

Final Evaluation (CTEF) for Kim, Chan Ho MATH 3A LEC H (44615), Winter Qtr 2015

Responses: 32/64 (50%)

A. Please comment on the following areas and be as specific as possible:

1. What are the instructor's teaching strengths?

- Availability, note presentation, and speaking ability.
- Being charismatic, he is easy to listen to.
- Eager to want to help, and gives clarification when asked.
- Explains concepts well
- going through problems and proofs/concepts
- He goes through every definition and proof to make sure how things are derived. Lectures are detailed.
- He is Very nice and clear
- He is very understanding and exceptional at one on one.
- He provides definitions and examples for us to understand the material.
- He seems to understand the topic thoroughly
- He was very nice, polite, and always willing to help. He was kinda funny, too.
- Humorous and approachable teacher.
- Knows what he is talking about.
- Lots of examples helpful and understanding wants the students to learn
- moderate
- Professor Kim seems to genuinely want his students to succeed. He always fills his classroom with a light, cheery atmosphere and that really enhances the learning environment.
- Provides many examples to go along with the proofs and theorems presented in class.
- Providing examples in class.
- Speaks clearly and provides great effort and demonstrations toward the subject.
- Tries to make the subject understandable
- Very interested in subject and tries to make it as interesting as math can be. Always stops to help students if they are falling behind during lecture.
- Very nice.
- Was very nice and open.
- 9 blank answer(s).

2. How can this instructor improve as a teacher?

- Adding more concrete examples (possibly a problem or two from the textbook) would help with comprehension, given there are many theorems to learn.
- By explaining things a little better, rather than stating what is said in the book because the book is confusing at times. He could also give more examples rather than just only writing facts.
- By working out examples instead of just writing definitions on the chalk board. Also, he should really communicate with the TA more.
- Explain concepts more thoroughly and clearly. Do not assume we understand the notation you use all the time. Examples accompanying concepts would be very helpful.

- Go over actual homework problems and focus on computation and engineering related problems instead of focusing on memorizing theorems and proofs.
- He could slow down his lectures a bit or break them up into segments.
- He does not explain the material very well in my opinion. I feel that he does not come to class fully prepared to teach the material as many times during lecture he seems flustered and does not know how to explain it. Most importantly, he is not consistent with his headers. He does not tell us which section he is on, and sometimes it causes me to lose my place. I would like it if he explained which section he was on. Also, he practically explained word for word what the text book printed. It felt like he was reading us the textbook, not really explaining the examples. Most of the class composed of me trying to copy down long sentences that are already in the book.
- He should provide more ideas about the concepts rather than simply copying the textbook.
- He was very disorganized. He didn't even get us a syllabus till like halfway into week 1. Plus he switched the date of the midterm from what it was on the syllabus which completely messed up my schedule and studying so I got a horrible grade. Not to mention, the class had very little structure. He just wrote stuff on the board and had us copy it down. His explanations were just reading what he wrote, it was completely unhelpful and useless. I wish he had more effective teaching strategies. I couldn't understand the relevance of any of the stuff we learned to real life. I really didn't like his lecturing style and was very lost. I think if I had a different professor, I could've learned better.
- It would be better for him to slow down his teaching process and understand that the people taking the course are not familiar with his own vocabulary. He should try and write on the board in a way that everyone understands.
- Just clarity... he talks pretty fast and in sometimes hard to understand but he does try to keep it interesting
- More examples in class than concepts
- Moves too quickly
- n/a
- Neater writing please. And try to not abbreviate with personal abbreviations to avoid confusion. The teacher was very nice but it was difficult to understand him due to his heavy accent and imperfect grammar. His explanations seemed to confuse more than help as well.
- None
- nothing
- Nothing.
- slow down during lecture
- sometimes the explanations are a little hard to understand when its all theory
- Speak slower and more clearly, explain why a concept is important, and maybe connect the class to real world examples.
- teach something that can help understand the concept more easily other than the texts on the textbook
- Variation in types of problems.
- 9 blank answer(s).

3. Any other comments about this course?

- A great teacher and a shame that he is leaving UCI next year.
- At times the course feels very simple, but other times concepts are extremely confusing.
- class is great, topic is interesting, but exams are a little difficult (especially with the time constraint)

UCI EEE Evaluations

Final Evaluation (CTEF) for Kim, Chan Ho MATH 3A LEC H (44615), Winter Qtr 2015

- I feel that his midterms are a little on the tough side. Making us calculate a 5x5 matrix full of only 1's and 0's is pretty confusing. Additionally, the matrices tend to be rather large, often 5x5 and that often takes a while to compute. Other than that, I found this class entertaining because of Professor Kim's humorous nature.
- I seriously couldn't understand anything he was saying because his accent was so thick. I'm not racist or anything but honestly half the time I was so lost trying to decipher what he was saying that I couldn't even follow along the math portion. It took me like 4 weeks to realize that he was saying "zero" because it sounded nothing like the word. I mean, math is super hard as it is and this added language barrier totally didn't help.
- Learned very little in lecture. Had to depend on textbook and homework.
- n/a
- none
- nope
- nope
- T/F should not have a guessing penalty. This is not the SAT. The newest version of the SAT removed the guessing penalty anyway and most, if not all, standardized tests do not have a guessing penalty anymore. Not the ACT nor AP test.
- This course should stick to a strict schedule and not go faster or cover more than necessary.
- very good.love it <3
- 19 blank answer(s).

B. Please choose the appropriate rating on the letter grade scale A to F:

'A' indicating an excellent and 'F' indicating a wholly inadequate performance. If you have no opinion on the question asked or if it does not apply, please select NA.

4. The course instructor shows enthusiasm for and is interested in the subject.

15	A	Value: 4
6	A-	Value: 3.7
4	B+	Value: 3.3
4	B	Value: 3
1	B-	Value: 2.7
0	C+	Value: 2.3
0	C	Value: 2
0	C-	Value: 1.7
0	D	Value: 1
0	F	Value: 0
0	NA	No Value
3.67	Mean	
3.85	Median	
0.41	Std Dev	

5. The course instructor stimulates your interest in the subject.

UCI EEE Evaluations

Final Evaluation (CTEF) for Kim, Chan Ho MATH 3A LEC H (44615), Winter Qtr 2015

6	A	Value: 4
8	A-	Value: 3.7
5	B+	Value: 3.3
4	B	Value: 3
2	B-	Value: 2.7
2	C+	Value: 2.3
1	C	Value: 2
0	C-	Value: 1.7
1	D	Value: 1
2	F	Value: 0
0	NA	No Value
3.07	Mean	
3.30	Median	
1.05	Std Dev	

6. The course instructor meets stated objectives of the course.

11	A	Value: 4
10	A-	Value: 3.7
4	B+	Value: 3.3
3	B	Value: 3
2	B-	Value: 2.7
0	C+	Value: 2.3
1	C	Value: 2
0	C-	Value: 1.7
0	D	Value: 1
0	F	Value: 0
0	NA	No Value
3.57	Mean	
3.70	Median	
0.49	Std Dev	

7. The course instructor is accessible and responsive.

13	A	Value: 4
8	A-	Value: 3.7
3	B+	Value: 3.3
5	B	Value: 3
0	B-	Value: 2.7
1	C+	Value: 2.3
0	C	Value: 2
1	C-	Value: 1.7
0	D	Value: 1
0	F	Value: 0
0	NA	No Value
3.56	Mean	
3.70	Median	
0.55	Std Dev	

8. The course instructor creates an open and fair learning environment.

UCI EEE Evaluations

Final Evaluation (CTEF) for Kim, Chan Ho MATH 3A LEC H (44615), Winter Qtr 2015

13	A	Value: 4
9	A-	Value: 3.7
3	B+	Value: 3.3
4	B	Value: 3
2	B-	Value: 2.7
0	C+	Value: 2.3
0	C	Value: 2
0	C-	Value: 1.7
0	D	Value: 1
0	F	Value: 0
0	NA	No Value
3.63	Mean	
3.70	Median	
0.42	Std Dev	

9. The course instructor encourages students to think in this course.

10	A	Value: 4
6	A-	Value: 3.7
5	B+	Value: 3.3
5	B	Value: 3
1	B-	Value: 2.7
2	C+	Value: 2.3
1	C	Value: 2
1	C-	Value: 1.7
0	D	Value: 1
0	F	Value: 0
0	NA	No Value
3.38	Mean	
3.70	Median	
0.64	Std Dev	

10. The course instructor's presentations and explanations of concepts were clear.

6	A	Value: 4
5	A-	Value: 3.7
3	B+	Value: 3.3
6	B	Value: 3
4	B-	Value: 2.7
1	C+	Value: 2.3
3	C	Value: 2
0	C-	Value: 1.7
2	D	Value: 1
1	F	Value: 0
0	NA	No Value
2.95	Mean	
3.00	Median	
0.98	Std Dev	

11. Assignments and exams covered important aspects of the course.

UCI EEE Evaluations

Final Evaluation (CTEF) for Kim, Chan Ho MATH 3A LEC H (44615), Winter Qtr 2015

10	A	Value: 4
11	A-	Value: 3.7
4	B+	Value: 3.3
2	B	Value: 3
1	B-	Value: 2.7
1	C+	Value: 2.3
0	C	Value: 2
1	C-	Value: 1.7
0	D	Value: 1
0	F	Value: 0
0	NA	No Value
3.55	Mean	
3.70	Median	
0.54	Std Dev	

12. What overall grade would you give this instructor?

6	A	Value: 4
11	A-	Value: 3.7
2	B+	Value: 3.3
5	B	Value: 3
2	B-	Value: 2.7
2	C+	Value: 2.3
1	C	Value: 2
2	C-	Value: 1.7
0	D	Value: 1
0	F	Value: 0
0	NA	No Value
3.28	Mean	
3.70	Median	
0.69	Std Dev	

13. What overall grade would you give this course?

5	A	Value: 4
7	A-	Value: 3.7
6	B+	Value: 3.3
6	B	Value: 3
5	B-	Value: 2.7
0	C+	Value: 2.3
0	C	Value: 2
1	C-	Value: 1.7
0	D	Value: 1
0	F	Value: 0
1	NA	No Value
3.30	Mean	
3.30	Median	
0.53	Std Dev	

C. Please answer:

14. Based on completed assignments thus far, what is your current course grade or approximate standing?

UCI EEE Evaluations

Final Evaluation (CTEF) for Kim, Chan Ho MATH 3A LEC H (44615), Winter Qtr 2015

9	A	Value: 4
14	B	Value: 3
7	C	Value: 2
0	D	Value: 1
0	F	Value: 0
1	NA	No Value
3.07	Mean	
3.00	Median	
0.73	Std Dev	

15. How much academic dishonesty seemed to occur in this course? If applicable, please describe the type of academic dishonesty that occurred (not the particular students involved).

1.

- 0** A lot
- 1** Some
- 4** A little
- 26** None I could discern

2. Examples:

- some pple w/ their phones during discussion quizzes
- 31 blank answer(s).

16. How helpful were the textbooks and/or readings to your overall learning experience?

- 19** Very
- 9** Adequately
- 3** Somewhat
- 0** Not at all

17. How challenging was this course?

- 9** Very
- 20** Adequately
- 2** Somewhat
- 0** Not at all