ESCIONLINE SURVEY STATISTICS Note that the Campus and Departmental Norms for this Survey are based ONLY on other ESCI Online Courses.

Due to the different method of data collection, these Norms do not include ESCI Surveys collected by the paper response forms.

End of Fall Quarter 2017 -- ESCI Online

Department and Campus Norms taken over time span: Winter Quarter 2013 - Fall Quarter 2017

Abbrv: MATH Instructor: SCHARLEMANN M

Department: MATHEMATICS

SCHARLEMANN M

Rank: Faculty

Course Enrollment: 37

8 0200

Course: MATH

Guidelines for "Interpreting ESCI Data" and a description of the "Report Output" can be found at http://oic.id.ucsb.edu/esci. NOTICE: Please examine these evaluations upon receipt and immediately report any suspected errors to: ESCI Coordinator, Instructional Consultation, 1130 Kerr Hall (x4278).

(3256) 1	•	Comment	on	the	instructor	's	strengths	and	weaknesses.
-----------------	---	---------	----	-----	------------	----	-----------	-----	-------------

Tries to make students come out of their shell if we aren't as vocal as we should be
A little hard to follow sometimes, doesnt fully explain some concepts expecting us to already understand certain portions.
Sometimes I cannot get his joke
Sometimes the professor switches topics quickly and without explanation so it is easy to get lost in the lectures. He is very engaging though and really tries to make sure his students understand the subject material.
strength: telling jokes during classes weakness: voice low
Good at explaining definations and theroms very clearly. Very focus on the textbook
good lectures that go over most material but could improve on having clearer and more concrete examples. good exams that are pretty fair. sometimes hard to follow professor's train of thought and once you get lost once it is hard to understand the rest of the lecture
weakness - goes back and forth between examples strength - engages students
He is good at explaining concepts and any questions students may have.
The instructor knew what he was talking about and did a great job explaining. However, he was very intimidating. Especially how he'd call on random students to answer his questions then seem very disappointed if the student gave a wrong answer.
Explains the concepts thoroughly and provides a lot of examples. However, he can go through material quite quickly and expect us to know what is going on. It'd be helpful to slow down.
writing on board is not good
Strengths: very good lectures , and explains reason behind theorems and props very well. Weakness: spends too much time with reasoning behind theorems and props that I believe some of that time should go to more examples.
The professor often times worked too fast and did not offer a lot of chances for us to think for ourselves. I found myself at lecture mindless copying down what he was writing on the board just to keep up and hardly had any chance to actually understand

what I was writing in my notebook. Most of the time, he was simply talking to himself throughout lecture without making any stops

Type:Lecture

Page 2

Due to the different method of data collection, these Norms do not include ESCI Surveys collected by the paper response forms.

End of Fall Quarter 2017 -- ESCI Online

Department and Campus Norms taken over time span: Winter Quarter 2013 - Fall Quarter 2017

Abbrv: MATH Instructor: SCHARLEMANN M Department: MATHEMATICS

Rank: Faculty

Course: MATH 8 0200 Type:Lecture

Course Enrollment:

37 Guidelines for "Interpreting ESCI Data" and a description of the "Report Output" can be found at http://oic.id.ucsb.edu/esci.

NOTICE: Please examine these evaluations upon receipt and immediately report any suspected errors to: ESCI Coordinator, Instructional Consultation, 1130 Kerr Hall (x4278).

for questions or to see if people were still following along. In addition, the times he actually stopped to give us a chance to stop and work out a problem ourselves and participate were scarce and spread out. He also consistently writes over abbreviated and minimal proofs, that hardly ever have any words or writing (the times he does it is very illegible). However, if we were to follow in the example he sets, we get heavily penalized. In addition, his grading system for homeworks is much too harsh. Each assignment is treated like a take home exam, where only the worst problems are graded or even looked at, while all the time and effort put into other problems you may have gotten right aren't even considered. It seems as though they only function to hurt you, and several problems are much too difficult to figure out on your own. To remedy this, we are expected to go to office hours which aren't always realistic due to regular schedule conflicts. In addition, his system of only grading the worst looking problems on the midterm and final just seems lazy, like our hard work and effort isn't even worth your time. However, the professor was indeed charismatic and entertaining, and I appreciated his jokes here and there. I also appreciated his enthusiasm for the subject matter, as it radiates and inspires.

I thought the instructor was informative, and simplified complicated proofs. Perhaps something to grab the students' attention more would be helpful.

He explained everything clearly and at a good pace and ensured that students never hesitated to ask a guestion. You could tell he genuinely wanted us to learn and succeed. He gave a fair amount of homework and kept a good amount of office hours and responded quickly to emails. The only weakness in his teaching was that he spent a majority of the class period often on proofs of Theorems or Propositions in the textbook after telling us in class on the first week that we wouldn't be doing these specific proofs on the tests and could just site them to move our proofs along. It would have been much more helpful to see proofs that used these Theorems and Propositions in them than the proofs of them themselves.