

Division: PHYSICAL SCIENCES **Department:** MATH

MATH 19900-41 Intro to Analysis & Lin. Alg.

Quarter: Autumn 2007

Instructor: Schmidt Ben

Number of Responses: 9
Number Enrolled: 27

COURSE EVALUATION COMMENTS

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

| | |
|-------------------------------|----------|
| Core requirement | 0 (0%) |
| Instructor reputation | 0 (0%) |
| Faculty member recommended it | 4 (57%) |
| Concentration requirement | 7 (100%) |
| Meets at a convenient time | 2 (29%) |
| A student recommended it | 1 (14%) |
| Topic interests me | 7 (100%) |
| Concentration elective | 3 (43%) |

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 (11%) | 2 (22%) | 6 (67%) | |

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%: 2 (22%) All: 7 (78%)

Were the time demands of this course reasonable?

Yes: 9 (100%) No: 0 (0%)

The Instructor

| | not applicable | strongly disagree | disagree | neutral | agree | strongly agree |
|---|----------------|-------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------------|
| The instructor was organized | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (22%) | 7 (78%) |
| His/her lectures were clear and understandable | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (33%) | 6 (67%) |
| His/her lectures were interesting | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (11%) | 2 (22%) | 6 (67%) |
| The instructor exhibited a positive attitude toward student | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (100%) |
| The instructor was accessible outside of class | 2 (22%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (11%) | 6 (67%) |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| I would recommend this instructor to others | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (11%) | 8 (89%) |
|---|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|

What were the instructor's strong points?

Very approachable. Interested in helping students. Interesting math-history tangents.

He explained the topics clearly with examples and was open to student questions. He was very excited about math, which made the class enjoyable.

Very good lecturer. Very clear, made sure students understood material.

Good explanations

Very good at explaining theorems and gave a little enrichment stuff here and there. Problem sets were challenging without being unreasonable, as were the tests.

Clarity. Intuitive explanations. Enthusiasm for math. Attentiveness to student needs.

Passionate and funny

Ben is an amazing person. Very effective teacher. Great board work. Great at explaining concepts.

Extremely helpful and clear. He had really good notes on the board and was very good at explaining things.

He was very enthusiastic and clearly cared a lot about both his students and the material. This made his lectures both interesting and pleasant.

What were the instructor's weak points?

Proofs were a little disorganized during lectures. Halfway through the proof, professor would break off and explain the conclusion, then return back to the proof. More time should be spent explaining the rationale going into a proof: goals, possible methods and strengths of those methods, etc. This would really help on the longer proofs.

He could have explained some fundamentals of proof writing better.

Sometimes he got sidetracked answering questions. That wasn't really his fault though. Every now and then he spent all class proving some theorem when he could have just said ``Okay guys trust me that this is true/read this proof in the book`` and then gone onto some new material

Directing the TA.

Don't really understand the point of theoretical math, but maybe that's my fault

None.

None.

He would occasionally delve into the minutia of proofs or wouldn't spend enough time explaining why he was proving what he was, making it difficult to follow his overall point.

Assignments and Tests

How often were homework assignments due?

Every Class: 0 (0%) Every Week: 9 (100%) Occasionally: 0 (0%)

| | Not Applicable | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| The homework assignments were useful, appropriate, reasonable | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (44%) | 5 (56%) |
| The exams were appropriate/reasonable | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (22%) | 4 (44%) | 3 (33%) |

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

Proofs

Proofs, explanations.

Proofs, explaining concepts, but mostly proofs.

proofs

They were usually about 90% proofs. The remainder was usually finding explicit examples satisfying some properties.

Proofs.

Proofs

Proofs.

Proofs and problems and explanations

Proofs

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

Sally's text has far to few proofs. Very obnoxious to read. Expects the student to prove some of the more difficult proofs with no guidance whatsoever.

Sally's Foundations of Mathematical Analysis- it was not very useful. It explained some topics poorly, and it makes you feel dumb when Sally calls a proof ``simple stuff``.

Paul Sally's ``Foundations of Mathematical Analysis`` was utterly horrible. It was completely unhelpful, and it is written as more of a math quick reference text than a textbook.

``Foundations of Mathematical Analysis`` - Paul Sally Book very useful; good to read ahead

Sally's ``Foundation of Mathematical Analysis`` wasn't too useful (we went over most of it in class) but it was a good reference for definitions I guess.

The Sally text was not useful at first. Once I became familiar with the material, it was useful to deepening my understanding and providing practice problems.

Didn't even use it.

Not very, Sally's book is pretty useless if you're new to the subject. Maybe an effective review for someone already familiar with the material.

Sally's book was very good but if it had had more examples, it would be more helpful. Or maybe solutions to the exercises so you can check your work.

Foundations of Analysis by Paul Sally was perfect for the class, though as a general analysis textbook it might not be as useful.

How many exams were there? What did they involve?

True/False questions, definitions and proofs. Two midterms, one cumulative final.

2 midterms and a final. Proofs, true/false, definitions, explanations.

2 midterms, 1 final. True/false, a few proofs, a few explanations.

2 midterms - True/False, Definitions, and proofs

Two midterms, one final. The midterms were about six questions long and all applications of what we had done for the homeworks in the past couple of weeks. The final was longer and more cumulative.

3 exams. True/false, definitions, and proofs.

2 midterms 1 final. All proofs and recalling definitions.

Not hard enough.

3 exams. 2 midterms and a final. proofs.

3. They involved a series of True/False questions followed by proofs.

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

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?

Drop the Sally text. More focus on teaching proof strategies than introducing fields of mathematical study. E.G. spending one week on topologies and the next on linear algebra introduces too much new information without contributing to (what appears to be) the main goal of the course: learning to write proofs.

None

Replace Sally's text with a more intelligible one.

Good introduction to analysis, not too much depth into linear algebra

You could probably get rid of the text

The TA should give structures sessions where she walks students through a new problem, and

possibly solves one with the students.

Explain why theoretical math is important

Supplemental book.

none

What aspects of the course should be retained?

The teacher, the topics.

Ben Schmidt, he's amazing!

keep the book

Honestly it's pretty good as is

Everything

All of them as far as is possible. I will note that Dr. Schmidt occasionally gave us interesting problems to work on outside of class, and I think that this lent a fun, informal atmosphere to the class as well as giving our work some context, as he would use these to explain problems that real mathematicians are working on. I would make sure to keep those.

Would you recommend this course to others? Why?

Yes. But not absolutely necessary for 150s students who want to transition into 200s.

Yes, it's a good intro to proofs and theoretical math.

Definitely, but I'd recommend it more strongly if Sally's text were scrapped.

Yes, necessary for math major

Yes, it is a very good introduction to formal proofs

Yes. Great introduction to proofs. Wonderful teacher. Not impossible, but neither easy. A rewarding, stimulating, challenge.

Maybe. If they like math. I don't much.

Yes, great intro to proof writing.

Yes. very strongly. It helped me catch up in math in an unintimidating way.

Definitely. It's a good, well-taught introduction to higher mathematics.

View another Evaluation:

 Browse by department

or Course Number

or Instructor Last Name

Choose a department . . .

-

Submit

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