

EVALUATION RESULT - INSTRUCTOR

Based on 10 Evaluations

Course Title **Solid Modeling Using Pro/ENGINEER**
 Schedule No. **E0034-18565 F (08/25/2003 - 10/27/2003)**

Instructor
 Location of Class

Frederick Vasenius
CS 304

| Starting Int 2002 | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------|----------|----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---------------------|
| Instructor | Highest Rating 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | Lowest rating 1 | Does Not Apply 0 | Average | No Resp 9 |
| 1. Instructor(s) provided a class syllabus and established clear objectives. | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.2 | 0 |
| 2. Instructor(s) demonstrated expertise in the subject area. | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.4 | 0 |
| 3. Instructor(s) presented material in a clear, understandable manner. | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.9 | 0 |
| 4. Instructor(s) demonstrated interest and enthusiasm in conducting the class. | 4 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.3 | 0 |
| 5. Instructor(s) were well prepared for each class meeting. | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4.1 | 0 |
| 6. Instructor(s) encouraged student participation/questions. | 3 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.2 | 0 |
| Course Content | Highest Rating 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | Lowest rating 1 | Does Not Apply 0 | Average | No Resp 9 |
| 7. The textbook was useful. | 2 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.6 | 0 |
| 8. The class materials/online course materials were useful. | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4.2 | 0 |
| 9. The class format and assignments were effective. | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.1 | 0 |
| 10. The pace of the class was just right. | 4 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.3 | 0 |
| 11. The material presented in class was at an appropriate level. | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.4 | 0 |
| 12. The class content met the stated objectives as advertised. | 5 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.3 | 0 |
| 13. The class met my expectations. | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.4 | 0 |
| Administration | Highest Rating 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | Lowest rating 1 | Does Not Apply 0 | Average | No Resp 9 |
| 14. The class met my needs or the needs of my company. | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.4 | 0 |
| 15. Registration procedures were handled efficiently. | 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.6 | 0 |
| 16. The classroom was well suited for our needs. | 3 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.2 | 0 |
| 17. The laboratory was well suited for our needs. | 4 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.3 | 0 |
| 18. Advertising materials were easy to read and understand. | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.2 | 0 |
| Overall Impression | Highest Rating 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | Lowest rating 1 | Does Not Apply 0 | Average | No Resp 9 |
| 19. This class is a good value for the money. | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.6 | 0 |
| 20. I would recommend CSUF to a friend, co-worker and/or business associate. | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.4 | 0 |
| | Highest Rating | | | | Lowest rating | Does Not Apply | | No Resp |

| Additional comments | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | Average | 9 |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---------|---|
| 21. What did you like about the class? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Instructor communicated clearly. Related material to real-world situations. -A lot of practices. Good friends. -I did learn to model parts and make drawings and assemblies using Pro/E 2001. -The CDs in each class were very handy and good instructions. -Presented at a good pace. -Pro/E itself. -Facilities and equipment. -The way the teacher explains. -I thought the professor showed a great idea of practice in the exercises we did. | | | | | | | |
| 22. What improvements would you suggest about the class? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teach Wildfire instead of 2001 version of Pro/E. -You should upgrade your computers to be faster! -The homework should be comparable to the Pro/E that we used in the company, not the educational Pro/E that we used here. -None. Keep it up. -More examples of concepts to further understand. -Nothing. I thought the class provided everything for my education. | | | | | | | |