

Division: PHYSICAL SCIENCES **Department:** MATH

MATH 19900-21 Intro to Analysis & Lin. Alg.

Quarter: Autumn 2007

Instructor: Schmidt Ben

Number of Responses: 9
Number Enrolled: 22

COURSE EVALUATION COMMENTS

Why did you take this course? (circle all that apply):

Core requirement	1 (20%)
Instructor reputation	0 (0%)
Faculty member recommended it	1 (20%)
Concentration requirement	5 (100%)
Meets at a convenient time	0 (0%)
A student recommended it	1 (20%)
Topic interests me	4 (80%)
Concentration elective	0 (0%)

In summary, I had a strong desire to take this course. (circle one)

Strongly Disagree					Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	
0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	4 (50%)	3 (38%)	

How many hours per week did you spend on this course?

Low Answer: 0 Average Answer: 0 High Answer: 0

What proportion of classes did you attend?

None: 0 (0%) 25%: 0 (0%) 50%: 0 (0%) 75%: 0 (0%) All: 9 (100%)

Were the time demands of this course reasonable?

Yes: 7 (88%) No: 1 (13%)

The Instructor

	not applicable	strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree
The instructor was organized	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (44%)	5 (56%)
His/her lectures were clear and understandable	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	7 (78%)
His/her lectures were interesting	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	7 (78%)
The instructor exhibited a positive attitude toward student	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	7 (78%)
The instructor was accessible outside of class	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (78%)

I would recommend this instructor to others 0 0 0 1 1 7
 (0%) (0%) (0%) (11%) (11%) (78%)

What were the instructor's strong points?

His lectures were amazingly easy to understand! They were extremely helpful, especially with such an awful book. He was also extremely personable and willing to help.

Clarity and flexibility in lecture.

He worked very well with students. He was quite funny and engaging, and clearly interested in teaching. He was always willing to answer questions.

clear, interesting lectures. very good at explaining things and always accessible for questions.

The instructor taught the material in a very logical and thorough manner.

Very organized Great board work Funny, approachable Very helpful during office hours Reasonable expectations for midterm, HW and final

He is very well organized, likes the subject and transmits that. He was always available to students and gave a lot of material to be prepared.

Very good at explaining things, very easy to talk to, very accessible out of class. Overall exactly what you are looking for in a math professor.

Very sharp, enthusiastic... a wonderful teacher.

What were the instructor's weak points?

Maybe went too fast sometimes.

Sometimes to quick to give away answers.

He did not relate the material in a way that would be easily understandable to students completely new to the area we studied.

None, great professor!

Not really any.

Could have moved through the material a bit faster.

Assignments and Tests

How often were homework assignments due?

Every Class: 0 (0%) Every Week: 8 (100%) Occasionally: 0 (0%)

	Not Applicable	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The homework assignments were useful, appropriate, reasonable	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (67%)	2 (22%)
The exams were	1	0	0	0	4	3

appropriate/reasonable (13%) (0%) (0%) (0%) (50%) (38%)

What did homework assignments involve? (Problems, proofs, computation, explanations, etc.)

Mostly proofs.

Mostly proofs with a few examples.

Proofs, usually rigorous. We also occasionally explains facts.

Weekly problem sets with 6-7 problems that are all proofs.

6-8 proofs

Proofs.

Proofs

How useful were the texts? (Please give author and title)

``Foundations of Mathematical Analysis`` by Dr. Paul Sally. Unfortunately, the textbook was way too concise. It skipped over way too many details and made too many assumptions that you already knew things. The proofs for many complex theorems and ideas were not even given with the excuse that they were clearly observed. However, they were often very difficult to understand.

Good if a little too concise.

The text was terse, and not as useful as the class lectures and notes. It was still helpful, though. (Paul Sally: Foundations of Mathematical Analysis)

Paul Sally, Intro to Analysis Linear Algebra. The text was reasonably helpful.

Not useful at all - didn't even use but instead relied on class notes

This is the course package. I don't think is appropriate or good enough for the course.

The text was the intro to analysis textbook by Paul Sally. I didn't like it very much because a lot of the time there are proofs that are assigned for exercises that the book relies on later for illustration of other concepts and if you don't do the exercises (which are too numerous to do all of and which we weren't assigned to do -- we had different homework problems) you miss that. But, the book was useful to study from. However, it is a little hard to read in general. Also, the proofs are pretty difficult to follow if you are not very experienced in the subject already (which by definition people taking ``Intro to Analysis`` aren't). Additionally, some of the problems in the book are problems that have not yet been solved (I think 1.3 is one example).

Paul Sally's book... pretty good.

How many exams were there? What did they involve?

Two midterms and a final. All stuff we covered in class.

Two midterms with T/F and a few proofs.

Two midterms and a final. There was nothing completely out of nowhere on the midterm, and they usually covered what was in class lectures and the textbook. The averages were pretty high.

Two midterms and one final, true/false questions, some short answers, and many proofs.

2 midterms one final proofs - covered subjects learned in class

There were 2 midterms and a final. They all involved proofs (and definitions of concepts).

2 midterms and a final; proofs plus t/f questions.

How well were the labs coordinated with the rest of the course?

none

Did the experiments help you understand the course material? Did the experiments teach you useful lab techniques?

How well did the lab manual present the theory behind the experiments? How well did it explain experimental procedure?

What aspects of the course should be changed?

The text needs to be better written.

It would be nice to have a grader not prohibitively rigorous.

None. The course is fine as is.

I wish we would go more in depth with a few important concepts rather than quickly jump around a wide range of topics.

The book. It's not good.

It would be incredibly helpful if solutions to the practice midterms and practice final were put up along with the practice exams. And if homework solutions were provided faster and more regularly.

What aspects of the course should be retained?

The material is good, and interesting.

Teacher, text.

The course is fine as is.

Hard to say.

Would you recommend this course to others? Why?

If you have never done proofs before, this should be a useful class.

Maybe, especially for those new to proofs.

I would highly recommend this instructor, and the course was also quite interesting.

If they want a good intro class before Analysis, then yes, or just a strong passion for math. Otherwise, it's a pain in the ass.

Great professor Steep learning curve for learning proofs

Yes, and will mostly recommend the instructor.

Yes, I really enjoyed it and think Ben Schmidt is a great math professor.

View another Evaluation:

• Browse by department or Course Number or Instructor Last Name

- -

Example: ARTH-10100

-
- [UChicago](#) [Current Students](#) [Course Catalog](#) [Course Advice](#) [Course Evaluations](#) [Contact Us](#) •

Information on using this site | All pages on this site © 2008