

[MIT Online Subject Evaluation](#) | [Guide to Reports](#)

Change report view:

Reid, McMahon Thomas Homer ▼

18.330 Introduction to Numerical Analysis

Survey Window: Spring 2014 End of Term | [View Current Catalog Entry](#) | [Print Report](#)

Report Includes Data for:

Students: For credit

Subjects: 18.330 Introduction to Numerical Analysis - Lecture L01

[\(filter data\)](#)

Eligible to Respond: 12 **Total # of Respondents:** 10 **Response rate:** 83% **Overall rating of subject:** 6.3 out of 7

Download Set of Individual Student Responses: [PDF](#) [raw data](#)

[Show/Hide Comments](#)

INSTRUCTORS

Quality of Teaching	<i>1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)</i>			<i>1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)</i>
	Stimulated interest	Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	Helped me learn	Overall rating
Reid, McMahon Thomas Homer , Lecturer (LEC)	6.4 (10)	6.5 (10)	6.5 (10)	6.6 (10)

Additional Questions for Math Instructors	<i>1=Strongly Disagree, 7=Strongly Agree (7 is best)</i>		
	Presentations were well organized	Instructor encouraged participation	Instructor used good examples
Reid, McMahon Thomas Homer , Lecturer (LEC)	6.2 (10)	5.3 (10)	6.3 (10)

Reid, McMahon Thomas Homer, Lecturer in Lecture L01 - Overall rating: 6.6

Quality of Teaching	<i>Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)</i>								
	AVG	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	RESPONSES
Stimulated interest	6.4							10	1.07
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	6.5							10	0.97
Helped me learn	6.5							10	0.97

Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not

Applicable (7 is best)

AVG 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **RESPONSES** **STDEV**

Overall rating	6.6	10	0.97
--------------------------------	------------	----	------

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

[Student 2306](#) - I really enjoyed the structure of the class. The only thing that I'd say could use improving is that the notes on the board could be better organized.

[Student 12424](#) - Overall great! What I really liked about the lectures (aside from the material and the awesome structure) was the sense of humor. I think that's actually really important, and it has made a huge difference for me in the past in a couple of classes. And the fact that you can talk to your professor in a normal way, I think that's really important. I felt like I could ask all my questions, and that I could understand the answers I got. So I guess my point is that Prof. Reid is approachable and a great teacher. Please, never become one of those gray, unenthusiastic math professors :) The only thing I would have liked to see more of is class participation. The lectures were often pretty dense, so there wasn't a lot of room for sort of discussion. That being said, the lectures were also very well structured and clearly well planned, and I liked that a lot. Classes without a clear path are the worst.

[Student 14696](#) - I very much enjoyed the lectures. Pretty fast paced, but logical and well organized.

[Student 22584](#) - Was enthusiastic about the class and was always available for help. Presented the topics in a logic fashion. Great teacher

[Student 36544](#) - Very thorough and logical teaching style. Made it easy to understand key material.

[Student 46310](#) - Lecture notes were often incomplete and the examples were often much more trivial than on problem sets. This leads to inconsistencies between the problem solving methods in the notes and in the pset due to higher dimension, difficult change of variables, etc..

[Student 48762](#) - Prof. Homer is really a great teacher.

Additional Questions for Math Instructors

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 7=Strongly Agree (7 is best)

AVG 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **RESPONSES** **STDEV**

Presentations were well organized	6.2	10	1.03
Instructor encouraged participation	5.3	10	1.49
Instructor used good examples	6.3	10	1.06

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

AVG 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **RESPONSES** **STDEV**

Subject expectations were clearly defined	6.5	10	0.97
Subject's learning objectives were met	6.6	10	0.97
Assignments contributed to my learning	6.6	10	0.97
Grading thus far has been fair	6.5	10	0.97

Rating Scale: 1=Too Slow, 4=Just Right, 7=Too Fast, N/A=Not Applicable (4 is best)

AVG 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **RESPONSES** **STDEV**

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4.7	10	0.82
--	------------	----	------

	AVG	RESPONSES	STDEV
Average hours you spent per week on this subject in the classroom	2.7	10	0.95
Average hours you spent per week on this subject outside of the classroom	11.5	10	5.32

Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent (7 is best)

	AVG	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	RESPONSES	STDEV
Overall rating of the subject	6.3		10	1.06

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

[Student 12424](#) - I think the first couple of weeks were a little slow, and that the last 2-3 weeks were a little fast. There are lots of cool applications and methods in the second half of the course, and I sort of felt like things went a little fast towards the end. My suggestion would be to maybe go a little more quickly through the first quadrature rules, because people (at least I had) have most likely seen those in 18.01, to leave a little more time to the last material. I also felt like the modulation topics were a little rushed. All that being said, I really really liked how well organized this class was! This is probably the best organized class I've ever taken (and I'm a senior), and I really liked the fact that I knew sort of where we were going, and not only that - the roadmap made a lot of sense. Also, how we sort of wrapped things up at the end, tying things together, that was great. A couple of things about the exams: I think the questions were fair, but for many of us, I think, the kinds of problems we got were very unfamiliar. I, for example, had never written pseudo code on the spot before, so I was really terrified on that first exam. My suggestion is to post a couple of practice problems in advance, so that people have a sense of what they need to be able to do. Because the material was fine, and the questions were totally reasonable, I just got confused because I wasn't used to writing pseudo code on the fly.

[Student 14696](#) - The one criticism I have about this course is that both of the midterms were much too long. Each midterm had 5 problems, and I felt both times that if there had only been 4 problems I would have had time to completely think through each one and demonstrate my understanding. Since that extra problem was there, my attention was split and I wasn't about to work through them in detail. Five problems in 80 minutes for this course material is one too many. The difficulty of the problems were fine, and if I had enough time I would have been able to work them out. The number of problems made it feel to me like I was being tested on how fast I could answer exam questions, which seems very unimportant in any real world application of the material. If you want me to be able to demonstrate my understanding of the material you taught, give me one less question and allow me to work through 4 problems to completion.

[Student 22584](#) - A suggestion would be to shorten the Unit 1 and spend more time in more advanced methods

[Student 36544](#) - The workload for this class was really too much. On a good (easy) week - which happened only a couple times during the semester - the psets took ~10 hours. On an average week, they took more like 15 hours, and even more on a particularly challenging pset. When considering studying for tests, projects, etc., I spent about 20 hours/week on this class on average. This was really frustrating given that the average MIT student takes 4-5 classes and works or has a UROP - spending this amount of time on one class is really not realistic. On that note, I think psets should not be assigned during weeks with exams - I had to prioritize one over the other and think the quality of my work suffered a little during these weeks. Finally, the expectations on the tests were really unreasonable. The questions were challenging and required significant creative thinking - which wouldn't be a problem, except that to have to answer 5 of those questions in only 80 minutes was pretty much impossible. Otherwise, the actual content of this course was great. I'm leaving the class feeling like I've gained a lot of practical knowledge that can be applied to future work. It's a shame that the workload was so disproportionate - a class which could have been fun and interesting became a huge source of stress.

[Student 46310](#) - There were many problems on the problem set that took way too long and didn't help me understand the subject better. Also, too many problems about proving some mathematical fact or finding closed forms or fourier transforms. In some problems it made sense as the computation were part of the numerical analysis. In many other problems though it just felt like 18.03 bitch work.

[Student 48762](#) - Great course!!

[Show/Hide Comments](#)

[\(top of page\)](#)