

## Section Detail

Class: MATH 0151 - CALCULUS II  
Instructor: BONTHIUS, JAY MICHAEL  
Schedule Number: 22165, Fall 2016  
Instrument: Math Stat Teaching Assistant  
Date Printed: 01/04/2017 20:21:18  
Enrolled in class: 34  
Responded to this evaluation: 19  
Response Percentage: 55.88%

## Quantitative

Question #	Question Prompt	Count	Percentage	Mean	St. Dev.	Median
<b>Group 1</b>						
1	<b>Rate the instructor's overall organization and presentation of the course material.</b>	18	95%	4.61	.61	5.00
	1 = Poor	0	.00%			
	2 = Below Average	0	.00%			
	3 = Average	1	5.26%			
	4 = Good	5	26.32%			
	5 = Excellent	12	63.16%			
	Not Applicable	0	.00%			
	DID NOT RESPOND	1	5.26%			
2	<b>Rate the instructor's focus on the student learning outcomes listed in the syllabus.</b>	15	79%	4.73	.46	5.00
	1 = Poor	0	.00%			
	2 = Below Average	0	.00%			
	3 = Average	0	.00%			
	4 = Good	4	21.05%			
	5 = Excellent	11	57.89%			
	Not Applicable	2	10.53%			
	DID NOT RESPOND	4	21.05%			
3	<b>Rate the instructor's teaching overall.</b>	18	95%	4.83	.38	5.00
	1 = Poor	0	.00%			
	2 = Below Average	0	.00%			
	3 = Average	0	.00%			
	4 = Good	3	15.79%			
	5 = Excellent	15	78.95%			
	Not Applicable	0	.00%			
	DID NOT RESPOND	1	5.26%			
<b>Group 2</b>						
	<b>Rate the teaching assistant's ability to</b>					

<b>4</b>	<b>explain concepts clearly.</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>4.72</b>	<b>.46</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	1 = Poor	0	.00%			
	2 = Below Average	0	.00%			
	3 = Average	0	.00%			
	4 = Good	5	26.32%			
	5 = Excellent	13	68.42%			
	Not Applicable	0	.00%			
	DID NOT RESPOND	1	5.26%			
<b>5</b>	<b>Rate the teaching assistant's ability to actively engage you during class time.</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>4.83</b>	<b>.38</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	1 = Poor	0	.00%			
	2 = Below Average	0	.00%			
	3 = Average	0	.00%			
	4 = Good	3	15.79%			
	5 = Excellent	15	78.95%			
	Not Applicable	0	.00%			
	DID NOT RESPOND	1	5.26%			
<b>6</b>	<b>Rate the teaching assistant's helpfulness when you had difficulties or questions.</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>4.76</b>	<b>.44</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	1 = Poor	0	.00%			
	2 = Below Average	0	.00%			
	3 = Average	0	.00%			
	4 = Good	4	21.05%			
	5 = Excellent	13	68.42%			
	Not Applicable	0	.00%			
	DID NOT RESPOND	2	10.53%			
<b>7</b>	<b>Rate the teaching assistant's ability to stimulate your interest in the subject.</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>4.71</b>	<b>.59</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	1 = Poor	0	.00%			
	2 = Below Average	0	.00%			
	3 = Average	1	5.26%			
	4 = Good	3	15.79%			
	5 = Excellent	13	68.42%			
	Not Applicable	0	.00%			
	DID NOT RESPOND	2	10.53%			
<b>8</b>	<b>How effectively was class time used in the teaching assistant led breakout sessions?</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>4.56</b>	<b>.98</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	1 = Poor	1	5.26%			
	2 = Below Average	0	.00%			
	3 = Average	0	.00%			
	4 = Good	4	21.05%			
	5 = Excellent	13	68.42%			
	Not Applicable	0	.00%			
	DID NOT RESPOND	1	5.26%			

9	<b>How much did the teaching assistant led breakout sections contribute to the learning process?</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>4.56</b>	<b>.98</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	1 = Poor	1	5.26%			
	2 = Below Average	0	.00%			
	3 = Average	0	.00%			
	4 = Good	4	21.05%			
	5 = Excellent	13	68.42%			
	Not Applicable	0	.00%			
	DID NOT RESPOND	1	5.26%			

Group Totals	Mean	St. Dev.	Median
Group 1	4.73	.49	5.00
Group 2	4.69	.68	5.00

Overall Total	Mean	St. Dev.	Median
	4.70	.62	5.00

## Qualitative

### 14 *What were the instructor's strengths?*

- A: He is an amazing teacher , really down to earth and taught it at our level; as opposed to teaching above our heads
- A: Very enthusiastic
- A: Explained things almost perfectly; super nice
- A: very helpful
- A: Makes concepts easily understood and engages the class
- A: He had a great understanding of the subject.
- A: Jay is the best math teacher I have had at SDSU as well as the rest of academic career. This guy is going places, he has a deep understanding of the material and does an excellent job showing students the way.
- A: He made concepts that I was struggling with clear and during activities he would help us understand what the objectives were and give us tips. His review sessions before midterms were extremely helpful and was one the reasons I'm getting such a high grade in this class. During office hours he was always extremely attentive and always helped everyone he could. He obviously cared about his students a lot and that showed throughout the semester.
- A: He was engaging
- A: good
- A: Great speaker
- A: one of the best TA's I've had at SDSU he has many strengths.
- A: Passion for math and likability

**6 student(s) did not respond to this question.**

### 15 *In what ways might the instructor improve this course?*

- A: n/a
- A: Better communication with lecture
- A: good
- A: Nothing
- A: Nothing
- A: nothing
- A: Pass back papers before class ended
- A: It was excellent the way it was

A: Nothing!

A: He's already the best TA, he doesn't need to improve.

A: Better communication with lecturer

A: Don't think I can think of anything that he could do to improve his teaching.

**7 student(s) did not respond to this question.**

**18** *What is your major?*

A: Mechanical engineering

A: mechanical engineering

A: Mechanical Engineering

A: Mechanical engineering

A: Economics

A: Computer engineering

A: Mechanical Engineering

A: Computer Science

A: civil engineering

A: Computer Engineering

A: Aerospace engineering

A: Mechanical Engineering - Bioengineering

A: engineering

A: Mechanical Engineering

**5 student(s) did not respond to this question.**

## Section vs. Course

Semester: Fall 2016  
Course: MATH 0151 - CALCULUS II  
Section: 22165 - MANCHESTER,COREY  
Instrument: Math Stat Teaching Assistant  
Date Printed: 01/04/2017 20:21:25

Question #	Question	Mean	St. Dev.	Median
<b>Group 1</b>				
1				
	<b>Section:</b>	<b>4.61</b>	<b>.61</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	<b>Course:</b>	<b>3.92</b>	<b>1.12</b>	<b>4.00</b>
	<b>Lower Division:</b>	<b>4.15</b>	<b>1.03</b>	<b>4.00</b>
2				
	<b>Section:</b>	<b>4.73</b>	<b>.46</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	<b>Course:</b>	<b>4.04</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>4.00</b>
	<b>Lower Division:</b>	<b>4.23</b>	<b>.96</b>	<b>4.00</b>
3				
	<b>Section:</b>	<b>4.83</b>	<b>.38</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	<b>Course:</b>	<b>3.90</b>	<b>1.21</b>	<b>4.00</b>
	<b>Lower Division:</b>	<b>4.12</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>4.00</b>
<b>Group 2</b>				
4				
	<b>Section:</b>	<b>4.72</b>	<b>.46</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	<b>Course:</b>	<b>3.90</b>	<b>1.24</b>	<b>4.00</b>
	<b>Lower Division:</b>	<b>4.15</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>4.00</b>
5				
	<b>Section:</b>	<b>4.83</b>	<b>.38</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	<b>Course:</b>	<b>3.90</b>	<b>1.20</b>	<b>4.00</b>
	<b>Lower Division:</b>	<b>4.11</b>	<b>1.07</b>	<b>4.00</b>
6				
	<b>Section:</b>	<b>4.76</b>	<b>.44</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	<b>Course:</b>	<b>4.02</b>	<b>1.20</b>	<b>4.00</b>
	<b>Lower Division:</b>	<b>4.26</b>	<b>1.03</b>	<b>5.00</b>
7				
	<b>Section:</b>	<b>4.71</b>	<b>.59</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	<b>Course:</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>1.20</b>	<b>4.00</b>

**Lower Division: 3.94 1.09 4.00**

**8**

**Section: 4.56 .98 5.00**

**Course: 3.88 1.20 4.00**

**Lower Division: 4.16 1.05 4.00**

**9**

**Section: 4.56 .98 5.00**

**Course: 3.88 1.22 4.00**

**Lower Division: 4.17 1.06 5.00**

<b>Group 1 Totals</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>St. Dev.</b>	<b>Median</b>
<b>Section</b>	<b>4.73</b>	<b>.49</b>	<b>5.00</b>
<b>Course</b>	<b>3.95</b>	<b>1.13</b>	<b>4.00</b>
<b>Lower Division</b>	<b>4.16</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>4.00</b>

<b>Group 2 Totals</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>St. Dev.</b>	<b>Median</b>
<b>Section</b>	<b>4.69</b>	<b>.68</b>	<b>5.00</b>
<b>Course</b>	<b>3.89</b>	<b>1.21</b>	<b>4.00</b>
<b>Lower Division</b>	<b>4.13</b>	<b>1.07</b>	<b>4.00</b>

<b>Total</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>St. Dev.</b>	<b>Median</b>
<b>Section</b>	<b>4.70</b>	<b>.62</b>	<b>5.00</b>
<b>Course</b>	<b>3.91</b>	<b>1.19</b>	<b>4.00</b>
<b>Lower Division</b>	<b>4.14</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>4.00</b>

## Section Detail

Class: MATH 0151 - CALCULUS II  
 Instructor: BONTHIUS, JAY MICHAEL  
 Schedule Number: 22172, Fall 2016  
 Instrument: Math Stat Teaching Assistant  
 Date Printed: 01/04/2017 20:21:23  
 Enrolled in class: 34  
 Responded to this evaluation: 16  
 Response Percentage: 47.06%

## Quantitative

Question #	Question Prompt	Count	Percentage	Mean	St. Dev.	Median
<b>Group 1</b>						
1	<b>Rate the instructor's overall organization and presentation of the course material.</b>	15	94%	4.07	1.10	4.00
	1 = Poor	1	6.25%			
	2 = Below Average	0	.00%			
	3 = Average	2	12.50%			
	4 = Good	6	37.50%			
	5 = Excellent	6	37.50%			
	Not Applicable	1	6.25%			
	DID NOT RESPOND	1	6.25%			
2	<b>Rate the instructor's focus on the student learning outcomes listed in the syllabus.</b>	15	94%	4.27	.88	4.00
	1 = Poor	0	.00%			
	2 = Below Average	1	6.25%			
	3 = Average	1	6.25%			
	4 = Good	6	37.50%			
	5 = Excellent	7	43.75%			
	Not Applicable	0	.00%			
	DID NOT RESPOND	1	6.25%			
3	<b>Rate the instructor's teaching overall.</b>	15	94%	4.47	.64	5.00
	1 = Poor	0	.00%			
	2 = Below Average	0	.00%			
	3 = Average	1	6.25%			
	4 = Good	6	37.50%			
	5 = Excellent	8	50.00%			
	Not Applicable	0	.00%			
	DID NOT RESPOND	1	6.25%			

### Group 2

**Rate the teaching assistant's ability to**

<b>4</b>	<b>explain concepts clearly.</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>4.53</b>	<b>.64</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	1 = Poor	0	.00%			
	2 = Below Average	0	.00%			
	3 = Average	1	6.25%			
	4 = Good	5	31.25%			
	5 = Excellent	9	56.25%			
	Not Applicable	0	.00%			
	DID NOT RESPOND	1	6.25%			
<b>5</b>	<b>Rate the teaching assistant's ability to actively engage you during class time.</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>4.40</b>	<b>.74</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	1 = Poor	0	.00%			
	2 = Below Average	0	.00%			
	3 = Average	2	12.50%			
	4 = Good	5	31.25%			
	5 = Excellent	8	50.00%			
	Not Applicable	0	.00%			
	DID NOT RESPOND	1	6.25%			
<b>6</b>	<b>Rate the teaching assistant's helpfulness when you had difficulties or questions.</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>4.60</b>	<b>.74</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	1 = Poor	0	.00%			
	2 = Below Average	0	.00%			
	3 = Average	2	12.50%			
	4 = Good	2	12.50%			
	5 = Excellent	11	68.75%			
	Not Applicable	0	.00%			
	DID NOT RESPOND	1	6.25%			
<b>7</b>	<b>Rate the teaching assistant's ability to stimulate your interest in the subject.</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>4.47</b>	<b>.64</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	1 = Poor	0	.00%			
	2 = Below Average	0	.00%			
	3 = Average	1	6.25%			
	4 = Good	6	37.50%			
	5 = Excellent	8	50.00%			
	Not Applicable	0	.00%			
	DID NOT RESPOND	1	6.25%			
<b>8</b>	<b>How effectively was class time used in the teaching assistant led breakout sessions?</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>4.36</b>	<b>.74</b>	<b>4.50</b>
	1 = Poor	0	.00%			
	2 = Below Average	0	.00%			
	3 = Average	2	12.50%			
	4 = Good	5	31.25%			
	5 = Excellent	7	43.75%			
	Not Applicable	1	6.25%			
	DID NOT RESPOND	2	12.50%			



9	<b>How much did the teaching assistant led breakout sections contribute to the learning process?</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>4.36</b>	<b>.74</b>	<b>4.50</b>
	1 = Poor	0	.00%			
	2 = Below Average	0	.00%			
	3 = Average	2	12.50%			
	4 = Good	5	31.25%			
	5 = Excellent	7	43.75%			
	Not Applicable	0	.00%			
	DID NOT RESPOND	2	12.50%			

Group Totals	Mean	St. Dev.	Median
Group 1	4.27	.89	4.00
Group 2	4.45	.69	5.00

Overall Total	Mean	St. Dev.	Median
	4.39	.77	5.00

## Qualitative

### 14 *What were the instructor's strengths?*

- A: He always attempted to have more student involvement in the class as well as made the class engaging.
- A: Character
- A: Always kept me interested and explained things well
- A: Fun engaging tutorial
- A: Jay was very good at explaining the new material to us. His explanations were often enough for me to understand the topics pretty well before even attending lecture. He always has an extremely positive attitude and tries to make jokes whenever he can (although none of them were very funny). Overall, I appreciate Jay's ability to explain things very well and his attempts to cheer the class up all the time.
- A: Explaining concepts
- A: good
- A: Keeping students engaged.
- A: He was very freindly
- A: Passionate about the subject, helpful with questions

**6 student(s) did not respond to this question.**

### 15 *In what ways might the instructor improve this course?*

- A: nothing in particular
- A: N/A
- A: Settle pace down a bit.
- A: None.
- A: could have used time more effectively, been more prepared at times
- A: There were a couple occasions (the first meeting being one) were he wasn't able to answer some questions because he had forgotten the material. This only happened very early in the semester, and after the first couple weeks his preparation was very good.
- A: n/a
- A: good
- A: Sometimes he was not organized, but he still had a pretty good idea of what he was going to cover.
- A: He was a little cocky and forgot what he was doing a lot

**6 student(s) did not respond to this question.**

**18** *What is your major?*

A: astronomy

A: it was Comp E

A: AE

A: Mechanical Engineering

A: Bus/Econ

A: ME

A: Computer Science

A: Astronomy BS and Applied Mathematics

A: Mathematics

A: Environmental Engineering

A: Mechanical Engineering

A: Applied Mathematics

**4 student(s) did not respond to this question.**

## Section vs. Course

Semester: Fall 2016  
Course: MATH 0151 - CALCULUS II  
Section: 22172 - MANCHESTER,COREY  
Instrument: Math Stat Teaching Assistant  
Date Printed: 01/04/2017 20:21:28

Question #	Question	Mean	St. Dev.	Median
<b>Group 1</b>				
1				
	<b>Section:</b>	<b>4.07</b>	<b>1.10</b>	<b>4.00</b>
	<b>Course:</b>	<b>3.92</b>	<b>1.12</b>	<b>4.00</b>
	<b>Lower Division:</b>	<b>4.15</b>	<b>1.03</b>	<b>4.00</b>
2				
	<b>Section:</b>	<b>4.27</b>	<b>.88</b>	<b>4.00</b>
	<b>Course:</b>	<b>4.04</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>4.00</b>
	<b>Lower Division:</b>	<b>4.23</b>	<b>.96</b>	<b>4.00</b>
3				
	<b>Section:</b>	<b>4.47</b>	<b>.64</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	<b>Course:</b>	<b>3.90</b>	<b>1.21</b>	<b>4.00</b>
	<b>Lower Division:</b>	<b>4.12</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>4.00</b>
<b>Group 2</b>				
4				
	<b>Section:</b>	<b>4.53</b>	<b>.64</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	<b>Course:</b>	<b>3.90</b>	<b>1.24</b>	<b>4.00</b>
	<b>Lower Division:</b>	<b>4.15</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>4.00</b>
5				
	<b>Section:</b>	<b>4.40</b>	<b>.74</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	<b>Course:</b>	<b>3.90</b>	<b>1.20</b>	<b>4.00</b>
	<b>Lower Division:</b>	<b>4.11</b>	<b>1.07</b>	<b>4.00</b>
6				
	<b>Section:</b>	<b>4.60</b>	<b>.74</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	<b>Course:</b>	<b>4.02</b>	<b>1.20</b>	<b>4.00</b>
	<b>Lower Division:</b>	<b>4.26</b>	<b>1.03</b>	<b>5.00</b>
7				
	<b>Section:</b>	<b>4.47</b>	<b>.64</b>	<b>5.00</b>
	<b>Course:</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>1.20</b>	<b>4.00</b>

**Lower Division: 3.94 1.09 4.00**

**8**

**Section: 4.36 .74 4.50**

**Course: 3.88 1.20 4.00**

**Lower Division: 4.16 1.05 4.00**

**9**

**Section: 4.36 .74 4.50**

**Course: 3.88 1.22 4.00**

**Lower Division: 4.17 1.06 5.00**

<b>Group 1 Totals</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>St. Dev.</b>	<b>Median</b>
<b>Section</b>	<b>4.27</b>	<b>.89</b>	<b>4.00</b>
<b>Course</b>	<b>3.95</b>	<b>1.13</b>	<b>4.00</b>
<b>Lower Division</b>	<b>4.16</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>4.00</b>

<b>Group 2 Totals</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>St. Dev.</b>	<b>Median</b>
<b>Section</b>	<b>4.45</b>	<b>.69</b>	<b>5.00</b>
<b>Course</b>	<b>3.89</b>	<b>1.21</b>	<b>4.00</b>
<b>Lower Division</b>	<b>4.13</b>	<b>1.07</b>	<b>4.00</b>

<b>Total</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>St. Dev.</b>	<b>Median</b>
<b>Section</b>	<b>4.39</b>	<b>.77</b>	<b>5.00</b>
<b>Course</b>	<b>3.91</b>	<b>1.19</b>	<b>4.00</b>
<b>Lower Division</b>	<b>4.14</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>4.00</b>