

SUBJECT: 18.330 Introduction to Numerical Analysis
Survey Window: Spring 2016 End of Term | Responses for Student 4813

INSTRUCTORS

Reid, McMahon Thomas Homer, Lecturer

Teaching in Lecture L01 meets TR2.30-4 in 2-105

QUALITY OF TEACHING

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

Stimulated my interest in the subject	7
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	7

Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Overall rating of teaching	7
----------------------------	---

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

Best professor I've ever had.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR MATH INSTRUCTORS

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

Presentations were well organized	7
Instructor encouraged participation	7
Instructor used good examples	7

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

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

Subject expectations were clearly defined	7
Subject's learning objectives were met	7
Assignments contributed to my learning	7
Grading thus far has been fair	7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	5
------------------------------------------------------	---

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	3
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	8

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

Overall rating of the subject

7

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

I loved this class. I have never enjoyed a math class this much. Thank you!

SUBJECT: 18.330 Introduction to Numerical Analysis

Survey Window: Spring 2016 End of Term | Responses for Student 5340

INSTRUCTORS

Reid, McMahon Thomas Homer, Lecturer

Teaching in Lecture L01 meets TR2.30-4 in 2-105

QUALITY OF TEACHING

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

Stimulated my interest in the subject 7

Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material 7

Helped me learn 7

Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Overall rating of teaching 7

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

Homer is the best Math instructor I've had so far at MIT. Every lecture builds off the previous very smoothly and he presents the information in a manner that starts with what we know and builds to new concepts. He also doesn't ask his students to answer questions during lectures, which I prefer because after all it's a lecture not a review session. Give this man his professorship.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR MATH INSTRUCTORS

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

Presentations were well organized 7

Instructor encouraged participation 4

Instructor used good examples 7

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

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

Subject expectations were clearly defined 7

Subject's learning objectives were met 7

Assignments contributed to my learning 7

Grading thus far has been fair 6

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was: 4

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, Student: 5340 3

seminars, etc.)

Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers,
projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)

12

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

Overall rating of the subject

7

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

My only criticism of the class is I think the grading could be at times too lenient. Otherwise, this was my favorite Math class at MIT and this is largely due to Homer's excellent teaching. I felt I was able to learn a great deal and will be able to apply this information in my work going forward.

SUBJECT: 18.330 Introduction to Numerical Analysis
Survey Window: Spring 2016 End of Term | Responses for Student 6078

INSTRUCTORS

Reid, McMahon Thomas Homer, Lecturer
Teaching in Lecture L01 meets TR2.30-4 in 2-105

QUALITY OF TEACHING

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

Stimulated my interest in the subject	7
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	7

Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Overall rating of teaching	7
----------------------------	---

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR MATH INSTRUCTORS

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

Presentations were well organized	7
Instructor encouraged participation	7
Instructor used good examples	7

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

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

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

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments)
was:

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	

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

Overall rating of the subject

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT: 18.330 Introduction to Numerical Analysis
Survey Window: Spring 2016 End of Term | Responses for Student 7907

INSTRUCTORS

Reid, McMahon Thomas Homer, Lecturer

Teaching in Lecture L01 meets TR2.30-4 in 2-105

QUALITY OF TEACHING

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

Stimulated my interest in the subject 7

Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material 6

Helped me learn 6

Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Overall rating of teaching 7

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR MATH INSTRUCTORS

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

Presentations were well organized 7

Instructor encouraged participation 6

Instructor used good examples 7

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

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

Subject expectations were clearly defined 7

Subject's learning objectives were met 7

Assignments contributed to my learning 7

Grading thus far has been fair 7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was: 4

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.) 3

Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.) 8

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

Overall rating of the subject

7

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

take it. not so hard that it'll kill you. hard enough to teach you something useful

SUBJECT: 18.330 Introduction to Numerical Analysis
Survey Window: Spring 2016 End of Term | Responses for Student 9615

INSTRUCTORS

Reid, McMahon Thomas Homer, Lecturer
Teaching in Lecture L01 meets TR2.30-4 in 2-105

QUALITY OF TEACHING

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

Stimulated my interest in the subject	7
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	7

Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Overall rating of teaching	7
----------------------------	---

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR MATH INSTRUCTORS

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

Presentations were well organized	7
Instructor encouraged participation	7
Instructor used good examples	7

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

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

Subject expectations were clearly defined	7
Subject's learning objectives were met	7
Assignments contributed to my learning	5
Grading thus far has been fair	6

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	6
------------------------------------------------------	---

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	4
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	9

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

Overall rating of the subject

6

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT: 18.330 Introduction to Numerical Analysis
Survey Window: Spring 2016 End of Term | Responses for Student 10099

INSTRUCTORS

Reid, McMahon Thomas Homer, Lecturer
Teaching in Lecture L01 meets TR2.30-4 in 2-105

QUALITY OF TEACHING

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

Stimulated my interest in the subject	7
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	7

Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Overall rating of teaching	7
----------------------------	---

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR MATH INSTRUCTORS

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

Presentations were well organized	7
Instructor encouraged participation	7
Instructor used good examples	7

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

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

Subject expectations were clearly defined	7
Subject's learning objectives were met	7
Assignments contributed to my learning	7
Grading thus far has been fair	7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4
------------------------------------------------------	---

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	3
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	7

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

Overall rating of the subject

7

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

Great class. I wish the instructor can give written answers for practice exam.

SUBJECT: 18.330 Introduction to Numerical Analysis
Survey Window: Spring 2016 End of Term | Responses for Student 14684

INSTRUCTORS

Reid, McMahon Thomas Homer, Lecturer
Teaching in Lecture L01 meets TR2.30-4 in 2-105

QUALITY OF TEACHING

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

Stimulated my interest in the subject	7
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	7

Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Overall rating of teaching	7
----------------------------	---

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR MATH INSTRUCTORS

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

Presentations were well organized	7
Instructor encouraged participation	7
Instructor used good examples	7

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

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

Subject expectations were clearly defined	7
Subject's learning objectives were met	7
Assignments contributed to my learning	7
Grading thus far has been fair	7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4
------------------------------------------------------	---

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	3
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	7

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

Overall rating of the subject

7

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT: 18.330 Introduction to Numerical Analysis
Survey Window: Spring 2016 End of Term | Responses for Student 16780

INSTRUCTORS

Reid, McMahon Thomas Homer, Lecturer
Teaching in Lecture L01 meets TR2.30-4 in 2-105

QUALITY OF TEACHING

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

Stimulated my interest in the subject	7
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	6
Helped me learn	7

Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Overall rating of teaching	7
----------------------------	---

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR MATH INSTRUCTORS

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

Presentations were well organized	7
Instructor encouraged participation	5
Instructor used good examples	7

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

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

Subject expectations were clearly defined	6
Subject's learning objectives were met	7
Assignments contributed to my learning	7
Grading thus far has been fair	7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4
------------------------------------------------------	---

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	3
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	9

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

Overall rating of the subject

7

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT: 18.330 Introduction to Numerical Analysis
Survey Window: Spring 2016 End of Term | Responses for Student 18041

INSTRUCTORS

Reid, McMahon Thomas Homer, Lecturer
Teaching in Lecture L01 meets TR2.30-4 in 2-105

QUALITY OF TEACHING

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

Stimulated my interest in the subject	7
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	7

Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Overall rating of teaching	7
----------------------------	---

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR MATH INSTRUCTORS

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

Presentations were well organized	7
Instructor encouraged participation	5
Instructor used good examples	7

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

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

Subject expectations were clearly defined	7
Subject's learning objectives were met	7
Assignments contributed to my learning	7
Grading thus far has been fair	7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	5
------------------------------------------------------	---

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	3
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	6

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

Overall rating of the subject

7

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT: 18.330 Introduction to Numerical Analysis
Survey Window: Spring 2016 End of Term | Responses for Student 34526

INSTRUCTORS

Reid, McMahon Thomas Homer, Lecturer
Teaching in Lecture L01 meets TR2.30-4 in 2-105

QUALITY OF TEACHING

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

Stimulated my interest in the subject	7
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	7

Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Overall rating of teaching	7
----------------------------	---

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

Lectures were pretty good overall. I felt that it was actually worth going to lecture every time, unlike some other classes I have taken. I love how this class talked about the relevance of the material (ex: how we talked about the LIGO experiments). My one critique is that sometimes you would repeatedly talk a lot about a small detail that we all understood. Thanks for the class!

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR MATH INSTRUCTORS

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

Presentations were well organized	7
Instructor encouraged participation	7
Instructor used good examples	7

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

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

Subject expectations were clearly defined	7
Subject's learning objectives were met	7
Assignments contributed to my learning	7
Grading thus far has been fair	7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	6
------------------------------------------------------	---

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, Student: 34526)	3
----------------------------------------------------------------	---

seminars, etc.)

Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers,
projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)

12

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

Overall rating of the subject

7

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

This class is probably the best class I've taken yet, and I pretty much recommend this class whenever I can.

Pace varied week to week, and probably too fast in the second half of the course. Psets took a very long time for me, but it was rewarding.

SUBJECT: 18.330 Introduction to Numerical Analysis
Survey Window: Spring 2016 End of Term | Responses for Student 35204

INSTRUCTORS

Reid, McMahon Thomas Homer, Lecturer

Teaching in Lecture L01 meets TR2.30-4 in 2-105

QUALITY OF TEACHING

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

Stimulated my interest in the subject 7

Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material 6

Helped me learn 7

Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Overall rating of teaching 7

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR MATH INSTRUCTORS

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

Presentations were well organized 7

Instructor encouraged participation 7

Instructor used good examples 7

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

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

Subject expectations were clearly defined 7

Subject's learning objectives were met 7

Assignments contributed to my learning 7

Grading thus far has been fair 7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was: 4

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.) 5

Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.) 4

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

Overall rating of the subject

7

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

SUBJECT: 18.330 Introduction to Numerical Analysis
Survey Window: Spring 2016 End of Term | Responses for Student 37842

INSTRUCTORS

Reid, McMahon Thomas Homer, Lecturer
Teaching in Lecture L01 meets TR2.30-4 in 2-105

QUALITY OF TEACHING

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

Stimulated my interest in the subject	7
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	7

Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Overall rating of teaching	7
----------------------------	---

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

Exceptional teaching

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR MATH INSTRUCTORS

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

Presentations were well organized	7
Instructor encouraged participation	7
Instructor used good examples	7

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

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

Subject expectations were clearly defined	7
Subject's learning objectives were met	7
Assignments contributed to my learning	7
Grading thus far has been fair	7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4
------------------------------------------------------	---

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	3
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	8

Student: 37842

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

Overall rating of the subject

7

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

Great class with excellent lectures, course notes, and p-sets. Numerical analysis is a hard subject to teach in a compelling way, but Homer managed to do so by naturally motivating problems and teaching both theory and applications well. I would definitely take another class taught by Homer, regardless of the subject.

SUBJECT: 18.330 Introduction to Numerical Analysis
Survey Window: Spring 2016 End of Term | Responses for Student 47941

INSTRUCTORS

Reid, McMahon Thomas Homer, Lecturer
Teaching in Lecture L01 meets TR2.30-4 in 2-105

QUALITY OF TEACHING

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

Stimulated my interest in the subject	7
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	7

Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Overall rating of teaching	7
----------------------------	---

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

Amazing lecturer! Homer is the best instructor I have had at MIT. Homers investment in the class is inspiring and motivating. In addition to having written the curriculum, it is clear that Homer has spent ample time preparing for his lectures. I have never seen an instructor discuss problem set solutions in class or be so flexible in their office hours. Homer's lectures are awesome. You get the feeling that 100% of the class is following his explanations 100% of the time. Homer also bleeds with passion about the subject. He is enthusiastic about the material in such a fresh and real way to an extent that makes you feel like you are missing out by not spending as much time as him thinking about the subject. I also appreciate how Homer ties in relevant current events in his lectures. For example, with the recent LIGO gravitational wave findings, Homer spent over half of an hour explaining the results and how they relate to class the following session. There was also a question pertaining to the findings on that week's problem set. Homer is the most invested, clear, and passionate lecturer I've had at MIT. I'm so glad to have taken this class before graduating!

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR MATH INSTRUCTORS

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

Presentations were well organized	7
Instructor encouraged participation	7
Instructor used good examples	7

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

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

Subject expectations were clearly defined	7
Subject's learning objectives were met	7

SUBJECT

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

Assignments contributed to my learning 7

Grading thus far has been fair 7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) 4

was:

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.) 3

Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.) 10

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

Overall rating of the subject 7

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

Great class. Very interesting material presented in a great way.

SUBJECT: 18.330 Introduction to Numerical Analysis
Survey Window: Spring 2016 End of Term | Responses for Student 49986

INSTRUCTORS

Reid, McMahon Thomas Homer, Lecturer
Teaching in Lecture L01 meets TR2.30-4 in 2-105

QUALITY OF TEACHING

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

Stimulated my interest in the subject	7
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7
Helped me learn	7

Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

Overall rating of teaching	7
----------------------------	---

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

I love how you integrate a bunch of random things into the curriculum and how much energy you put into teaching. You always explain things so well and I love how organized your class is.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR MATH INSTRUCTORS

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

Presentations were well organized	7
Instructor encouraged participation	7
Instructor used good examples	7

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

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

Subject expectations were clearly defined	7
Subject's learning objectives were met	7
Assignments contributed to my learning	7
Grading thus far has been fair	7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4
------------------------------------------------------	---

Average hours you spent per week on this subject: (round to the nearest whole number)

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	3
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, Student: 49986)	6

projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)

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

Overall rating of the subject

7

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)