of Student Attributes and Instructional Styles

	Number Responding [VL=1, VH=5]						Statistics	
	VL	L	M	H	VH	OMIT	SD[1]	AVG
Relevant Student Attributes								
12. Interest in the course before enrolling	0	1	4	2	3	0	1.0	3.7
13. Effort to learn in the course	0	0	2	3	5	0	0.8	4.3
Instructional Styles								
A. Establishing a Learning Climate								
2. Made the course goals and objectives clear	0	0	3	2	5	0	0.9	4.2
3. Well prepared for class	0	0	2	1	7	0	0.8	4.5
5. Interest in helping students learn	0	0	3	3	4	0	0.8	4.1
10. Willingness to help outside of class	1	1	2	2	4	0	1.3	3.7
B. Facilitating Student Learning								
4. Explained the subject clearly	0	0	1	5	4	0	0.6	4.3
6. Stimulated thinking about the subject	0	0	4	3	3	0	0.8	3.9
7. Made helpful comments on student work	1	2	0	5	2	0	1.3	3.5
8. Grading procedures fair and equitable	0	1	1	1	7	0	1.0	4.4
9. Realized when students did not understand	0	1	2	4	3	0	0.9	3.9

Instructor's Description of Class

A. Type of class

B. Class size

C. Physical facilities

D. Previously taught this course?

E. Approach significantly different this term?

F. Description of teaching load?

G. Attitude toward teaching this course

H. Control of course decisions

I. Differences in student preparation

J. Student enthusiasm

K. Student effort to learn

L. Additional comments?

---

[1] STANDARD DEVIATION

[2] RELATIVE TO KSU CLASSES RATED BY 10 OR MORE STUDENTS: H=UPPER 10%; HM=NEXT 20%; M=MIDDLE 40%; LM=NEXT 20%; L=LOWEST 10%

[3] ADJUSTED FOR STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS & CLASS SIZE: SEE TEVAL GUIDE

Teval

Teval Report: Student Ratings of Instruction
Teaching and Learning Center | Kansas State University

Faculty Member: **Miller, Joshua** Course Name: **Traditional(11952)**	Course #: **MATH 100**
Hr./Days: **1130 M On Campus** College: **Arts and Sciences**	Term: **Spring 2018**

Mathematics

		1	2	3	4	5	OMIT	SD	AVG
1.1	Overall, the instructor is an excellent teacher.	0	0	4	1	5	0	0.9	4.1
1.2	The instructor communicates well.	0	1	1	3	5	0	1.0	4.2
1.3	The instructor was well-prepared for class and the presentations well-planned.	0	0	3	2	5	0	0.9	4.2
1.4	The instructor helped me learn the material	0	0	2	3	5	0	0.8	4.3
1.5	I feel free to ask the instructor questions in class and out of class.	0	2	0	3	5	0	1.1	4.1
1.6	I would recommend the instructor to a friend.	0	1	2	1	6	0	1.1	4.2

1 = strongly disagree | 2 = somewhat disagree | 3 = ambivalent | 4 = somewhat agree | 5 = strongly agree

Additional Comments

1. Additional Comments
   - Overall I learned a lot of material and I feel that professor Miller did a good job of teaching the material.
   - Really helped to make the mathematical processes clear! Any misconceptions or misunderstandings that I had about any of the problems were corrected during this class.