UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



Department of Mathematics 970 Evans Hall BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720

Summary of Teaching Evaluation

Instructor: Ribet, Kenneth

Course/Title: Math 113(1)/Abstract Algebra

Semester: Fall 2013

Official Class Enrollment: 37

Number of Forms Returned: 30

Required Text: Dummit & Foote – Abstract Algebra 3rd ed. (Wiley)

(O=No Rating	')	Poor			Typical			Excellent			
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total	Average	
Professor	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	13	30	6.2	
Course	0	0	0	1	2	5	14	8	30	5.9	

Ribet Math 113, Lec. 1, F '13

Instructor

Unmarked	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total Marked	Total Forms	Average
	-									
0	0	0	0	0	6	11	13	30	30	6.2
	0	0	0	0	30	66	91	187		

Course

Unmarked	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total Marked	Total Forms	Average
0	0	0	1	2	5	14	8	30	30	5.9
	0	0	3	8	25	84	56	176		

University of California, Berkeley

Instr	uctor Ken Ribet	Course	Math 113	Semester _	F-11 2013
,	olled yes				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
fu	hese evaluations will be belowing ways: (1) for unture teaching; (2) for u	se by the instructouse by the student	or (after grades s in selecting co	have been turned in urses and instructors) in improving s.
1.	Considering both the you rate the overall	ie limitations and i teaching effective	possibilities of the eness of this inst	e subject matter and ructor?	course, how would
	not at all		moderately effective		extremely effective
2.	What are the instruction boardwork, example hours, homework, e	es, clarity, willingn	i.e. preparation a ess to answer q	and organization of louestions, attitude tow	ectures, content, vard students, office
• • • •	Ribet is an Swe to Keep Stops Frequent	exculent some streets ergogedy to encour	ce of Methe id throughout ge znestions.	mitted Knowledge. The entire dect	He mokes are ont
3.	What are the instruc	ctor's weaknesses	? How could the	instructor improve h	nis/her teaching?
•	to the book;	however, this	Sometimes	which con alternate Present mokes the f	ectures
	difficult to				
4.	Please rate the over	all <i>course</i> on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:		
	ा क्या क्या क्या क्या का क्या का क्या का क्या का क्या किया किया किया किया किया किया किया कि	13 1	四 moderately effective	5	extremely effective
5.	Comments on any of improved, advice to	ther relevant aspe beople who have t	cts of the course to take it, etc.	e such as content, te	xt, how it could be
	overall, the courtopies dry i	se is que	et, though	I found Somm	. of the
	topies dry i	n Com Posicon	to other	math classes	ghave.
	Beruley,			y	

University of California, Berkeley

Instruc	ctor <u>Ken Rib</u>	er	Course	math 113	S	emester <u>fa</u>	11 2012
Enrolle	ed <u> </u>		Auditing	m0	Yo	our Major <u>ν</u>	nathematics
foll fut	ese evaluations owing ways: (1) ure teaching; (2	for use by t) for use by t	he instructo the students	r (after grades in selecting co	have been to ourses and in	urned in) in i estructors.	mproving
1.				ossibilities of the ness of this ins		atter and cou	ırse, how would
	्रा not at all	-2 3	3 1	ঞ moderately effective	(5)	. 16 1	extremely effective
2.	boardwork, ex hours, homew	amples, clar ork, exams,	rity, willingne grading).		questions, att		res, content, students, office
	communica exams mak	tes regular e you this	ly via em nx.	ons, comments ail			
3.	What are the i	nstructor's w	veaknesses'	? How could th	e instructor i	mprove his/h	er teaching?
	• .				·		
4.	Please rate the	e overall <i>cou</i>	<i>irse</i> on a sca	ale of 1 to 7:			
	ा not at all	12 1	(3)	moderately effective	:5 1	6 0	extremely effective
5.	Comments on improved, adv				se such as co	ontent, text,	now it could be
	a. fundamen emphasis a	-	in met	1.			

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instru	ctor <u>Ken</u>	Ribet	Course	113		_ Semester	Fall 2013
Enroll	ed	<u> </u>	Auditing	9		_ Your Major	Mechanical En
foll	lowing ways: ure teaching; Considering	(1) for use by(2) for use bboth the lim	y the instruc y the studer iitations and	tor (after grad its in selecting	les have been a courses and the subjec		re of the improving ourse, how would
	not at all	-2 1	:3 0	moderately effective	5	4 50	extremely effective
2.	boardwork, hours, home	examples, cl ework, exam	arity, willing s, grading).	ness to answe	er questions,		d students, office
	Patient	with all	students.	Always :	stops during	lectures to	ask for
	questions/	danfi cating	Availat	ble and for	endly at	all times!	
3.	What are the	e instructor's	weaknesse	s? How could	the instructe	or improve his/	her teaching?
					, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	p. 6)
4.	Please rate	the overall co	o <i>urse</i> on a s	cale of 1 to 7:			
	ep not at all	22	(3)	本 moderately effective	5 5	15 3	extremely effective
5.	Comments of	on any other	relevant asp	ects of the co	urse such a	s content, text.	how it could be

University of California, Berkeley

Instruc	ctor KENFI	BET	Course	MATH113	214.	Semester F	ALC 2013
		2013, YES	Auditing _			Your Major _	MATH
follo	owing ways: (1)) for use by the	instructo	partment of Mat (after grades h in selecting cou	hematics nave been	in one or me turned in) i	ore of the n improving
1.				ossibilities of the ness of this instr		matter and o	course, how would
	्रा not at all	(2)	:3 3	ক moderately effective	15 1	16 1	extremely effective
2.	hoardwork av	ramplee clarity	willingne	e. preparation ass to answer que well-planne specially so via limited	octions (attituda tawa	ard students office
3.				How could the			
					•		
4.	Please rate the	e overall <i>cours</i>	e on a sca	ale of 1 to 7:			
	ा not at all	:2 1	4	moderately effective	:5)	16 0	extremely effective
5.		any other relevice to people w			e such as	content, tex	t, how it could be

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	tor Kenvern A.	Ribert Cours	e Mah	113	Semester _	fall 2013
Enrolle	d	Auditii			Your Major	applied math
The folic	se evaluations will owing ways: (1) for re teaching; (2) fo	I be helpful to the use by the instru	Department ctor (after gr	ades have bee	en turned in)	in improving
1.	_	the limitations an all teaching effect	•	•	t matter and	course, how would
	ri⊐ r2 not at all		moderate effective	ıd 5 ⊐ ely	. 16 3	extremely effective
2.		-	gness to ans			ectures, content, ard students, office
3.	What are the inst	ructor's weakness	ses? How co	uld the instruct	or improve h	is/her teaching?
•						
					·	`
4.	Please rate the ov	verall <i>course</i> on a	scale of 1 to	7:	1	
	ा ा ा not at all	ı (3 1	ದು moderate effective		K -1	extremely effective
5.	Comments on any	y other relevant as	spects of the	course such a	s content, te	ext, how it could be

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

				Math 113			
Enroll	ed		Auditing			our Major	EECS
foll	lowing ways: (1 ure teaching; (2 Considering b) for use by 2) for use by poth the limi	the instructor the student tations and	epartment of Mor (after grades in selecting conssibilities of teness of this ins	have been ourses and i	turned in) in i nstructors.	e of the mproving urse, how would
	not at all	C 2 3	:3 3	moderately effective	(5)	(6)	extremely effective
2.	boardwork, ex hours, homev	xamples, cla vork, exams	rity, willingn , grading).		questions, at	titude toward	res, content, students, office
	verd	clear 1	ectures			<u></u>	
	Ver	y friendly	and e	eccessible to	studen		
						:	
3.	What are the	instructor's \	weaknesses	? How could th	e instructor i	improve his/h	er teaching?
	HW	and lec	ture some	how doesn't	related),
•					·		
4.	Please rate the	e overall co	<i>irse</i> on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:			
	ा not at all	12 1	C3:1	四 moderately effective	E 5 0		⊄⊐ extremely effective
5.	Comments on	any other re	elevant aspe	ects of the cours	se such as c	ontent, text, h	now it could be

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Enrolled		Auditin	9		_ Your Major _	Math -
future teachir	/s: (1) for use t ng; (2) for use	by the instruction by the studer	Department of Nator (after grade to selecting of the sele	s have bee courses an	en turned in) i d instructors.	n improving
 Consider you rate 	ring both the lii the overall tea	mitations and ching effectiv	possibilities of reness of this in	the subject structor?	t matter and o	course, how wo
மு not at all	-2 3	3 33	moderately effective	(5)	-6 1	extremely effective
boardwo	the instructor rk, examples, o mework, exam	clarity, willing	(i.e. preparation ness to answer	n and orga questions,	nization of led attitude towa	ctures, content, ard students, of
Very	organized	and str	uctured lecto	ures.		
					•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
3. What are	the instructor'	s weaknesse	s? How could tl	ne instructo	or improve his	s/her teaching?
3. What are	the instructor'	s weaknesse	s? How could tl	ne instructo	or improve his	s/her teaching?
3. What are	the instructor'	s weaknesse	s? How could tl	ne instructo	or improve his	s/her teaching?
3. What are	the instructor'	s weaknesse	s? How could tl	ne instructo	or improve his	s/her teaching?
	the instructor'			ne instructo	or improve his	s/her teaching?

University of California, Berkeley

Instruc	tor Len	Ribet	Course _	Math 1	3s	emester <u>F</u>	11 2013
Enrolle	ed Yes		Auditing	No	Yo	our Major	EECS
The follo	ese evaluation owing ways: (1 are teaching; (2 Considering)	 for use by th for use by th both the limital 	e instructor e students tions and po	partment of Ma (after grades in selecting co ossibilities of thess of this inst	thematics in have been to urses and in se subject ma	one or more urned in) in i structors.	
	not at all		g enecuver	□ □ □ moderately effective	.tuctor:	16 1	extremely effective
2.	boardwork, e	xamples, clarit work, exams, ç	y, willingne	e. preparation ess to answer q	_		ires, content, I students, office
3.	What are the Sometime proven.			How could the			
4.	Please rate th	ne overall <i>cour</i>	se on a sca	ale of 1 to 7:	.5 0	e de la companya de l	:7 0
	not at all			moderately effective	~		extremely effective
5.		n any other rele vice to people			se such as co	ontent, text,	how it could be
	Class 5	tarts 1	1987	t gets	signific	ishty	harder.

University of California, Berkeley

Instr	ructor Ken Ribet	Course _	MATH 113	Semes	ter_Fall 13
Enro	olled	Auditing		Your Ma	ajor EECS
IŲ	hese evaluations will be he blowing ways: (1) for use by ture teaching; (2) for use but Considering both the lime you rate the overall teac	y the instructo y the students itations and p	r (after grades in selecting co ossibilities of th	thematics in one have been turned urses and instructed subject matter	or more of the d in) in improving ctors.
	中 立 加 not at all	:3 1	moderately effective	(5)	extremely effective
2.	What are the instructor's boardwork, examples, cl hours, homework, exams	arity, willingne	e. preparation a	and organization uestions, attitude	of lectures, content, toward students, office
781 ATC 1	Extremely fri	endly a	nd approc	chable.	
3.	What are the instructor's	weaknesses?	How could the	instructor improv	/e his/her teaching?
	Some fines so does si uc e discussions weatness.	nd up 0 this w	topic -	but wi only in	ren re tresting My much of a
4.	Please rate the overall co	urse on a sca	le of 1 to 7:		
	not at all	C3 3	本 moderately effective	5 50	extremely effective
5.	Comments on any other reimproved, advice to people	e wno have to	take it, etc.		
	Perhaps follows	t, the	norz can	spead as	t of topics
• .	would be fun	- Activities	•	y	*

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instru	ctor <u>Ribet</u>	Co	urse	Math 113		Semester _	Fall 20	13
Enroll	ed Yes	Au	diting _	NO		Your Major	Applied	Math
toll	ese evaluations wil owing ways: (1) for ure teaching; (2) for Considering both you rate the overa	use by the insi ruse by the stu the limitations	tructor dents and po	partment of N (after grade in selecting of	Mathematics s have beer courses and the subject	in one or n turned in) instructors	nore of the in improvi	ng
	며 다 다.	3 (3)		moderately effective	5 3	16 1		zi emely ective
2.	What are the instruction boardwork, example hours, homework, Away prepare comfultable	ples, clarity, will , exams, gradin d , engaged	lingne: g). q∽	ss to answer	questions, a	attitude tow	ard studer	nts, office
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •								
3.	What are the instr							hing?
	Som Hard t	commun	1 Cate	on h/w	grades	Occassión	ally)
4.	Please rate the ov	erall course on	a sca	le of 1 to 7:				•
	्रा not at all	(3)		本 moderately effective	15 0	(163)	extrei effec	mely
5.	Comments on any	other relevant	aspec	ts of the cour	se such as	content, tex	ct, how it c	ould be

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruct	or Ribet		Course _	Math 113		Semester	1/ 20/3
Enrolled	d		Auditing		Y	′our Major <u>Aะ</u> ୧	(iel math/cs
follo	wing ways	: (1) for use b	y the instructo	epartment of Ma or (after grades or in selecting co	athematics in have been	n one or more turned in) in i	e of the
				oossibilities of t ness of this ins		atter and co	urse, how would
	ा not at all	(2)	3 1	moderately effective	(5)	16 1	extremely effective
	boardwork	k, examples, o	clarity, willingn	ess to answer of the students	questions, at		ires, content, I students, office
				:			
3.	What are t	the instructor	's weaknesses	? How could th	ne instructor	improve his/f	ner teaching?
4.	Please rate	e the overall	course on a so	ale of 1 to 7:			
•	ு not at all	□2 □	C 3 31		5 50	± 6 3	extremely effective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be 5. improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

Difficult but very worthwhile

University of California, Berkeley

Instruct	tor <u>Kenneth</u>	Riber	_ Course	Math	113	_ Semester	Fall 2013
Enrolle	d		_ Auditing			_ Your Major _	Oppicel Mark
follo futu	ese evaluations of the second	for use by th for use by th	e instruct ne studen	or (after grats ts in selection	ades have bed ng courses ar	en turned in) i nd instructors.	in improving
1.	you rate the ov	oth the limita erall teachin	tions and g effective	possibilities eness of thi	of the subjects instructor?	t matter and	course, how would
	ದು not at all	2 1	:3 :1	moderatel effective	5 5.	16 1	extremely effective
	What are the in boardwork, exa hours, homewo	amples, clari	ty, willingr	(i.e. prepara	ition and orga ver questions	nization of le	ctures, content, ard students, office
	He is qui	ite enthusiastiz	about -	the class a	I condents.		
	V	prepared for					
3.	What are the in	structor's we	eaknesse:	s? How cou	ld the instruct	or improve hi	s/her teaching?
					, dury lext)
		ut will be		l			
·				to fam	to follo	~ ·	
				•			
4.	Please rate the	overall cour	se on a so	cale of 1 to	7 :		
r	ு not at all	12 1	C 3 33	四 moderately effective	E 51	E 6 3	extremely effective
5. (Comments on a improved, advic	iny other rele e to people	evant asp who have	ects of the o	course such a tc.	s content, tex	t, how it could be
					Sometik	,	
. •	1	And some	concepts	are quit	difficult ,	a undusta	l.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Inst	ructor _	Kenk	Sibet	Course	Marth 113	Semester _	Fall 2013
Enr	olled	yes		Auditing	No	Your Major	statistics
		ways.	i) ioi use b	v the instructo	or (atter grades h	thematics in one or nave been turned in urses and instructor	more of the
1.	. Con you	sidering rate the	both the lin	nitations and philoshing effective	oossibilities of the ness of this instr	e subject matter and uctor?	course, how wou
	not at	I. /	2 3	:3 :1	হা moderately effective	ජා ජා	extremely effective
2.	DUai	uwoik, e	ixampies, c	s strengths? (larity, willingnes, grading).	.e. preparation a ess to answer qu	nd organization of le estions, attitude tow	ectures, content, ard students, offic
	(good A	low of lech	ures/course,	boardwork is	good, definitely	willing to
		answer	questions	and in offi	ce hours and	by email, our	very
	6	approac	habie.				
3.	What	are the	instructor's	weaknesses	2 How could the	instructor improve h	
	pac	e of th	e course	1.01(A ()	edd	instructor improve n	is/her teaching?
	ha	on Pullody	(3)(1) (4) (4)	ot was sour	sua, we spent	212 on groups),
	10	rut lus	t looked a	ip the assu	ty long so 1	know a lot of 1	ocople
			i jugicent c	is the asi	es onine		
4.	Pleas	e rate th	e overall co	ourse on a sca	le of 1 to 7:		
	c‡⊐ not at a	ill	12 1	C 3 C1	moderately effective	45 0 46 0	extremely effective
5.	Commimprov	nents on ved, advi	any other r ice to peopl	elevant aspec e who have to	ets of the course take it, etc.	such as content, tex	•
	ma	uke sun	e you un	iderstand E	everything as	you go along be	America It
	al	a boile	as up a	nd you m	li need & an	od undertandin	a of prov
	٠ ,	oncent.	(16 us	. 4 //	in teason of	justient groupi,	7 01 11-21
	\sim		in a strate	ov aon't i	MARKETTON "	UNITED A A IN	- da. (1

Continue on back, if needed.

University of California, Berkeley

Instruc	ctor <u>Ken Rib</u>	et	_ Course	113		Semester _		13
Enrolle	ed		_ Auditing _			Your Major	Math/	Physics.
follo	ese evaluations wowing ways: (1) four teaching; (2) for Considering bot	or use by the or use by th	e instructor e students	(after grades in selecting o	have beer ourses and	n turned in) instructors	in impro	oving
,	you rate the ove	*	-		•		,	
	rip not at all	12 3	:3 :	ক্ষ moderately effective	:5 3			⊄ xtremely effective
3.	What are the instance the instance the instance the instance the instance the instance of could be motivat	mples, clarity k, exams, g was a couraged q office ha rendly to felt careco structor's we k sets a	y, willingne rading). very clear vestions. vers. word standard a lot of a were a lot of a	ss to answer leturer. Products (one bout their bit long.	questions, a second was of the students). The instructions of the second was a second with the second was a sec	attitude tow oternal lo few profe r improve h	gically	dents, office f wade it inter t've had who eaching?
4.	Please rate the	overall <i>cours</i>	se on a sca	ale of 1 to 7:				
	्रा not at all	2 2	C3 33	moderately effective	5 0	:6 :		r⊅ ktremely ffective
5.	Comments on ar	e to people v	who have t	o take it, etc.				
	I'm a	bigger	fon of	analysis (is opposed f	o algebra), but	- Prof.
	Hilbert n	rade the	2 cours	e interest	ing. W.	ish I co	iuld ho	We
•	gone To	more	office ho	urs. Would	definite	ly take	a cla	ss with

University of California, Berkeley

Instru	octor Ken Ribet course 113	_ Semester	Fall	2013
Enroll	led Auditing	_ Your Major	_	Math
foll	lese evaluations will be helpful to the Department of Mathematic lowing ways: (1) for use by the instructor (after grades have because teaching; (2) for use by the students in selecting courses an Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subjections.	en turned in d instructor) in impro s.	oving
	you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor?	186 1	e	口 xtremely effective
2.	boardwork, examples, clarity, willingness to answer questions hours, homework, exams, grading).	, attitude to	ward stud	lents, office
	Lectures are organized, thought ver students, accessible + responsive to	ry hel 9 ema	psul - 1 , e	to nthusiast,
	about material, does review	nateria		
3.	What are the instructor's weaknesses? How could the instruct Lectures can Sollow hook closely	1100	ld be	2 more
	creative. Homeworks can be ver	y lo	ng, A	hould
	it hard to get through every give better overview every so often	1 7	•	
4.	Please rate the overall course on a scale of 1 to 7:			•
	া হে বে ক্র not at all moderately effective	2 6 3		tremely ffective
5.	Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such a improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.	•		
	Carse is somewhat of an ecclecti	C WIX	OF M	naterial.
•	Carse is somewhat of an ecclectic Text is repetative in section to tell what's new, what	layou	t, h	ard
•	to tell whats here what	け、 ピ	CW.	

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc		Keyne	th Course _	Math 11?) 2 s	emester <u>Fa</u> our Major	Math
follo	owing ways: ((1) for use b	y the instructo	epartment of Ma or (after grades s in selecting co	athematics ir have been t	n one or mor turned in) in	e of the
1.				oossibilities of the ness of this ins		atter and co	urse, how would
	rot at all	□2 □	:3 3		:5 1	16 1	extremely effective
2.	boardwork,	examples, c ework, exam	larity, willingnos. s. grading).		questions, at	titude toward	ures, content, d students, office
	He	is nice	, professi	onal and	experie	nced	
				•			
3.			the top	? How could the		•	ner teaching?
4.	Please rate	the overall o	course on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:		· ·	
	ा not at all	E 2 E	(3)	्रवा moderately effective	5 0	(6)	extremely effective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

Class in Kind of outficult 5.

S C A N T 8 O N CUSTOM FORM NO. F-19933-UCB © SCANTRON CORPORATION 2005 IM7 4

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

					•
Instruc	itor <u>Ribet</u> , Ken	Course	Math 113	Semester _	Fall 2013
Enrolle	ed	Auditing _		Your Major	EECS/Appliced Morth
follo	ese evaluations will be helowing ways: (1) for use by tre teaching; (2) for use by	the instructor	(after grades ha	eve been turned in	in improving
1.	Considering both the lim you rate the overall teach	•		•	course, how would
	not at all	:3 1		15 1 10	extremely effective
2.	What are the instructor's boardwork, examples, claudes and effective water and effective cool land	arity, willingnes, grading). Software The Garages	ss to answer que vely knowledg	estions, attitude to	vard students, office
3.	What are the instructor's	weaknesses?	How could the i	nstructor improve	his/her teaching?
	Nothus, real	9			
4.	Please rate the overall co	ourse on a sca	ale of 1 to 7:		+ · •
	not at all	3 0 :	moderately effective	⊑50 # ∰01	extremely effective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

It's a difficult course.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	or Ken Ribbet Course 113 Semester Fa 2013
	d Your Major FECS
follo futu	se evaluations will be helpful to the Department of Mathematics in one or more of the wing ways: (1) for use by the instructor (after grades have been turned in) in improving re teaching; (2) for use by the students in selecting courses and instructors. Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would
	you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor? The proof of the control of th
2.	What are the instructor's strengths? (i.e. preparation and organization of lectures, content, boardwork, examples, clarity, willingness to answer questions, attitude toward students, office hours, homework, exams, grading).
	Very friendly towards students, excited abt material.
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
3.	What are the instructor's weaknesses? How could the instructor improve his/her teaching?
	Spretimes goes a bit tast and loses
	Sometimes goes a bit fast and loses the class. If no-one is asking questions,
	probably means no-one is understanding.
	If that happens go over the broad points that were Please rate the overall course on a scale of 1 to 7: just covered and see if a
4.	Please rate the overall course on a scale of 1 to 7:) ust covered and see if 9
•	not at all reflective reflective responses to the second results and the second results result
5.	Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instructor Ribet	Course	113		Semester _	Fall 2013
Enrolled	_ Auditing			Your Major	Math
 These evaluations will be helpfu following ways: (1) for use by the future teaching; (2) for use by the 1. Considering both the limitat you rate the overall teaching 	I to the Dep instructor e students i	(after grade n selecting of ssibilities of	s have been courses and the subject	in one or r turned in) instructors	more of the) in improving s.
rd⊐ r2⊐ not at all		本 moderately effective	:5 1		extremely effective
2. What are the instructor's str boardwork, examples, clarit hours, homework, exams, g Awesome emay and classed to respond to goestimsk.	y, willingnes rading).	e. Easily a	questions,	attitude tov	vard students, office
3. What are the instructor's we					
but were still confusing to	Students				
Also some of the were hard to follow a	due to	tation of unclear .	longer, structurn	proofs y. Noth	ing too problematic
4. Please rate the overall cours	se on a scal	e of 1 to 7:			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
্ৰা হৈ not at all	C30 I	ादा moderately effective	5 0	-	extremely effective
5. Comments on any other rele	vant aspect	ts of the cou	rse such as	content, te	ext, how it could be

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instru	ictor <u>K. R. be</u>	Course _	Marh 113	Semester _	Fall 2013
Enroll	led	Auditing		Your Major	Applied Morty
fol	lese evaluations will lowing ways: (1) for ture teaching; (2) for Considering both to you rate the overa	use by the instructouse by the student	or (after grades or in selecting co	have been turned in urses and instructors e subject matter and	in improving s.
	cto c20 not at all	13 1	cta moderately effective	(5)	extremely effective
2.	boardwork, examp hours, homework,	les, clarity, willingn exams, grading).	ess to answer q		vard students, office
	Well organ w answer surlen	ned lectures, guestrons,	concert c really good	larry, super	unlling
3.	What are the instru	ıctor's weaknesses	? How could the	instructor improve h	nis/her teaching?
	Exams as letruses	e hevel may	be some pro-	eview of co	mony,
		•			
4.	Please rate the over	erall <i>course</i> on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:		
	not at all	. (3 1	ক moderately effective	r\$1 (18)	extremely effective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instru	ctor <u>ken</u> hibet	Course _	Math 113	Semester _	Fall 2013.
Enroll	edYES	Auditing _	No	Your Major	Physics LEwnomic
foll	ese evaluations will be help owing ways: (1) for use by t ure teaching; (2) for use by Considering both the limit	ful to the De he instructo the students ations and p	partment of Mathemater (after grades have to in selecting courses ossibilities of the sub	atics in one or rocen turned in) and instructors	more of the in improving s.
	you rate the overall teachi ap 22 not at all	ng effectiver □3□	ness of this instructor a s moderately effective		extremely effective
2.	What are the instructor's s boardwork, examples, clar hours, homework, exams,	ity, willingne	e. preparation and or ess to answer questio	ganization of le	ectures, content, vard students, office
	Well prepared Give very friendly 0: The pace was	ffice nou	rs are producte	va.	
3.	What are the instructor's w	/eaknesses?	How could the instru	uctor improve h	is/her teaching?
4.	Not a weakness,			to physics	; ! U,
	ct	(3)	四 馬 moderately effective	Me.	extremely effective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

University of California, Berkeley

Instru	ctor <u>ken</u>	Pilat	Course	Mathi	13	Semester _	fall 2013
Enroll	ed		Auditing _	-:-		Your Major _	Applied Mat
TOII	owing ways: ure teaching; Considering	(1) for use by (2) for use by I both the limi	oful to the Dep the instructor the students	(after grade in selecting of ossibilities of	s have beer courses and the subject	n turned in) I instructors.	in improving
	not at all	©2⊒	ing effectiven ሜ	ess of this in an moderately effective	structor?		⊏⊐ extremely effective
2.	poardwork,	exampies, cia ework, exams	rity, Willingne: . aradina)	ss to answer	questions, a	attitude towa	ctures, content, ard students, office
		Very	interest	ナッカ	re sulp	ect, o	nd very
	approxi	hable. 1	rice Suy,	an int	erestin	n lectu	No of
	It's ev	relant the	et he co	oves a	sout h	15 str.	dents
3.	What are the	instructor's v	veaknesses?	How could th	ne instructor	improve his	s/her teaching?
. *	The	homew	rules	were.	tod lo	3. 7	often felt
	line	I 80	not hav	e en	ough	time	to sit and r
	W	derstord.	each.	Thesto	n like	I did	in other
4.	Please rate t	he overall cou	<i>irse</i> on a scal	e of 1 to 7:			•
1	ு not at all	2 2	C333	四 moderately effective	E \$1	40	extremely effective
5 .	Comments or improved, ad	n any other re vice to people	levant aspect who have to	s of the cour take it, etc.	se such as	content, tex	t, how it could be
	We	corld	try to t	alk ar	ont a	ll c-	mcepts;
	W						eps and
	SIV	85.				Cantinu	on book if pooder

University of California, Berkeley

Instruc	ctor <u>kenneth</u> Ribet	Course	Math 113		Semester	Fall 2013
Enrolle	ed	Auditing _		,	Your Major	Applied Math.
follo	ese evaluations will be helpful owing ways: (1) for use by the ure teaching; (2) for use by the	instructor	(after grades	have been	turned in) in	
1.	Considering both the limitation	•		•	natter and co	ourse, how would
	not at all	:3 1	्रक moderately effective	:5 1	. (161)	⊄ extremely effective
2.	What are the instructor's street boardwork, examples, clarity hours, homework, exams, gi	, willingnes				
	very well timed. Not	tuo fast	or slow. St	ops for a	uestions	and makes
	sure students are int	rigued. Co	rnmunicates	well th	rough e-n	nail and
	encourages participation	n.				
3.	What are the instructor's weather thomework assignments. Give hitts on hw do so as to allow more	often ver uring lec	ry demandi ture or decr	ng. ease num	ber of ques	-
4.	Please rate the overall cours	e on a scal	e of 1 to 7:			
	not at all	(3)	moderately effective	5 0	16 1	extremely effective
5.	Comments on any other rele improved, advice to people v			e such as	content, text	, how it could be
hdv	rice: Keep up w/ lectur	ė ⇒ f	Better unders	tanding f	or midtern	NS ·

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

				, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		D 1 (11)		
Instruc	tor <u>Rik</u>	et	Course	Math IT.	3	Semester	Tall 13	5
Enrolle	d रिवा र	>> /	Auditing	NOPE	Y	our Major	pphel	Ma
follo	wing ways	: (1) for use b	y the instruct	epartment of M or (after grades ts in selecting c	s have been	turned in) in		
1.				possibilities of t eness of this ins		natter and co	ourse, how	would
	rpt at all	2	:3 3	্ৰ moderately effective	5 3		extreme effectiv	-
2.	boardwork		clarity, willingr	(i.e. preparatior ness to answer				
	He	Knows	itue					
3.	What are t	the instructor	s weaknesse	s? How could the	ne instructor	improve his/	her teachir	ıg?
	Q	Lee	lurcs	are Iff	>			
4.	Please rat	e the overall	<i>course</i> on a s	cale of 1 to 7:				
	¤⊐ not at all	2	C 3 31	moderately		-6 0	extreme	ely

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

effective

effective

University of California, Berkeley

Instru	ctorKe	nneth A. R	ibet Course	Math	1/3	Semester	Fall 2013
Enroll	led		Auditing			Your Major	Math
foll	lowing ways: ure teaching: Considerin	(1) for use b (2) for use b g both the lin	y the instruct by the student nitations and	epartment of Ma or (after grades ts in selecting co possibilities of the	athematics in have been burses and in he subject n	in one or mo turned in) in instructors.	re of the
•	्रा ाक not at all	e Overali lead ⊉	siiiig eliective	eness of this ins ab moderately effective	eructor?	. 16 0	⊄⊐ extremely effective
2.	boardwork		larity, willingr	(i.e. preparation ness to answer o			tures, content, d students, office
			He k	nous everything	about the	course	
		•			٠.	•	
3.	What are th	ne instructor's	s weaknesses	s? How could th	e instructor	improve his	/her teaching?
			Make	the course	e easier	-	
						·	
4.	Please rate	the overall o	ourse on a s	cale of 1 to 7:			
	व्म not at all	-2 1	3 3	moderately effective		116 3	extremely effective
5.				ects of the cour to take it, etc.	se such as	content, text	, how it could be
		•	The b	wok is too a	old and	the con-	tents are
				stract use			

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instru	ctor \mathbb{R}	ibet	Course	Math	112	Semester _	Fau 2013
Enroll	led		Auditing _			Your Major	Applied Ma
tol	lowing way ure teachi Conside	ations will be he ys: (1) for use by ng; (2) for use b ring both the lim the overall teac	y the instructor y the students nitations and po	(after grades in selecting conssibilities of t	have bee ourses and he subject	n turned in) I instructors	in improving
	not at all	12 3	:31	本 moderately effective	(5)	-6 1	extremely effective
2.	boardwo	the instructor's rk, examples, cl omework, exam	larity, willingne	e. preparation	and orgar questions,	nization of le	ectures, content, ard students, office
6		and the second s)			
		These are	pretty go	od (acco	rding t	o my f	Friend:)
					••		
3.	What are	the instructor's	weaknesses?	How could th	a instructo	r improve b	is/her teaching?
		exams to			e msu ucto	i impiove n	s/ner teaching?
•		Homework	too ho	rol ic			
			•				
4.	Please ra	te the overall co	ourse on a sca	le of 1 to 7:			
	ा not at all	22	(33)	moderately effective	15 0	16 0	⊏7⊐ extremely effective
5.	Comment improved.	s on any other r advice to peop	relevant aspec le who have to	ts of the cours	se such as	content, tex	kt, how it could be
		toohard!	III to	oc abstr	act!		
• •			Even th	ough I	Knon) (HS)	Abstrat "ning

but Still ...

Continue on back, if needed.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instr	ructor <u>K</u>	R; bet	Course	Math	113	Semester _	all	2013
Enro	olled	/	Auditin	g		Your Major _	Applied	No
10	iture teaching Considerin	; (2) for use I	by the instruction the studer mitations and	Department of I tor (after grade its in selecting possibilities of reness of this in	es have bee courses and the subject	n turned in) ir I instructors.	n improvir	ng
	ा not at all	12 3	:3 1	moderately effective	*	15 1	extre effec	mely
2.	DOGLOWOLK,	ne instructor' examples, c ework, exam	arity, willing	(i.e. preparatio ness to answer	n and organ questions,	ization of lec attitude towa	tures, cor d studen	itent, ts, office
		Calne Great	office	ood howy k fosts s? How could the				
3.	What are th	Exams Lunch; e instructor's	are to be weaknesse	k fosts s? How could th	he instructo	r improve his	/her teach	nina?
	(/00-	release,				• • •).
	700	much	homework					
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
4.	Please rate	the overall co	ourse on a so	cale of 1 to 7:				
	ा not at all	ī 2 ī	C3 3	moderately effective	9 5 2	15 3	extrem	-
5.	Comments of	on any other	relevant aspe	ects of the cour	se such as	content, text,	how it co	uld be

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruct	tor Ribert		Course _	13		Semester _	Fa 13	
Enrolle	d <u>yes</u>		Auditing _			Your Major	Methemati	is
follo	wing ways: (1)	will be helpful) for use by the) for use by the	instructor	(after grades	have beer	turned in)	in improving	
1.		oth the limitation	•		•	matter and	course, how w	ould/
	rp not at all	(2)	:3 :1	moderately effective	(5)	. 6 1	⊄⊐ extremely effective	•
2. He a	boardwork, ex	instructor's stre kamples, clarity vork, exams, gr	, willingne	ss to answer q	uestions,	attitude tow	ard students,	office
3. He MU We M Had M Yali 4.	What are the inverse when the second rate the	instructor's were fuckly in more than when when when when when when when whe	aknesses? Netu Netu Not Not He mi	How could the self and I - consequent of the self to 7:	e instructo of very partly, g this eve return late to	r improve he become lack of med so lengage.	is/her teaching like he ne, fruits fuestion are I di the services	thinks stemo
	व्म not at all	Ż	C3 0	moderately effective	5 50	□6 3	⊏ 7 ⊐ extremely effective	•

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

5.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	ctor Ribe	ef	Course	Math 113		Semester <u>Fa</u>	U '13	
Enrolle	ed		Auditing _			Your Major Ap	plice Math	
follo	owing ways: (ure teaching; (Considering	 for use by for use by both the limit 	the instructor the students ations and p	partment of Mar (after grades in selecting co ossibilities of the	athematics i have been ourses and i	n one or more turned in) in ir nstructors.	of the	
	ा not at all	12 3	:30	ন্দ্ৰ moderately effective		16 1	extremely effective	
2.	boardwork, e hours, home	examples, cla work, exams	rity, willingne , grading).	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	uestions, a	ttitude toward	students, office	
	Very ee	rger & e	oganized.	Vec fair	exours	& grading		
						:		
3.	What are the	instructor's	weaknesses?	How could the	instructor	improve his/h	er teaching?	
	nd alw	ays en	ey bo	Collow),	
4.	Please rate t	he overall co	urse on a sca	ale of 1 to 7:				
	्या not at all	2	C\$ 3	moderately effective		16 3	extremely effective	

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instructor Prof. R	Course Course	Math 113	Semester	Fall 2013
Enrolled	Auditing		Your Major _	Applied Math
following ways: (1 future teaching; (2	s will be helpful to the D) for use by the instruct 2) for use by the student both the limitations and overall teaching effective	or (after grades have ts in selecting courses possibilities of the sul	been turned in) in a sand instructors.	n improving
ा not at all	⊈2 ga	moderately effective		extremely effective
boardwork, ex	instructor's strengths? (kamples, clarity, willingr vork, exams, grading).	(i.e. preparation and onestion and control of the c	organization of lec ons, attitude towa	tures, content, rd students, office
	Content			
	attitude	town students.		
3. What are the i	instructor's weaknesses	s? How could the instr	uctor improve his	/her teaching?
	Claurty			
4. Please rate the	e overall <i>course</i> on a so	cale of 1 to 7:		
⊄⊐ not at all	12 1 (31	⊈च ⊈च moderately	16 5	⊏7⊐ extremely