

Course: ME32300 002 - Mechanics Of Material

Department: ME

Responses / Expected: 28 / 37 (75.68%)

ME32300 - 002

1a - Demographics

Responses

Course

	F	S	JR	SR	G	O	N	Grp Med	Mode	Std Dev
Q1 YOUR CLASS	0	12	16	0	0	0	28	2.6	3	.49

Responses: [F] Fresh=1 [S] Soph=2 [JR] Jr=3 [SR] Sr=4 [G] Grad=5 [O] Other=6

ME32300 - 002

1a - Demographics

Responses

Course

	A	B	C	D	F	P	F	N	Grp Med	Mode	Std Dev
Q2 EXPECTED GRADE	5	18	5	0	0	0	0	28	6.0	6	.60

Responses: [A] A=7 [B] B=6 [C] C=5 [D] D=4 [F] F=3 [P] Pass=2 [F] Fail=1

ME32300 - 002

1a - Demographics

Responses

Course

	RFY	RBS	E	N	Grp Med	Mode	Std Dev
Q3 COURSE REQUIRED	28	0	0	28	1.0	1	0

Responses: [RFY] Required for your major/minor=1 [RBS] Required by school/University=2 [E] Elective=3

ME32300 - 002

1a - Demographics

Responses

Course

	AG	ED	E	HHS	LA	M	P	SCI	T	VM	U	N	Grp Med	Mode	Std Dev
Q4 YOUR SCHOOL	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	9.0	9	0

Responses: [AG] AG=11 [ED] ED=10 [E] ENGR=9 [HHS] HHS=8 [LA] LA=7 [M] MGMT=6 [P] PHARM=5 [SCI] SCI=4 [T] TECH=3 [VM] VET MED=2 [U] UNDECLARED=1

2a - University questions about your course

ME32300 - 002

Responses

Course

	E	G	F	P	VP	N	Grp	Mode	Std
--	---	---	---	---	----	---	-----	------	-----

	1	2	3	4	5	N	Med	Mode	Std Dev
Q5 Overall, I would rate this course as:	18	6	3	0	28	3.8	4	.72	
Responses: [E] Excellent=5 [G] Good=4 [F] Fair=3 [P] Poor=2 [VP] Very Poor=1									

Rong Xu									
2b - University questions about your instructor	Responses					Individual			
	E	G	F	P	VP	N	Grp Med	Mode	Std Dev
Q6 Overall, I would rate this instructor as:	4	11	8	5	0	28	3.6	4	.94
Responses: [E] Excellent=5 [G] Good=4 [F] Fair=3 [P] Poor=2 [VP] Very Poor=1									

ME32300 - 002									
MEC ENG standard questions about course	Responses					Course			
	SA	A	U	D	SD	N	Grp Med	Mode	Std Dev
Q7 The course has clearly stated objectives.	4	21	3	0	0	28	4.0	4	.50
Q8 The work load for the course was reasonable.	6	16	3	2	1	28	4.0	4	.95
Q9 The exams were fair in assessing my comprehension of the course material.	4	15	5	2	2	28	3.8	4	1.05
Q10 The course was pitched at a reasonable level of difficulty for me.	5	16	5	1	1	28	3.9	4	.89
Q11 Adequate consultation and assistance was available when needed.	6	18	2	2	0	28	4.1	4	.76
Responses: [SA] Strongly Agree=5 [A] Agree=4 [U] Undecided=3 [D] Disagree=2 [SD] Strongly Disagree=1									

ME32300 - 002									
MEC ENG standard questions about course	Responses					Course			
	<	1	2	>	N	Grp Med	Mode	Std Dev	
Q12 The course has an average weekly workload (in-class and out-of-class) of approximately:	5	18	2	1	1	27	4.0	4	.86
Responses: [<] <10hrs/wk=5 [1] 11-15hrs/wk=4 [1] 16-20hrs/wk=3 [2] 21-25hrs/wk=2 [>] >25hrs/wk=1									

ME32300 - 002									
MEC ENG standard questions about course	Responses					Course			
	SA	A	U	D	SD	N	Grp Med	Mode	Std Dev
Q13 The course enhanced my understanding of the fundamental principles of the subject.	4	21	2	0	0	27	4.0	4	.47
Q14 The course showed me how to apply these principles to practical engineering situations.	5	16	6	0	1	28	3.9	4	.83
Q15 The course stimulated me to think creatively.	1	13	7	6	1	28	3.5	4	.95
Q16 The course enhanced my ability to communicate technical information (in written and/or oral form).	2	8	9	8	1	28	3.1	3	1
Q17 The laboratory complemented well the material covered in lectures.	2	6	18	1	1	28	3.2	3	.78

Q18	The course equipped me with the ability to independently assimilate new concepts and information and solve novel problems.	1	21	4	2	0	28	3.9	4	.63
Q19	The course helped me understand the effects of technology on society.	1	7	7	9	4	28	2.6	2	1.10
Q20	The classroom atmosphere was conducive to learning.	2	15	8	2	1	28	3.7	4	.87
Q21	The lectures contributed significantly to my understanding of the material.	7	13	5	3	0	28	4.0	4	.91

Responses: [SA] Strongly Agree=5 [A] Agree=4 [U] Undecided=3 [D] Disagree=2 [SD] Strongly Disagree=1

Rong Xu

MEC ENG standard questions about instructor

		Responses						Individual		
		SA	A	U	D	SD	N	Grp Med	Mode	Std Dev
Q22	The instructor was well prepared for class.	11	17	0	0	0	28	4.3	4	.49
Q23	The instructor wrote legibly.	4	14	4	6	0	28	3.8	4	.98
Q24	The instructor spoke clearly and at a suitable pace for note taking and understanding.	2	11	7	7	1	28	3.4	4	1.01
Q25	The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching this course.	5	14	7	2	0	28	3.9	4	.82
Q26	The instructor stimulated me to think creatively.	3	8	9	7	0	27	3.2	3	.97
Q27	The instructor clearly presented the principles of the subject.	4	17	4	3	0	28	3.9	4	.82
Q28	The instructor clearly showed the applications of these principles to practical engineering situations.	4	15	5	3	1	28	3.8	4	.97
Q29	The instructor encouraged interaction and cooperative learning (student-teacher and student-student interaction).	7	13	6	2	0	28	4.0	4	.86

Responses: [SA] Strongly Agree=5 [A] Agree=4 [U] Undecided=3 [D] Disagree=2 [SD] Strongly Disagree=1

Q30 - We welcome your written comments below. What is something/are some things that the instructor does well, e.g., something you hope that the instructor will continue to do in the class in the future?

Faculty: Rong Xu

Response Rate: 39.29% (11 of 28)

- 1 Too much time spent on equation derivations that did not matter whatsoever to the scope of the course (e.g. deflection equations); time would have been better spent on examples from the lecture book.
- 2 The quizzes in lecture were about the right level of difficulty
Rong would sometimes also point out exceptions to certain rules or provide more complicated problem scenarios (e.g. adding spring to system), which was helpful for homework. He presented content in a way relevant to the students and reflective of what could realistically be learned in an undergraduate ME course—lectures were to the point, not overwrought, but still informative. Slightly surprising for a grad TA.
- 3 Rong encouraged us to ask questions in case we didn't understand a concept, and made sure that we were following what he taught in class. This clearly portrayed his passion for teaching and his desire that the students actually learn something in his class. He also allowed students to collaborate on the in-class quizzes which facilitated the learning process. I believe he should continue following these aspects of his teaching method.
- 4 Overall the Instructor taught the course very well. Better than an the average professor at Purdue. Something that I think should continue is coving the lecture book for one class then doing problems in that section the next. This really helped out with

understanding. Also, it was very helpful when the students worked on problems together.

6 Overall had a very positive experience with Rong Xu, it took a day or two to get used to his accent but he is a very good instructor

7 Mr. Xu is very good at explaining the concepts. I cannot think of any way his lectures could improve .

8 It is useful that the instructor walks through examples with students, and that he helps guide students when they are stuck on problems or quiz questions.

9 I think he is very good at guiding students during quizzes without giving too much away. The interaction he encourages during quizzes is very helpful as they are often new concepts that are hard to completely grasp by one student.

10 I liked the in-class quizzes to help gauge understanding of the material those were very well.

11 He is a good instructor with a lot of knowledge but should incorporate more interacting elements in teaching or some fun elements.

Q31 - Make a suggestion(s) for improving the course (a criticism alone is not helpful; tell your instructor how you would fix any problem).

Faculty: Rong Xu

Response Rate: 46.43% (13 of 28)

1 spend less time on derivations which are already included in book and more on examples

2 When using the iPad to lecture and do examples, it is hard to follow along since you have to move the screen all the time. It would be helpful to have a classroom with 2 screens or even use the chalkboard.

3 Some problems in the book do not have solutions online for later chapters. I also want to point out that I felt this class was much more manageable in a smaller setting. Given the class had only about 40 students, it was much easier for me to follow along (no distractions, easy to see the projector, etc.). This format most definitely benefits instructors too, especially those who haven't as much teaching experience.

4 Some conceptual questions asked on the exam were not covered in class. The lecture was mainly math examples, when some conceptual ideas could've been helpful to learning and understanding the material.

5 Rong is always prepared for his lectures, but sometimes has trouble managing the lecture time. This does not mean he finishes after time; sometimes he finished before time too. One thing he could work on is the pace of his lectures.

6 Please curve the course. The average grades are similar to other engineering courses, but there is no curve.

7 Na

8 NA

In general, a lot of material on homeworks were significantly more complicated than examples or quizzes done in class; the difficulty and extreme length of some homeworks (notably HW 7) were not conducive to learning and turned more into a tedious chore. Homeworks should better fit the examples done in class, instead of asking questions that have never been covered in lecture or examples (Homework 11.4 for example). If combining concepts are required on homework assignments, there should be examples done in class demonstrating this requirement.

9 In addition, there were one or two instances where provided homework solutions were incorrect, and I had to notify a TA about the error. I've also noticed several grading inconsistencies; I've had correct answers marked wrong for some reason, and grading criteria seems to vary from TA to TA, as I have had same errors as friends who have gotten marked off more or fewer points than me.

I also think that two exams to cover the amount of material this course covers is cramming too much information; I feel like I would have been significantly less stressed before each exam if there were three exams, instead of two.

10 If possible, please make the homework due at 1AM instead of 11:59PM

11 I feel that more help for students outside of class would be beneficial. Most of the help sessions were held during the same time-slot

on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. I would always have class during those time slots so getting help was very difficult for me, and I am sure it was for other students as well. Also, I feel that the assigned homework problems were of a much greater difficulty than the examples done in class. I found myself lost and confused on many problems even after feeling that I had a good grasp on the topics after class.

12 I could tell that Mr. Xu wanted to teach the class and was excited to, but sometimes lectures were a tad boring and confusing. Other than that I thought it was a good semester.

13 Having a mandatory lab portion to understand concepts better.