University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Enrolle The folic	tor Yes evaluations owing ways: (1) re teaching; (2)	for use by the	to the Dep	partment of Mat (after grades h	hematics nave been	in one or m turned in) i	in improving
1.				ossibilities of the less of this instr an moderately effective		matter and	course, how would extremely effective
2.	boardwork, exchours, homework	amples, clarity ork, exams, g	y, willingne rading).	ss to answer qu	g ocl	exampl	ctures, content, and students, office where question
\$5 m				.t			*
3.	What are the in	nstructor's we	aknesses?	How could the	instructo	improve h	is/her teaching?
¥1	N/A		6	vi e			
4.	Please rate the	e overall <i>cour</i> s	se on a sca	ale of 1 to 7:			*1
	ा not at all	2	C333	ाक moderately effective	助	∷ \$⊃	extremely effective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

5.

University of California, Berkeley

	TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM								
Instruct	or Ker	Ribet	Course _	Math 55	· (Semester	5p 15		
Enrolle		3	Auditing	8.5		Your Major N	NCF, Cog Sc		
follo	wing wa	uations will be he lys: (1) for use t ing; (2) for use	by the instructo	r (after grades	have been	turned in) in			
1.		ering both the li	•		•	natter and co	ourse, how would		
	not at all	C 2 2	I 331	moderately effective	(\$)	- (6)	extremely effective		
2.	boardw		clarity, willingn		uestions, a	ttitude towar	ures, content, d students, office		
3.	What a	re the instructor	's weaknesses	? How could the	e instructor	improve his/	her teaching?		
ā			2		ii				
4.	Please	rate the overall	course on a so	cale of 1 to 7:					
	ा not at all	:	C33	本 moderately effective	5 3	*	⊏7⊐ extremely effective		

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be 5. improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

					_		5	
Instruct	or Profe	Rebet	Course	Math 5	5	_ Semester _	Spring	2015
Enrolle	Comun	Rebet ent Enrolle	Auditing	p	(c.a.	You r Major		
follo	wing ways	: (1) for use b	y the instructe	or (after gra	of Mathematica des have beeing courses and	en turned in) in improv	
1.		ng both the ling ne overall teac		•	of the subject instructor?	t matter and	d course, h	ow would
	not at all	22	(3)	ঞ moderately effective		्र		remely ective
2.	boardwork		larity, willingr		tion and orga ver questions,		V.	
ν,	Cettit	yler & ex who tower	surgle pur dro storti	e for	* ea	ω .*		5
3.	What are t	the instructor'	s weaknesse	s? How cou	ld the instruct	or improve	his/her tea	ching?
	Sine	a little a	sore inform	the on a	insite			
2	R							
			ī.			0		
4.	Please rate	e the overall	course on a s	cale of 1 to	7 :			80
	⊄⊐ not at all	12 1	(3)	⊏t⊃ moderately	5 50	-	exti	rz⊐ remely

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

effective

Requires bale 18 towardsbye of series

effective

University of California, Berkeley

Instruct	tor Ribe	\	Course	Marla	55	Semester _	SP. 201	5
Enrolle	d		Auditing	8.0		Your Major	Math	12 12 12 13 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14
follo	se evaluations wing ways: (1) re teaching; (2)	for use by the	instructor	(after grades	have beer	turned in)	in improving	e e
1. å	Considering be you rate the or not at all		effectivene			matter and	course, how extrement effective	ely
2.		nstructor's stre amples, clarity ork, exams, gr	, willingnes		_			
	well prepared	x red , Very , Hw, exams	friendly	etc, which	la answer	question but 0s	god esit	complaints
přísi							6	
3.	What are the i	nstructor's wea	aknesses?	How could the	ne instructo	r improve h	nis/her teachi	ng?
		_						
				* *				
4.	Please rate the	e overall <i>cours</i>	e on a sca	le of 1 to 7:	ź			
	ा not at all	12 1	(3)	moderately effective	150	253	extremented effective	•
5.	Comments on improved, adv	•	-		rse such as	s content, to	ext, how it co	uld be
					n division	Courses	first, tha	+ Theo,
	math 55	were not	require	$t \sim tv$	e himber	theony	ic lovered	in 113,
	+1e_ (0	wish, having were not an bisactorics	is pre	sumably cove	wed in th	e combin	neol soinoly	se which
	10/1/10	of regular , and if its istor classes.	DOSSIBLY SI	10010 00	all GND	Proof	ariling in	555

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	ctor Ken Ribet	Course	Math 55		Semester 🧾	pring	
Enrolle	ed <u></u>	Auditing	1.70		Your Major Cognitive Scien		
foll	ese evaluations will be flowing ways: (1) for use ure teaching; (2) for use	by the instructo	or (after grades	have been	turned in) in		
1.	Considering both the layou rate the overall team not at all				natter and co	extremely effective	
2.	What are the instructo boardwork, examples, homework, exa	clarity, willingn		_			
	prepared and orga	nized lacture	s, takes ample	time to a	momer que	estions, goes	
	above and beyond t	o answer qua	nons in offic	a hours an	d goes no	great lengths	
	to accommodate st	rudents in of	fice hours, in	cridibly re	sponsive ou	tr email .	
3.	What are the instructo						
	no major weaknes		·				
	explain background	information	pepor divine	in, but h	e wouldn't	need to if	
	Students read the	Usion before	and - which	(2 N/+ 100)	impossible	of a task	
,	in the grand sch	ieme of thin	45		a		
4.	Please rate the overal	course on a s	cale of 1 to 7:			2	
	മ്മ മു not at all	3 1	moderately effective	5	16 0	extremely effective	

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruct	or <u>Kenneth</u>	A Ribet	_ Course _	Mouth II.		Semester_	Spring 2015
Enrolled		/	_ Auditing	8.0		Your Major	Applied Mouthon
follo	wing ways: (1)	for use by the	e instructo	partment of Ma r (after grades l in selecting co	have beer	n turned in)	in improving
	_			ossibilities of th	•	matter and	course, how would
	्रा⊐ not at all	12 1	r 3 n	व्या moderately effective	(5)	26 0	extremely effective
2.	boardwork, exa	amples, clarit	y, willingne	12	uestions,	attitude tov	ectures, content, vard students, office
	And he	y an exu	ellout Les	tuer		17.1	a
		58			15-21	3	a.
3.	What are the ir	nstructor's we	aknesses	? How could the	instructo	or improve h	nis/her teaching?
	I have th	rest of prossib	he he ca	n Guer mor	e topic	s in clas	\$ _
8	76			3 ×		O.	
			- 			ø	
4.	Please rate the	e overall cour	se on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:			·
	ு not at all	_2 _	3 1	moderately	5 3	r 6 0	extremely

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

la atau sa	e Ribet		Cauraa	math 55	c	omootor :	2010
Instruc		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		math 55		emesterSr	
Enrolle	ed		Auditing _	8.8	Yo	our Major	og . 504
follo futu	ese evaluations of the second	for use by the for use by the	instructor students	(after grades in selecting co	have been to burses and ir	urned in) in in instructors.	mproving
1.	you rate the ov				•	atter and co	urse, how would
	ದ್ದಾ not at all	2 2	್ಕಾ	moderately effective	(\$1	_{5.} 16 1	extremely effective
2.	What are the ir boardwork, exa hours, homework	amples, clarity	, willingne	72	_		ires, content, I students, office
							13
			55			Я	
		8			⁶ 38	9	28 - 55
GA 12							
3.	What are the in	structor's we	aknesses?	How could th	ne instructor i	improve his/	her teaching?
					e:		
8				× "			
						8	
4.	Please rate the						
	not at all	<u>12</u> 1	13 1	moderately effective	(5)	් විට	extremely effective
5.	Comments on improved, advi-	•	•		rse such as o	content, text,	how it could be
	Great	professor,	Micc 9	juy and	cover arout	r fudents	
	12/10	Funny					

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

nstruct	or Ken R	ret	Course _	math 5	55	Semester Sp Your Major	rns 2	017
Enrolle	d yet		Auditing	- Si		Your Major <u></u>	osn; tr	ر 2
follo		for use by the	instructo	r (after grades	s have beer	in one or more turned in) in in instructors.		à
1.		oth the limitation verall teaching			structor?	matter and cou	extremely effective	ould
2.	boardwork, ex	amples, clarity	, willingne	ess to answer	questions,	nization of lecturation attitude toward the ches	students, o	
3.	What are the i	nstructor's we	aknesses'	? How could t	he instructo	or improve his/h	ner teaching	?
	an and an		NIA			s:		
4.	Please rate th	e overall cours	se on a sc	ale of 1 to 7;				
	not at all	12 3	(3)	本 moderately effective	5 3	6 0	extremely effective	

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

5.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruct	or Ken Ribet	Course	Math 65	Se	emester _S	pnng 2015
Enrolle	d /	Auditing _	p = 2 H	Yo	ou r Major	Math
The follo	se evaluations will be helowing ways: (1) for use by re teaching; (2) for use by	the instructor	r (after grades	have been to	urned in) in i	
1.	Considering both the lim you rate the overall teac an an a	-			atter and cou	extremely effective
2.	What are the instructor's boardwork, examples, cl hours, homework, examples and clear and clear, he gasked if students	arity, willingne	ess to answer q	uestions, att	titude toward	d students, office
3.	What are the instructor's His handwith about all.					
4.	Please rate the overall of	ourse on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:			3
	cti c2i not at all	-3 3	্ৰহ moderately effective	₽	15 0	extremely effective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

Excellent class.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

In	struct	tor <u>Ken</u>	Ribet	Course	Math	55		Semest	er Spring	201	5
Ε	nrolle	d <u>Yes</u>		Auditing	No	a fi		Your Ma	ajor Appl	ied M	looth.
	-	1							No.		
				helpful to the D by the instruct	•						
			` '	by the student	, -						0.00
	4	Camaidasis		limitations and	naasihiliti	oo of the	aubical	motter	and acura	o howy	would
	1.		•	limitations and aching effective	•		-	maller	and cours	e, now	would
		cp	(2)	33	7		:5 1	5	116 1	4	lv.
		not at all			modera: effectiv	•				extreme effective	
	2.	What are t	the instructo	or's strengths?	(i.e. prepa	aration a	nd orga	nization	of lectures	s. conte	nt.
		boardwork	k, examples	, clarity, willingr							
		hours, hor	nework, exa	ams, grading).						×	
		Very	friendly	and outgo	sing ; 1	ikes	to	help	students	and a	virmer
		question	s: lectu	res are	very	interes	tina a	17 20d 4	cun .		
500			.22				· 0·0				* "
	3.	What are 1	the instructo	or's weaknesse	s? How c	ould the	instruct	or impro	ve his/her	teachir	ıg?
		0.									
				W							
	4.	Please rat	e the overal	ll <i>course</i> on a s	cale of 1	to 7·					
	7.	T ICUSC ICI	±2=	:: 0001100 OH Q 0	nda or r	10 7.	(5)		115 11	17	
		not at all	_	_	modera effectiv					extreme effective	
					211200					+ *	-

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

had to turn to other resources

University of California, Berkeley

Instruct	tor Ribet	Course	Math 55	S	Semester <u>Spr</u>	ing 15 th/physics
The follo	ese evaluations will be helpful owing ways: (1) for use by the re teaching; (2) for use by the	to the De	partment of Ma r (after grades	athematics in have been	n one or more turned in) in ir	of the
1.	Considering both the limitating you rate the overall teaching to the result of the limitation of the l				natter and cou	extremely effective
2.	What are the instructor's street boardwork, examples, clarity hours, homework, exams, gittle is always overly include the crack ever wal.	y, willingne rading).	ess to answer o	questions, a	ttitude toward	students, office
3 X						
3.	What are the instructor's we		? How could th	e instructor	improve his/h	er teaching?
		5	a e			
4.	Please rate the overall cours	se on a so	cale of 1 to 7:			и
	ा क्या क्या क्या क्या कार्य at all	C3 3	moderately effective	.5 1	(6)	extremely effective
5.	Comments on any other releimproved, advice to people of found the fextbook					

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruct	or Ken	Ribet	Course _	Muth SS		Semester Sp	m 2015
Enrolled		<u></u>	Auditing	* £		Semester <u> </u>	ndecided
follo	wing way	tions will be he s: (1) for use b g; (2) for use b	y the instructo	r (after grades	s have been	turned in) in i	
.1.		ing both the lin	•		•	natter and co	urse, how would
	ದಾ not at all	(2)	r 3 0	দ্রু moderately effective	(5)	⊑\$ ⊒ ⊴	extremely effective
2.	boardwor	the instructor's rk, examples, comework, examples, constants of the constant of the constants of the constant of the cons	larity, willingne	ess to answer	questions, a	ttitude toward	d students, office
- 16 × 31		변				i 2 9	
3.	What are	the instructor's	s weaknesses	? How could the	he instructor	improve his/l	her teaching?
a				(e	a		
						ž.	
4.	Please ra	ate the overall	course on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:			22
	व्म not at all	(2)	(3)	本 moderately effective	I5 1	15 3	extremely effective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

	I LACINITO L'ALCATION CONTETTION									
Instruc	tor <u>K</u>	4M414	Rivet	Course _	Noth	55	Semester	9 pring 7015		
Enrolle	ed	y 25		Auditing	10		_ Your Major	Mathematics		
follo	owing ware teac	/ays: (1) hing; (2)	for use by for use by	the instructory the students	or (after grad s in selecting	es have be courses ar	cs in one or mo en turned in) in nd instructors.	improving		
1.				itations and p hing effective			ot matter and co	ourse, how would		
	u⊐ not at a		-2 1	:3 0	অ moderately effective	(5)	□6 ⊒ ∷	extremely effective		
2.	board	work, exa	amples, cl	arity, willingn	ess to answe	er questions		rd students, office		
PRES	ed asia	ms u	les e	very 1	Nell dan	and	Mudiely	1 /Atechating		
Easi	Cy	are.	a +	he lugt	(laggos =	l'up th	er takes	1 /Atertains		
3.							tor improve his			
	The	6190	3-85-1	Wed CLASS	is thay	we V	lary to e	d this riass		
ą.	and	tak	e Class	ses wil	h dfie	Prof 4	2550105			
				70						
4.	Please	e rate the	overall <i>c</i>	ourse on a so	cale of 1 to 7	:				
	æ		-2 0	C 3 D	24 3	5	1160 1	7		

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

moderately

effective

not at all

extremely

effective

University of California, Berkeley

Instruct	tor Prof	Ribet	Course	Math 5	ţ	Semester _	Spring	2015
Enrolle	S 10 10			8.5			Mothemo	
folic futu	owing ways: re teaching;	ns will be helpf (1) for use by tl (2) for use by t	ne instructo he students	r (after grade in selecting	s have bee courses and	n turned in) d instructors	in improving	
1. ģ		g both the limita e overall teachi				matter and	course, now	/ would
	not at all	12 1	(3)	व्या moderately effective	(5)	□6 3	extrem effect	
2.	boardwork, hours, hom - always - access	ne instructor's seexamples, clare ework, exams, well-prepartible during the get to kell challenging the get to kell challenging the challenging the seexamens and the seexamens and the seexamens are the seexamens and the seexamens are the seexamens and the seexamens are the seexamen	ity, willingne grading). ed and its clar mow his	ess to answer extremely o ss breakto students	questions,	attitude tow	ard students	s, office
3.	What are th	o inefructor's w	vooknossos	2 How could		or improve h	nis/her teach	ing?
	Cant r	eally think o	of any ples in	class	20	2		
4.	Please rate	the overall co	<i>irse</i> on a sc	cale of 1 to 7:				3
	¤⊐ not at all	12 1	:3 1	本 moderately effective	(5)	2 6 0	extren effect	nely
5.		on any other readvice to people				is content, to	ext, how it co	ould be
	Effective	1 ext hould						

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instructo	or	Ribet		Course_	math	85		Semester _	spring 2015	
Enrolled)!		Auditing		z **			Economics	=
follov	vin	g ways: (1) f	vill be helpful for use by the for use by the	instructo	or (after g	rades ha	ematics i	in one or turned in	more of the) in improving	59/
	yοι	_	th the limitation that the series that the ser		•		•	matter and	d course, how woul	d
r		at all	_		moderate effective			2	extremely effective	
ŀ	boa	ardwork, exa		, willingr	ess to ans	swer que	estions, a	ittitude to	lectures, content, ward students, offic	е
			-				±,,		*	
			structor's wea						his/her teaching?	
24		×			2	5	<			
			T							
4. F	Ple	ease rate the	overall cours	e on a s	cale of 1 to	o 7:	_			
n		⊅ at all	12 1	C\$ 1		-	(5)	16 3	⊄⊐ extremely effective	

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruct	tor K.A. ri	bet	Course	Math 55	5	Semester	pring 2015.
Enrolle	d		Auditing _	g/41		Your Major	trath
follo	ese evaluations owing ways: (1) re teaching; (2)	for use by tl	he instructor	(after grades	s have been	turned in) in	
11 <u>#</u>	Considering bo					natter and co	urse, how would
	not at all	2 1	(3 1	本 moderately effective	:5 1		extremely effective
2.	What are the inboardwork, exhaurs, homework	amples, clar	ity, willingne				ures, content, d students, office
		E	inganization	of letture	and very	clarity	2
: 3		to.			u _{la}	٠	8 ⁸
3.	What are the in	nstructor's v	veaknesses'	? How could t	he instructor	improve his/	her teaching?
					g		
						29	
4.	Please rate the	e overall cou	<i>irse</i> on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:			92
	¤⊐ not at all	12 1	(3)	्रक moderately effective	15 0	ц£р	extremely effective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

			12,10					•		
Instruct	or <u>Ken</u>	neth	Riber	Course	Mouth	.55	Seme	ster <u></u>	Pring '	2015
Enrolled				Auditing _		8 5			J	7
follo	wing wa	ys: (1)	for use by t	ful to the De he instructor the students	r (after gr	ades have b	oeen turne	d in) in		
				ations and pend pend pendent p				r and co	ourse, h	ow would
	¤⊐ not at all		-2 2	Ľ 3 CI	moderate effective	•		⊑6 □	1	remely ective
2.	boardw	ork, exa		strengths? (i. rity, willingne grading).			_	100		
	Conte	nt, e	xaples,	clarity,	avail bi	lity, ve	ny prisi	tive.	alit	rele.
634						ů,			14	W
3.	What ar	e the ir	nstructor's v	veaknesses'	? How co	uld the instr	uctor impi	ove his	/her tea	ching?
: च	a bit	too ha	rd exa	ms	٥					
						_				Si Si
4.	Please	rate the	overall cou	urse on a sc	ale of 1 to	7:			-	
	⊄⊐ not at all		(2)	-3 11	moderate	ூ ly		E G D	exti	remely

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

effective

effective

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

	17	12-1-1		1/10/	CC		Sal	110
Instruc	ctor <u>Kenneth</u>	Kibel	Course/	man	_>>	Semester _	JUNY -	10CZ
Enrolle	ed be		Auditing _	E2:		Your Major	$-S_{\ell}$: USGI
	ese evaluations w							
foll fut	owing ways: (1) foure teaching; (2) fo	or use by the or use by the	instructor students	in selecting co	nave bee ourses and	n turned in I instructor) in improv s.	ing
1. [Considering both you rate the ove					matter and	d course, h	now would
	not at all	2	[3]	ঞ্চ moderately effective	(\$)	ជ ្ញិរៈ	ext	remely fective
2.	What are the ins	noles, clarity	, willingne	ss to answer o	uestions.	attitude to	ward stude	ents, office
	hours, homewor Preparate Physical Market What are the ins	rk, exams, gr	ading). MG 2	iemals.			3	
	Phlyene	in	exp	lang.	cohvo l	red	620	27/3
a or or	WHelp	hlos,	14 91	fice he	WY.			
3.	What are the ins	structor's we	aknesseš1	? How could th	e instructo	or improve	his/her tea	aching?
	$ND_{\cdot \cdot}$							
12	Too he	ent ex	yns					
4.	Please rate the	overall cours	ea on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:			/	
4.		overali cours	G3⊡	αle Ol 1 tO 7.	15 0	26 0		- /
	not at all			moderately effective	-			tremely fective
	_							

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.
Mod Much

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

	IEAGH	IIAQ ILAY	LUATION	SOITVE	Oldin		
Instruc	for Whats K. Ribet	Course	MONY	55	Semester 5	pring	2015
Enrolle	dX	_ Auditing _			Your Major <u>A</u>	pplied	mit
follo	se evaluations will be helpful wing ways: (1) for use by the re teaching; (2) for use by the	to the Der	partment of No. (after grade	Mathematics s have bee	s in one or mo n turned in) in	re of the	× 7 2
1.	Considering both the limitation you rate the overall teaching not at all				matter and co	extreme	ely)
2.	What are the instructor's str boardwork, examples, clarit hours, homework, exams, g His lettels	y, willingne	ss to answe	r questions,	attitude towar	d students,	office
		000,2	0.00		V		
	fair.			W.,	24		
S-10						* ×	
3 .	What are the instructor's we may be the correction of the correcti	eaknesses? SNE (N to	Pow could	the instructors YMMY EMMY	or improve his PUS CF	/her teachir	ig? :/i </td
		£					
4.	Please rate the overall cour	se on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:				
	not at all	(3)	moderately effective		± 6 0	extreme effectiv	•
5.	Comments on any other releimproved, advice to people	evant aspe	cts of the co	urse such a	is content, tex	t, how it cou	ıld be
	Val di	$\sim \Lambda$	<u> </u>	A ((1)		

Continue on back, if needed.

© SCANTHON CORPORATION 2005 IM7 4205 515 5 4 3 2

c‡a

not at all

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

	tor Ken Riber	_ Course	Math	85	Semester _	Spring 20 (og Sci	7/5
follo	se evaluations will be helpful owing ways: (1) for use by the re teaching; (2) for use by the	to the Dep	partment of (after grad	Mathematics es have bee	s in one or r n turned in)	more of the) in improving	8
1.	Considering both the limitati you rate the overall teaching		ess of this		matter and	d course, how w	ould
	not at all	[3]	moderately effective	(\$ 1)	□ 6 ;1	extremely effective	ic T
2.	What are the instructor's structor's structo	y, willingne: rading).	ss to answe		attitude tov		
	NAME - 4 - m - 45 - im - 4m - 4m - 4m - 2m - 4m - 4m - 4m - 4	olen a a a a a a a) Llour souls	l the inetwest	or improve	hia/har tagahing	.O
3.	What are the instructor's we		HOW COUIC	rtne instructi	or improve	nis/ner teaching	[
4.	Please rate the overall cours	se on a sca	ale of 1 to 7	:			

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

40

moderately

effective

[5]

163

But enr!

C33

2

extremely

effective

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruct	or <u>Ken</u> A	ibet	Course	math 55		Semester	Spnng 2015
Enrolled	d yes		Auditing _	0.2		Your Major _	Spring 2015 Cognitive Scie
The	se evaluations wing ways: (1) re teaching; (2)	will be helpful for use by the	to the Dep	artment of Mat (after grades h	hematics ave been	in one or mo	ore of the
11a	Considering bo you rate the ov					matter and o	course, how would
	rp not at all	1	3 1	本 moderately effective	(\$)	⊑§ ⊒	extremely effective
2 .	hours, homewo	amples, clarity ork, exams, g	y, willingnes rading).	ss to answer qu	uestions, a	attitude towa	ard students, office
Q (III	veny great teachin Excellent	at respo g style t teacher	nding t	students'	n and need for n	l adap 1s.	oting his
3.	What are the ir	estructor's we	aknesses?	How could the	instructo	r improve hi	s/her teaching?
0							
÷	15			a · · · · · · ·			
						72	
4.	Please rate the	e overall cours	se on a sca	le of 1 to 7:			
	ு not at all	堂	C\$1	本 moderately effective	(5)	m 6 0	extremely effective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be 5. improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

					_, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	110,						
Instruct	or _	Ken	Ribet			Cours	se _	Math 55		Semester _	Spring	2015
Enrolle	d		0			Audit	ing	<u> 3</u> .11		Your Major	math,	physics
follo	wing	way	/s: (1)	for use	by the	instru	ıcto	partment of Ma r (after grades l s in selecting co	have beer	n turned in)	in imp	
1.			-				_	ossibilities of th		matter and	course	e, how would
	ct not a			□2 3		:3 :1		moderately effective	(5)	□6 0	(extremely effective
2.	boa	rdwo	rk, exa	amples		, willir	ngne	.e. preparation a ess to answer q				
		Clari	'by and	good	atts tode	: hrwa	rd	students.				
		Fast	to res	spond g	questions	ארס	Piaz	La .		12/		
68°				• 60					10		-	3 ¹
3.	Wha	at are		nstruct	or's wea	aknes	ses	? How could the	e instructo	or improve I	nis/her	teaching?
24								X				
					3							
4.	Plea	ase r	ate the	overa	all cours	se on a	a sc	cale of 1 to 7:				
	ा not a			- 2		(3)		moderately effective	5 0	16 3	(extremely effective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be 5. improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

I think the midderms onese too easy, we should have some bonus questions!

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruct	tor Ribet		Course	Moth 55	Se	emester	Spring 15
Enrolle	d Yes.		Auditing	No.	Yo	our Major	Mathematics/Phy
follo	owing ways: (1 re teaching; (2 Considering b) for use b !) for use b ooth the lin	elpful to the De y the instructor by the students nitations and p	partment of Ma (after grades in selecting co	thematics in have been to urses and in he subject ma	one or mo urned in) in structors.	re of the
	cta not at all	· 2 1	c 3 3	如 moderately effective	(5)	⊑6 ⊒ ∴	extremely effective
2.	boardwork, ex	xamples, c vork, exam	clarity, willingners, grading).	e. preparation ess to answer of the is a go	uestions, att	itude towa	rd students, office
		J. 0	•				
7 00		8			500	ž.	д ⁶ ж
3.	What are the	instructor'	s weaknesses	? How could th	e instructor i	mprove his	her teaching?
	None						
-	9			z **	s	12	
	19						e e
4.	Please rate th	ne overall	course on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:			
	not at all	12 1	(3)	moderately effective	45 0	16 3	extremely effective
5.		•	r relevant aspe ople who have		se such as c	ontent, tex	t, how it could be

Text - not great, too no-dy, Contant - not focused enough for my liking, but cool topics

University of California, Berkeley

		TEACH	ING EVA	LUATION	SURVEY F	ORM C	pring 201
Instructo	or Ken K	ibet	_ Course _	Math	55	Semester #	exa
Enrolled		5	Auditing	ho		Your Major <u></u>	og sci
follo	se evaluations wing ways: (1) re teaching; (2)) for use by the	e instructo	r (after grade	s have been	turned in) in	e of the improving
	Considering by					matter and co	urse, how would
	□□ not at all	±2a	3 1	क moderately effective	5	. □6 □	extremely effective
2.	What are the boardwork, exhours, homew	kamples, clarit	ty, willingno	.e. preparatio ess to answer	n and organ questions, a	ization of lecto attitude toward	ures, content, d students, office
		Ve	7	clear	and	Conc	(50
n/ =							*
3 .	What are the	instructor's we	eaknesses	? How could	the instructo	r improve his/	her teaching?
	¥	Pa	NC	y a			
			185			p	
4.	Please rate th	ne overall coul	rse on a so	cale of 1 to 7:			
	മ not at all	1	C3 33	moderately effective	(5)	ශ්ව	extremely effective
5.	Comments or improved, adv	-				s content, text	, how it could be
		Stud	. J	hard 1			

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instructor	Ribet	Course	Mah	5 \$	Semester Spring 2015
Enrolled _	Yis	_ Auditing	NA	.=	Your Major Cogsci

These evaluations will be helpful to the Department of Mathematics in one or more of the following ways: (1) for use by the instructor (after grades have been turned in) in improving future teaching; (2) for use by the students in selecting courses and instructors.

1. Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor?

rd⊐ not at all **3**

extremely

2. What are the instructor's strengths? (i.e. preparation and organization of lectures, content, boardwork, examples, clarity, willingness to answer questions, attitude toward students, office hours, homework, exams, grading).

Good spraker, carring, wiso, etc.

3. What are the instructor's weaknesses? How could the instructor improve his/her teaching?

NA

4. Please rate the overall *course* on a scale of 1 to 7:

not at all

moderately effective

C**5**D

(nga)

extremely effective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

more multi-modil presontation of material could be useful

University of California, Berkeley

Instruct	tor Kenneth	Ribet	Course	Math	55	Semester _	Spring	2015
Enrolle	d		_ Auditing _			Your Major	-Moth	, Physic
follo	se evaluations wing ways: (1) re teaching; (2)	for use by the	e instructor	(after grad	es have be	en turned in) in improvir	
1.	Considering bo				•	ct matter and	d course, ho	w would
	not at all	⊈ 2	:3 1	¤চ moderately effective	(5)	_. 16 0	1	emely ctive
2.	What are the in boardwork, example to hours, homework,	amples, clarit ork, exams, g	y, willingne rading).	ss to answe	er question	s, attitude to	ward studer	nts, office
	content, Compel	examples,	attil	ide, V	ery L	spirity, it	teresting	1 and
y e	Compe	lling, off	ers i	hsight	10 2	vesting		* 8
3.	What are the in	nstructor's we	eaknesses?	? How could	the instruc	ctor improve	his/her tead	ching?
	write	down	wolfe	of w	hat y	ion say	y to	improve
			2					
4.	Please rate the	e overall cour	se on a sca	ale of 1 to 7	;			
	ा not at all	12 1	(3)	rato moderately effective	5	යුත	extre	emely active
5.	Comments on improved, advi	ice to people	who have t	to take it. et	C.			
	put 5	minute	breaks	more	tonords	The n	idpoint	of
	The	minute ecture	to ha	ke the	m ho	re effe	edite	

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	tor <u>Le</u>	n Ribe	et	Course _	Mean 55		Gemester Sp	ing 15
	ed	-		Auditing	Χ	\	′our Major <u>App</u>	ing 15 Hed Moon & E
follo	owing v	iluations vays: (1	s will be he) for use b	elpful to the De y the instructo	epartment of Ma or (after grades s in selecting co	athematics in have been	n one or more turned in) in i	e of the
. 1.		_			oossibilities of the	-	natter and co	urse, how would
	not at a		2	द्धा	্ৰেচ moderately effective	15 31	□6 □	extremely effective
2 .	board	work, ex	kamples, d		i.e. preparation ess to answer o	_		ires, content, I students, office
		Excelle	nt all cr	ound. Besi	= Professor	- I've h	ed.	
						8.97	,	72 ×
3.	What	are the	instructor'	s weaknesses	? How could th	ne instructor	improve his/l	ner teaching?
		None.						
2					8			
4.	Pleas	e rate th	e overall	course on a so	cale of 1 to 7:			
	ा not at a	ill	12 3	C3 3	moderately effective	த	15 3	extremely effective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

Great course, great insumcitor.

University of California, Berkeley

	0: 1-		. /	I		C	í-
Instruc	ctor Kibet		Course Ma	th 55	Se	emester Sp	12
Enrolle	ed		Auditing	10.0	Yo	our Major 🙏	plied Math
foll	ese evaluations owing ways: (1) ure teaching; (2	for use by the	instructor (at	fter grades h	ave been to	urned in) in i	
1. !!	_	oth the limitation	7.			atter and cou	urse, how would
	ದಾ not at all	C23	c3:1	व्या oderately effective	(\$)	_ = 6 =	extremely effective
2.	boardwork, ex	nstructor's stre amples, clarity ork, exams, gr	, willingness	to answer qu	estions, att	itude toward	students, office
	hours, homew He's clear simplify	rombias	na Aubi	orto por	ovideo	Plent	j examples
ist.	He's als	o very	аррлоа	chable	. & Fri	endly	
3.	What are the	150K					
	Focus r	nore, or	n topic	o like	2 reci	meno 2 like	in lecture ce relation graphs. Ik
4	,	0 0	/	Ų.			
4.	Please rate th	e overall cours	se on a scale	orito 7.	15 50	E 15 0	6
	not at all	-	m	oderately effective			extremely effective
5.	Comments on improved, adv	any other rele	evant aspects who have to t	of the course ake it, etc.	e such as o	content, text,	how it could be
	This c	liked lavor de	the consumit en	uroe k onclude igt mat	e caw e in a	e nice i	Ribet. unifying, to learn, all
	L I n.	more di	J ~ 91	reat jo	b pres	enting	all
	Out Pu	DEL M		1		Continue	on back if needed

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

						— 1 (11)	
Instruct	tor Ken	Riber	Course	Morh 55		Semester Spr.	m 2015
Enrolle			Auditing _	# ts		Your Major/	Norh
follo	owing way re teachin	tions will be heles: (1) for use by	the instructor y the students	(after grades in selecting o	s have been courses and	turned in) in ir instructors.	
		the overall teac	-			⊑6 ⊒	extremely effective
2.	boardwork hours, ho	mework, exam	larity, willingne s, grading).	ss to answer	questions, a	attitude toward	res, content, students, office
Ş*							5
	^	the instructor's			he instructo	r improve his/h	er teaching?
4.	Please ra	ate the overall o	course on a sca	ale of 1 to 7:			8
	ri⊐ not at all	1	C3 3	moderately effective	(5)	□\$ □	extremely effective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

Instruct	tor	K Ribet	0	_ Course	Math 55		SemesterS	oring 2015-
Enrolle	d	/		Auditing _	4.6		Your Major	Mathematics
follo	wing	g ways: (1)	for use by the	instructor	partment of Ma (after grades l in selecting co	have been	turned in) in	
1.		_		•	ossibilities of th	•	natter and co	ourse, how would
		t⊐ at all	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	133	ন্দ্র moderately effective	(\$)	∟6 3	extremely effective
2.	boa	ardwork, exa		y, willingne	e. preparation a ss to answer q	_		ures, content, d students, office
	The	re are many a	great qualities	that he has,	he is well organ	ilzed, hie	is very able t	to answer question
			office hours					-
		,	23	= '		691		74. →
E14								
3.					P How could the	·		-
6	W\ €	ss y and in coh	nevent.		2	£		
							A2	
4.	Ple	ase rate the	e overall <i>cour</i> s	se on a sca	ale of 1 to 7:			
	not a		12 1	C 3 3	moderately	5 0	□6 □	extremely effective

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Insti		or <u>Ken R</u>	ibet	Course _	Math 55			oring 15 catistics	
T fo	he:	se evaluatio wing ways:	(1) for use by	lpful to the Dy the instructe	epartment of Ma or (after grades is in selecting co	athematics in have been t	n one or mo turned in) in	e of the	
1	ě				possibilities of t		natter and co	ourse, how would	
		血 not at all	2 2	3 1	त्रः moderately effective	(5)	16 3	extremely effective	
2	<u>.</u>	boardwork, hours, hom	examples, on ework, examples, on the example examples, on the example examples, on the example example example.	larity, willingr s. grading).		questions, a	ttitude towar	ures, content, d students, office	red
; o		attentive for man What are th	to the ne y student	eds of the to the maj s weaknesse	ed lecture ne class, who wity of inform s? How could the Ribet is the	nation in ine instructor	this class	is all new ; /her teaching?	
	ğ	made	me w	sant to	take m Berkeley	ove clas			
							F		
4	١.	Please rate	the overall	course on a s	scale of 1 to 7:				
		not at all	2 2	(3)	্ৰে moderately effective	5	15 1	extremely effective	
5	j.	improved, a	advice to peo	ple who have	e to take it, etc.			t, how it could be	
		Ad	vice: 60) through	in concep	to fair	ly quick	ly (not	
		90	ist-pac	ed as v	ruch as	an c	mer Vien	ofa	
		Lo	Topa	ncepts)	so stay	on top o	f mat	erial	
			eek to n					ie on back, if need	led.

Continue on back, if needed.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	tor <u>Kenn</u>	eth R	ibet Course	Math 5	3	Semester	ping 201
Enrolle	ed <u>ye</u>	5	Auditing	No.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Your Major	Cognitive Sci
follo	owing ways:	(1) for use	elpful to the Doby the instructory by the student	or (after grad	Mathematics es have beer	in one or mor turned in) in	e of the
1.	_	•	mitations and aching effective		•	matter and co	urse, how would
	ा not at all	C <u>2</u> 2	E 3 31	ra⊐ moderately effective	:5 1	≣§ ⊒ ∷	extremely effective
2.	boardwork,	examples,	r's strengths? (clarity, willingr ms, grading).				ures, content, d students, office
	Ribe	1 13 0	rganizea	amal	prepa	red.	
	He's	great!			© =	ε .	. =
3.	What are th	e instructo	r's weaknesse	s? How could	the instructo	r improve his/	her teaching?
24	No	comple	unts!	. *	18		
			9			w :	
4.	Please rate	the overall	course on a s	cale of 1 to 7			
	⊏⊐ not at all	2 21	(30	ra⊐ moderately effective	15 1	C(G)	extremely effective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

_

5.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	tor <u>9.6e</u>	>	Course	XX + 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1-		Semester	
Enrolle	ed		_ Auditing _	XH		Your Major <u></u>	math
follo	owing ways: (1)	for use by the	instructor	partment of Math (after grades had in selecting cou	ave been	turned in) i	in improving
1.	_		-	ossibilities of the less of this instru	_	matter and	course, how would
	中 not at all	12 1	43 0	ক্র moderately effective	(5)	⊑6 ⊐ :	extremely effective
2.	boardwork, exa hours, homewo	amples, clarit ork, exams, g	y, willingne rading).	e. preparation a ss to answer qu ℓ ʎ ੀ ਆ	estions, a		ctures, content, ard students, office
ş =					5		e e
3.	What are the ir	nstructor's we	aknesses?	P How could the	instructo	r improve h	is/her teaching?
::	pick	la',	M-1	W- F	L	ctur	52
						<i>3</i> *	
4.	Please rate the	e overall cour	se on a sca	ale of 1 to 7:			
	not at all	12 0	C 3 31	മാ moderately effective	5 1	16 3	extremely effective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

Continue on back, if needed.

University of California, Berkeley

Instruct	or Kenneth	Ribet	Course _	Math SS	Sem-	ester <u> </u>	oraly 2015
Enrolle	~ /		Auditing				Mosh / Physics
follo	wing ways: (1) for use by	the instructo	epartment of Mat r (after grades h s in selecting cou	hematics in or nave been turr	ne or more ned in) in i	e of the
1.				ossibilities of the ness of this instr		er and coเ	urse, how would
	ct⊒ not at all	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	:3 :1	本 moderately effective	(\$)	□6 □	extremely effective
2.	What are the boardwork, exhours, homew	xamples, cla	arity, willingn	i.e. preparation a ess to answer qu	and organizatio uestions, attitu	on of lectu de toward	ires, content, I students, office
3.	Captura: Very len	thy, ento	hapastre, l	restant Pover restant or truly shows in ? How could the	tside leater	of me	Scarses etc.)
27	No	he.		55 '*	*		
			n			á.	
4.	Please rate th	ne overall c	ourse on a so	cale of 1 to 7:			
	্ৰা not at all	-2 1	C3 3	क moderately effective	್	□\$ 0	extremely effective
5.				ects of the cours to take it, etc.	se such as cor	itent, text,	how it could be
	R.b	of 13 en	amazhy	protessor, best	I've eve	- had	
	Angon	ento has	s de dala	ss should o	below 12 wis	2 Lh, x	er 5 mg

ANTRON CUSTOM FORM NO. F-19933-UCB

© SCANTHON CORPORATION 2005 IM7 4205 515 5 4 3 2

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

University of California, Berkeley

Instruc	ctor <u>Ken</u>	Ribe	,	Course	Math	55	Seme	ster <u>5</u>	prma	2015
Enrolle	ed			Auditing		474	Your N	Major/	Applied	Mati
follo	owing way	s: (1) fo	r use by tl	he instructo	or (after gr	ades have	matics in on been turne s and instru	ed in) in		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1.		-		ations and p			ubject matte or?	r and c	ourse, hov	/ would
	rot at all	C)	-	Ľ 31	ष्क moderate effective	ely	:5 1	16 1	extren effect	
2.	boardwor	k, exam	iples, clar exams.	rity, willingn aradina).	ess to ans	wer quest	organizatio tions, attitud	de towa	rd student	s, office
	Notes	on b	poard	and po	ice of	lectu	re rea	illy	helped	me
	unders	Hand	•	•				9.5		
2			76				W. C.	5		3" "
3.	What are	the inst	ructor's w	veaknesses	s? How co	uld the ins	structor imp	rove his	s/her teach	ing?
			_							
10						8				
				*			12			
4.	Please ra	ite the o	verall cou	<i>urse</i> on a s	cale of 1 to	o 7:				~
	rp not at all	C,	20	C3 11	ra⊐ moderate effective	ely	:5 1	(151)	extren effect	nely
5.			•	elevant asp e who have			uch as cont	ent, tex	t, how it co	ould be
	would talked	love	it if	some	More	COM	puting	idea	is we	e

University of California, Berkeley

	TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM										
Instruct	tor Ken	Ribet									
Enrolle	d Yes		_ Auditing _	No		Your Major	applied	Math			
The follo	se evaluation wing ways: (re teaching; (ns will be helpful 1) for use by the (2) for use by the both the limitati	to the Dep instructor students	partment of N (after grade in selecting o	lathematics s have bee courses and	s in one or mor in turned in) in d instructors.	e of the improving	2.			
h	_	overall teaching				industrial of					
	ದ್ದಾ not at all	2 3	3 0	moderately effective	(5)	□\$ □	extrem effective	- 1			
2. 3.	boardwork, hours, home - Prepared - Organized - Clear B - Excelle What are the Never how	e instructor's strexamples, clarity ework, exams, g courtwork at examples e instructor's we explained many prior	y, willingne rading). - Club - Alwi - Trul - Help eaknesses? or m	ss to answer	to answer for 5th hours the instruct	er questions tudents or improve his/	t students - fair and ther teachi	homevor homevor exams			
4.	Please rate	the overall <i>cour</i>	se on a sca	ale of 1 to 7:				15			
	ு not at all	:2 1	(3)	本 moderately effective	5 5	(IS)	extrem effecti				
5.	improved, a	on any other rele dvice to people	who have t	to take it, etc			6	1 (
	Best	Math	Prof	essor	I	Ever	Hao	(!			
		Than	e Yo	u, Ri	bet!						

University of California, Berkeley

Instruct	or <u>Kenneth</u>	Ribet	Course	MATH 5S.		Semester	SPRING 15				
Enrolled	· ·	,		16. M.		Your Major	FCON				
follo	These evaluations will be helpful to the Department of Mathematics in one or more of the following ways: (1) for use by the instructor (after grades have been turned in) in improving future teaching; (2) for use by the students in selecting courses and instructors.										
1.	Considering bo	oth the limitation	ons and pos	ssibilities of the	subject	matter and co	ourse, how would				
	rot at all	2 2	C 3 T	ঞ moderately effective	:5 :	□6 □	extremely effective				
2.	hours, homewo	amples, clarity ork, exams, gr	, willingnes ading).	. preparation at s to answer qu	nd organ estions, a	ization of lect attitude towar	tures, content, rd students, office				
	- v. clear an	d organized h	lecture	on to awwer t	questone						
16	- encourages 1 - encourages 1	tudent particil	position the			ž:					
m rē	THE DEST	000000			9.8		:E:				
3.	What are the i	nstructor's we	aknesses?	How could the	instructo	r improve his	/her teaching?				
	MIA			19							
	14				ű.						
			El .			y					
							ii ii				
4.	Please rate the	e overall <i>cour</i> s	se on a scal	e of 1 to /:							
	not at all	12 1	(3)	moderately effective	(5)	16 3	extremely effective				
5.	Comments on improved, advi	•	-		e such as	s content, tex	t, how it could be				
	- same sort of for exam pr	skeletal sub to uparation - inot	homework	problems (after already have	turning it	in), would be	well				

University of California, Berkeley

Instruc	tor Rifet		Course	Math 55	Se	emester <u></u>	ering 2015
Enrolle	. /		Auditing	102	Yo	our Major <u><i>Ma</i></u>	th & CS
follo	owing ways: (1) for use b	y the instructor	partment of Ma r (after grades l in selecting co	nave been t	urned in) in i	e of the mproving
1.				ossibilities of th ness of this inst		atter and cou	ırse, how would
	not at all	(2)	ু ্র		:5 3	16 3	extremely effective
2.	boardwork, e hours, home	examples, o work, exan	clarity, willingnens, grading).	e. preparation asset to answer quantity and of Breakfa	uestions, at	titude toward	students, office
g-							20
3.	What are the	e instructor	's weaknesses	? How could the	e instructor i	improve his/l	ner teaching?
50				a			
			e v				
4.	Please rate	the overall	course on a so	eale of 1 to 7:			
	ம் not at all	:2 1	C3 3	四 moderately effective	(5)	16 3	extremely effective
5.	improved, ad	dvice to pe	ople who have	to take it, etc.			how it could be
	I hope	you p	ind these	evaluation	helpfu	il, even	of they
	user 41	=			200	,	

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instructor Dr. Ribet	Course	Math 55		Semester <u></u> 9	pring 2015
Enrolled	Auditing			Your Major <u></u> උට	gnttive science
 These evaluations will be helpful following ways: (1) for use by the future teaching; (2) for use by the Considering both the limitating you rate the overall teaching 	e instructor e students ions and p	r (after grades in selecting co ossibilities of th	have been urses and ne subject r	turned in) in in instructors.	nproving
not at all		ক্ষ moderately effective	5 3	16 1	æ∕ extremely effective
2. What are the instructor's str boardwork, examples, clarit hours, homework, exams, gov. Ribet is extremely cle that really allowed we to major (cognitive scrence), the course because I the content required meto the with a different possible. 3. What are the instructor's we	y, willingnerading). ar in elements underst , i was nought the unk, pr. erspective	ess to answer of and the mate a bit he sitar a content which the content which the content than a content than	luestions, and conditions and conditions was and conditions are conditions and conditions and conditions are conditional conditional conditions are conditional conditions are conditional	attitude toward and provid and provid nervous goir aitticutt. at the view i	students, office estamples ed math ng into the While the math ess, math to me
**************************************		3		eren	creatik and innovatik nent. Thank Yun, professor Ribet
4. Please rate the overall cour	se on a so	ale of 1 to 7:			
्रा not at all	C 3 33	moderately effective	15 1	OĞO	⊈∕ extremely effective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

CANTRON CUSTOM FORM NO. F-19933

ANTHON CORPORATION 2005 IM7 4205 515 5 4 3 2

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

University of California, Berkeley

Instruct	tor <u>Ken</u>	Ribet	Course _	Math 55		Semester	Sp.2015
Enrolle	d yea	, 2 1	Auditing	(8.4)	`	Your Major	Math/Physics
follo	wing ways:	(1) for use by	y the instructo	partment of Mat r (after grades h in selecting cou	nave been	turned in) ir	
1.				ossibilities of the		natter and c	ourse, how would
	rp not at all	12 3	(3)	অন moderately effective	15 11	c \$ D	extremely effective
2.	boardwork, hours, hom are helpful willingness	examples, cework, examples, and hand frien host	larity, willingners, grading). Le explains dy in a		uestions, a et is a . He as well	ttitude towa wesome ! is inco	ird students, office His lectores edibly
3.		unpavallele ne instructor's		? How could the	instructor	improve his	s/her teaching?
	Hard +	o read	his boold	work at	Field	s, but	
n	he alu	vays cla	vities.	2 7			
			19			140	
4.	Please rate	the overall	course on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:			
	riot at all	22	(3)	moderately effective	(5)	(161)	extremely effective
5.		•	relevant aspe ple who have		se such as	content, tex	t, how it could be
	The hou	nemorks s	eemed to	lag behind	ledures	guizes	which
	W46 0	od 1 the	ought.	lag behind		•	

University of California, Berkeley

	IEACH	INGEVA	MONION 30	KAFII	FOINI		
Instruct	tor Ken. Ribet	Course	Math	55	Semester	Sp 11	5
Enrolle			504				
follo futu	ese evaluations will be helpfu owing ways: (1) for use by the re teaching; (2) for use by the Considering both the limitat	I to the Dependents I to the Dependents I to the	partment of Matl (after grades h in selecting cou	hematics ave beer	s in one or mor n turned in) in I instructors.	e of the improving	8
5	you rate the overall teaching	g effectiver		uctor?			
	not at all	113 11	moderately effective	(5)	□	extremely)
2.	What are the instructor's str boardwork, examples, clarit hours, homework, exams, g	y, willingne rading).	ss to answer qu	estions,	attitude toward	d students, o	office
	too fort.	lon L	on ver	900	ropion be	pue.	ney
U.	for the	amou	n F A	-	material	, we	reel
3.	Sometimes	earnesses he	r How could trie	pretty	> d	her teaching	? Shine
	Also some	Amer	condes	cenda	J		
4.	Please rate the overall cour	se on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:		α		ħ.
	not at all	C 3 31	কে moderately effective	(5)	(fs)	extremely effective	,
5.	Comments on any other relimproved, advice to people			e such a	s content, text	, how it could	d be
	(3	/	// 600		(04)	1	

SCANTRON CUSTOM FORM NO. F-19833-UCB SCANTRON CORPORATION 2005 IM7 4205 51

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

University of California, Berkeley

Instruct	or <u>Kennetl</u>	n Ribet	Course	Math 55	5	Semester _	Spring	2015
Enrolle	d		Auditing _	0.6		Your Major	Cognition	re Saie
follo	se evaluations wing ways: (1) for teaching; (2) for	r use by the	to the Dep	artment of Mat (after grades h	hematics ave been	in one or r turned in)	nore of the in improving	6
1	Considering both you rate the ove		•		•	matter and	course, how	v would
	not at all	2 1	13 0	ক্র moderately effective	(5)	□ 6 □	extren	- /
2.	What are the ins boardwork, exam hours, homewor	nples, clarity	, willingne		_			
	Passion of pr	or lectures	uring, His le	cares abou ectures. Al	t stur	dents, willio	very int	erestin
46	answert qu	estions.	· Mo	ST AM	AZI	NG	PROF	ESSO
3.	What are the ins	tructor's we	aknesses?	How could the	Α			ning?
,	Towards the	end, I	stopped	understar	nding	a la	_	
	of the con	ntent ma	tenal	. \$ the unrelated	homeu	verks		
33			max c	unrelated	to lea	rure		
	at time	۵				8		
4.	Please rate the	overall cours	se on a sca	lle of 1 to 7:				
	not at all	2 1	C3 31	moderately effective	15 1	[6]	extrer effect	
5.	Comments on ar	e to people v	who have t	o take it, etc.	e such as	content, t	ext, how it co	ould be
	Well, I d	on 4 get)	13 04	the			
	Comze con	Henry	jet. t	Sut Ribe	t is	0		
	great p	rofessor	< 9					

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM											
Instructor Ribet Ken	Course Math 55	Semester Ea Spring 2015									
Enrolled Yes	Auditing No	Your Major Math									
These evaluations will be helpful following ways: (1) for use by the future teaching; (2) for use by the	These evaluations will be helpful to the Department of Mathematics in one or more of the following ways: (1) for use by the instructor (after grades have been turned in) in improving future teaching; (2) for use by the students in selecting courses and instructors. 1. Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would										
Ÿ	tions and possibilities of the subject g effectiveness of this instructor?	ct matter and course, now would									
rd⊐ r2⊒ not at all	্রের হো moderately effective	extremely effective									
boardwork, examples, clarithours, homework, exams, of well prepared, very answer ALL quest hates a point to get (especially in such a la some days lecture they were great	organized. Clear lect of those, Great attitude, to know every student of class). I loved this classes the could the instruct of were a little slow, the classes the classes the slow, the classes were a little slow, the classes the could be instructed to the classes the could be instructed to the classes the could be a little slow, the classes the could be compared to the classes the could be compared to the could be could be compared to the could be compare	tures, leng alling to students, office tures, leng alling to very Ertendly to student, which means a lot sand loved Ribet!!!									
4. Please rate the overall coul	rse on a scale of 1 to 7:										
not at all	c30 c40 c50 moderately effective	extremely effective									
5. Comments on any other relimproved, advice to people I loved learning at Subjects. It was I loved this clathank you!	levant aspects of the course such who have to take it, etc. What the content of the son and interest is !	as content, text, how it could be source. Great variety ing !!! Continue on back, if neede									

SCANTRON CUSTOM FORM NO. F-19933-UCB © SCANTRON CORPORATION 2005 IM7 4205 515 5 4 3 2 wm

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

University of California, Berkeley

Instructor K. Righet Course M. 55 Semester SP 15
Enrolled Auditing Your Major
These evaluations will be helpful to the Department of Mathematics in one or more of the following ways: (1) for use by the instructor (after grades have been turned in) in improving future teaching; (2) for use by the students in selecting courses and instructors.
1. Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor? not at all moderately effective at the subject matter and course, how would instructor? extremely effective
2. What are the instructor's strengths? (i.e. preparation and organization of lectures, content, boardwork, examples, clarity, willingness to answer questions, attitude toward students, office hours, homework, exams, grading). Extractly and lefteshing lecture. Would like to take more classes w/
3. What are the instructor's weaknesses? How could the instructor improve his/her teaching?
Increased transparency of MT grading, not really sue how my 6SI (of the others) determine correctness of responses
4. Please rate the overall course on a scale of 1 to 7: not at all Please rate the overall course on a scale of 1 to 7: moderately effective Course on a scale of 1 to 7:
5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc. It would be cost to have optional coding assignments (see Project Euler a Project Euler a Project Euler a Royalind Continue on back, if needed.

5.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Ins	struct	or <u>ken</u>	Riber		Course _	Math 55	s	emester _	Spring	15
En	rolled	d <u>Yes</u>	0		Auditing	No	Y	ou r Major ₋	Cognitive	Sarrice
	foilo	wing wa	ys: (1) 1	or use by the	he instructo	partment of Ma r (after grades l s in selecting co	have been t	urned in)	in improvi	
9	1.					oossibilities of th ness of this inst moderately effective		atter and	extr	ow would emely ective
	2.	boardwo	ork, exa	mples, clar rk, exams,	ity, willingne grading).	e. preparation assists to answer q	uestions, at	titude tow	ard stude	
				00	s look sim	plet than book ololems	C. 89		0	· ·
	3.		. 1	essor overo structor's w		? How could the	instructor	improve h	nis/her tead	ching?
			- Loud	ness d v	voice when	speaking				
		-	- Clear	er witting	when wind	ting on black	eboard			
	4.	Please i	rate the	overall cou	<i>irse</i> on a so	cale of 1 to 7:				18
		ा not at all		2	C 3 31	್ರಾ moderately effective	5	185	extr	emely ective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

TAKE IT WITH RIBET!!! ><

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

Continue on back, if needed.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruct	tor <u>Ribet</u>		Course	Math 55		Semester	Spring 2015
Enrolle	d	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Auditing _	* 0	,	Your Major _	Undeclared.
follo	se evaluations wing ways: (1) re teaching; (2	for use by	y the instructor	(after grades	have been	turned in) i	n improving
1.				ossibilities of the		natter and o	course, how would
	not at all	c 2 1	(3)	本 moderately effective	.5 3	10 1.	⊄⊃ extremely effective
2.	boardwork, exhours, homew The lectures easy to und	kamples, c vork, exam are clear erstand.	larity, willingne is, grading). and flow well Always willing	e. preparation ess to answer of Examples and the conswer que	questions, a contentinclu estions and	ittitude towa	
5,100							10
3.	What are the	instructor's	s weaknesses	? How could th	ie instructoi	improve hi	s/her teaching?
	8				2		
4.	Please rate th	e overall	course on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:			旦
	্⊐ not at all	· 2 0	C 3 I	्रवा moderately effective	(5)	m 6 0	extremely effective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

Go to office hours, they are very helpful.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Enrolle The foll	owing ways	ions will be hel	Auditing pful to the Devite instructory	Partment of Ma or (after grades in selecting co	ithematics i	turned in) in i	e of the		
1.				oossibilities of the eness of this inst ab moderately effective		matter and co	urse, how would extremely effective		
2.	2. What are the instructor's strengths? (i.e. preparation and organization of lectures, content, boardwork, examples, clarity, willingness to answer questions, attitude toward students, office hours, homework, exams, grading). Willing to re-explain difficult ideal, electronic resources for lectures are good. Anores questions well, whits for questions. Kind and pacient trand								
Stu Su 3.	dents, F, white o What are	ut side the instructor's	Office by HW on 1 1 weaknesses	nours structure. ecture. s? How could th	red by st	nderf quest improve his/l	tions, 1 HHe her teaching?		
pr	oblems.	More m	and ated	structure	e for C	office ho	ample		
4.	Please ra	te the overall o	course on a s	cale of 1 to 7: moderately effective	*	o 6 3	extremely effective		

 Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

Textbook huge and unfit for course, changing textbooks would be better. Letwe note would be good, if available.

BE OK.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

University of California, Berkeley

			Ti .			
Instruc	ctor Ribet, K.	Course	MATH 55	8	Semester <u>5</u> 9	R-ING 2015
Enrolle			0.88	}	′our Major <u></u>	ATH
foll	ese evaluations will be helpful owing ways: (1) for use by the ure teaching; (2) for use by the	instructor students	(after grades h in selecting cou	nematics in ave been in rses and i	n one or mor turned in) in nstructors.	e of the improving
1.	Considering both the limitati				natter and co	urse, how would
	ा व्या not at all	[3]	হ্ব moderately effective	(\$)	Æ €±	extremely effective
2.	What are the instructor's str boardwork, examples, clarity hours, homework, exams, g COMES PREPARED,	y, willingne rading). ASS గే గ్	ess to answer qu	estions, a	ttitude toward	d students, office
40-32			2	15	*	27.5 H
3.	What are the instructor's we TEMES TO STAT	CANSIS T	ENT WITH	THE	500K BU.	TAT
	70.		a 5	2		
4.	Please rate the overall cour	se on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:			
	not at all	C\$ 3	ಡು moderately effective	5 1	r 6 0	extremely effective
5.	Comments on any other relationships to the comments of any other relationships the com	who have	to take it, etc.			

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruct	or Ken	Ribet	Course _	Meth SS		Semester	pring 2015
Enrolle	d		Auditing	1.7		our Major	
follo	wing ways	: (1) for use by	the instructory	epartment of M or (after grades s in selecting c	s have been	turned in) in i	e of the mproving
1.	Considering	ng both the lim	nitations and phing effective	oossibilities of t eness of this in	the subject n structor?	natter and co	ırse, how would
	rot at all	12 1	3 31	क moderately effective	C \$ 3	180	extremely effective
2.	boardworl hours, hou	k, examples, c mework, exam	larity, willingn s, grading).		questions, a	zation of lectu ttitude toward	ires, content, I students, office
	He	gires clear	erplanat	dly,	proofs.		
		the is	very fric	dly.		И	
		8			dS		9 8
3.		the instructor's		s? How could t	he instructor	improve his/	ner teaching?
5)				2.	27		
			e.			8	
4.	Please ra	te the overall o	course on a s	cale of 1 to 7:			2
	not at all	Ż	©	¤□ moderatelv	(5)	(163)	□ 7 □ extremely

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

effective

effective

SCANTRON CUSTOM FORM NO. F-19933-UCB

SCANTRON CORPORATION 2005 IM7 4205 515 5

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

t t	ctorRibet		Course	Moth 55		Competer Sp	ring 2015
instruc	ctor		_ Course			Selliestei	J
Enrolle	edles		_ Auditing _	is		Your Major	09 501
follo	ese evaluations owing ways: (1) ure teaching; (2)	for use by th	e instructor	(after grades h	nave beer	turned in) in i	
1.				ossibilities of the ness of this instr		matter and cou	ırse, how would
	rp⊐ not at all	c 2 :	C 3 0	ক্র moderately effective	151	i d s	extremely effective
2.	boardwork, ex	amples, clari	ty, willingne	e. preparation a			res, content, I students, office
10	hours, homewo	les clear	examples	t explanation	ş		(h
	Ver	y enthusios	stic			η α	^
		×			A _e	0	23 25
H C							
3.	What are the i	nstructor's w	eaknesses'	? How could the	instructo	r improve his/h	ner teaching?
o				e			
			A				
4.	Please rate the	e overall <i>cou</i> l	rse on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:			A
	⊄⊐ not at all	1	C3 33	本 moderately effective	(5)	0 8 a	extremely effective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	tor Ken	Ribet	Course _	Maple 5		Semester	oring 2013
Enrolle	ed	25	Auditing	,		Your Major	0a 309
follo	owing ways	: (1) for use b		r (after grades	have bee	s in one or more n turned in) in i d instructors.	
1:		-	mitations and p ching effective ⊐			matter and cou	extremely effective
2.	boardwork hours, how	k, examples, d mework, exar	clarity, willingnens, grading).	ess to answer	questions,		res, content, I students, office
							6
3.	What are	the instructor	's weaknesses	? How could tl	ne instructo	or improve his/h	ner teaching?
*	ege In	amed	re is g I impo would	reing.	to 4 Ame proof	ell wh ne exp	ere Dicit nofec.
4.			course on a so				
	not at all	□ 2□	(3)	moderately effective	(±6 ±	extremely effective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	ctor <u>ken Ril</u>	set	Course _	Math 55	Ser	nesterS _/	my 2015	_
Enrolle	ed <u>yup</u>		Auditing	, s =	You	ır Major	Dhilosopphy	
foll	owing ways: (1) for use by	the instructo	epartment of Ma r (after grades s in selecting co	have been tui	rned in) in		1/20
1.	_			oossibilities of th	•	lter and co	urse, how would	ł
	्रा not at all	C 2 3	13 3	ক moderately effective	(\$)	\$	extremely effective	
2.		kamples, cla	arity, willingn	ess to answer q	_		ures, content, d students, office	€
	All of the	above					2	
* (Z.		ā			6.	٥	् _य श श	
3.	What are the	instructor's	weaknesses	? How could the	e instructor im	prove his/	her teaching?	
	I was con	mermo a	bout a	history of a	uriting ex	ans the	at were	
				ery neasonable				
			Δ.			12		
4.	Please rate th	e overall co	ourse on a so	ale of 1 to 7:				
	्र not at all	②	C 3 33	moderately	5 0	19>	extremely	

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

Kathing

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruct	tor Kenne	eth A , Rib	et Course_	Moth 55	S	Semester <u>5</u>	PIT
Enrolle	d		Auditing	101	Y	our Maior	Math Copplied
The follo futu	se evaluation wing ways: re teaching;	ons will be he (1) for use by (2) for use b	Ipful to the De y the instructo y the students	partment of M r (after grades s in selecting o	athematics in have been courses and i	n one or more turned in) in i nstructors.	e of the mproving
1,				ness of this ins		latter and cot	ırse, how would
	ri⊐ not at all	(2)	=3 0	ಡು moderately effective	(5)	e lla	extremely effective
2.	boardwork, hours, hom	examples, conework, exam	larity, willingnos, grading).	ipul and	questions, a	ttitude toward	l students, office
a fi	wo	o his ex newer he	law is to	any qu	reutions w	m clear	<u> </u>
3.	What are th	ne instructor's	s weaknesses	? How could the	ne instructor	improve his/l	ner teaching?
e	W				÷ -9.		
			σ			Ħ	
4.	Please rate	e the overall	course on a so	cale of 1 to 7:			et.
	⊏⊐ not at all	②	C3 0	⊯ moderately	5 1	455	c z ⊐ extremely

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

effective

effective

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruct	tor Prof.	Ribet	Course	North 55		Semester _	Spring	2015
Enrolle	d Yes		Auditing	2		Your Major	IEOR	
follo	wing ways: ((1) for use I	elpful to the De by the instructo by the students	r (after grades	athematics have been	in one or n turned in)	nore of th in improv	
1.	_		mitations and p ching effective			matter and	course, l	now would
	not at all	⊉	13 0	moderately effective	(5)			r⊐ tremely fective
2.	boardwork,	examples,	r's strengths? (i clarity, willingne ns, grading).					
			\$c			17/		
p30		22. 4			В.,		7.)	a **
3.	What are th	e instructor	's weaknesses	? How could th	ne instructo	r improve l	nis/her tea	aching?
21	14			· · · · · · ·				
			9			EV		
4.	Please rate	the overall	course on a so	ale of 1 to 7:		1		
	ഥ not at all	(2)	යුා	ration moderately effective	.5 1	4		r 7 ⊐ tremely fective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instructor _	Ken Ribel	Course	Mash SS	Semester	15
Enrolled		Auditing	K0)	Your Major	:- : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :

These evaluations will be helpful to the Department of Mathematics in one or more of the following ways: (1) for use by the instructor (after grades have been turned in) in improving future teaching; (2) for use by the students in selecting courses and instructors.

Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would 1. you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor?

cia. not at all

moderately effective

Ċ extremely

What are the instructor's strengths? (i.e. preparation and organization of lectures, content, 2. boardwork, examples, clarity, willingness to answer questions, attitude toward students, office hours, homework, exams, grading).

- He is explained the comapt really well a interestry, - His OH is helpful as well - Turn break is helpful.

What are the instructor's weaknesses? How could the instructor improve his/her teaching? 3.

more practice problems dury lecture

Please rate the overall course on a scale of 1 to 7:

not at all

moderately effective

5

extremely effective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be 5. improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instructor <u>Professor Ribet</u>	Course Mat	h 55	Semester Sp	nno, 2015
Enrolled			2.	
These evaluations will be helpful following ways: (1) for use by the future teaching; (2) for use by the	to the Departme instructor (after students in sele	nt of Mathematics grades have beer cting courses and	in one or more n turned in) in im l instructors.	of the sproving
you rate the overall teaching	effectiveness of modera effect	್ತಾ ately	# @ #	⊄⊐ extremely effective
2. What are the instructor's street boardwork, examples, clarity hours, homework, exams, growth office hours, willing	y, willingness to a rading).	nswer questions,	attitude toward	students, office
я 3		9	8 9	9
3. What are the instructor's we		could the instructo	or improve his/he	er teaching?
whe out all p	roofs that v	ve need to k	"YNCW	
4. Please rate the overall cours	se on a scale of 1	to 7:		α
¤⊐ ⊈⊃ not at all	moder effect		16 1	extremely effective
	who have to take ny different		noster	now it could be

hard to fully understand I topic, before we

switch to rext one

Continue on back, if needed.

In	struct	or Kenneth	Ribet	_ Course	Math	<i>5</i> 5	Semester	Spring 2015
Ε	nrolle	d Yes	V = 22 all mose m	_ Auditing _	No		Your Major _	English & Pure M
•	follo	se evaluations wowing ways: (1) free teaching; (2) f	or use by the	e instructor	(after grad	es have bee	n turned in) i	n improving
	1.	Considering bot you rate the over					matter and	course, how would
		ri⊐ not at all	⊈ 3	13 33	can moderately effective	ජුව		extremely effective
	2.	hours, homewo	mples, clarity	y, willingne radina).	ss to answe	er questions,	attitude tow	ard students, office
		Humor, a	clarity, h	e leaves	plenty	of time	e to as	be questions, (which are
8 ⁷⁰	3.	involved hard, b	ly linear w/ the structor's we), he student y're w eaknesses?	makes ats all orth be: P How could	the con	ntent m very, ex or improve h	b questions, (which are ore interesting cams may be is/her teaching?
	8		N/A			Ti.		
				a			16 16	
	4.	Please rate the	overall cour	se on a sca	ale of 1 to 7	:		ia.
		া⊐ not at all	1 21	C3 31	moderately effective	C \$ 7		⊄⊃ extremely effective
	5.	improved, advice	e to people	who have t	to take it, et	c.		xt, how it could be
		The course than I	surprise thought	ed me I	in that would.	The mate	joyed it	more challenging while.
		at times,	but P	libet n	rade i	T	wor int	UN I CK

University of California, Berkeley

lr	nstruct	d Spring	Course	Math 55	Semester	Spring App Math
	nrolle	a opring	Auditing		Your Major	1100,000000
	follo	se evaluations will be helpful wing ways: (1) for use by the re teaching; (2) for use by the	instructor	(after grades have b	een turned in) ir	
	1.	Considering both the limitation		-		ourse, how would
		not at all	13 11	moderately effective	□	extremely effective
	2.	What are the instructor's street boardwork, examples, clarity hours, homework, exams, gr	, willingnes	s to answer question	ns, attitude towa	rd students, office
		hours, homework, exams, gi		sood attitude	, very tr	iencily,
		mar conten / VII	CINTELL	with student	J = 1	3
4 2						*
	3.	What are the instructor's we	aknesses?	How could the instru	ctor improve his	s/her teaching?
	-			E 8		
	4.	Please rate the overall cours	se on a sca	le of 1 to 7:		٠
		ආ යු not at all	C\$ 3	本 ⑤ moderately effective	∷6 ⊐	extremely effective
	5.	Comments on any other releismproved, advice to people v	-		n as content, tex	xt, how it could be
		440 0	- 0 () 0 0	10510		

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	ctor Ribet		Course	Math ST	con income i	Semester _	Spring	2015
Enrolle	ed		Auditing _	X- (Your Major	Math	No.
follo	ese evaluations owing ways: (1) ure teaching; (2) Considering boyon you rate the over	for use by the for use by the oth the limitati	e instructor e students ons and p	r (after grades in selecting co ossibilities of the	have beer ourses and ne subject	turned in) instructors	in improvin s.	
	ा⊐ not at all	12 1	[3]		(\$)	o ≅∳ 3	extre effec	mely
2.	What are the in boardwork, example to the local state of the local sta	amples, clarity	y, willingne	ess to answer o	questions,	attitude tov	vard studen	ts, office
3.	What are the in							
		/A			5)			
4.	Please rate the	e overall cours	se on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:				0
	ा not at all	12 0	©3 3	্ৰহ moderately effective	:5)	16 3	extre effec	
5.	Comments on improved, advi	•	•		rse such as	s content, t	ext, how it o	ould be

I really liked 11. Thanks.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

	_	-		V			O 111-
Instruc	tor <u>Kof</u> .	Ribet	Course	Math 55		Semester	Sp 15
Enrolle	ed		Auditing _	- 109	Y	′our Major	Econ, Math
follo	owing ways:	(1) for use b	y the instructor	partment of Ma r (after grades in selecting co	have been t	turned in) ir	
1. §				ossibilities of th		atter and o	course, how would
	्रा not at all	- 2	(3)	ঞ moderately effective	(\$)	•	extremely effective
2.	boardwork, hours, hom Very well-	examples, of ework, exam	clarity, willingners, grading).	& abt	uestions, at	ttitude towa	ard students, office
er ¹²	both th	nside & o	utside the 1	class,	*17	2	y ₂ = 41
	1.0			0.11			- // v to h i O
3.	-		s weaknesses		e instructor	improve ni	s/her teaching?
				0			
4.	Please rate	the overall	course on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:			e.
	ा⊐ not at all	2	C3 3		1150	16 1	r z ⊐ extremely

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

effective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

effective

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instructor	KRN Kibe +	Course	Math \$ 55	Semester	Spring 2015
Enrolled	Y15	Auditing	No	Your Major _/	unth and Physics

These evaluations will be helpful to the Department of Mathematics in one or more of the following ways: (1) for use by the instructor (after grades have been turned in) in improving future teaching; (2) for use by the students in selecting courses and instructors.

1. Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor?

rp not at all **=3**=

cata moderately effective

i

extremely

effective

2. What are the instructor's strengths? (i.e. preparation and organization of lectures, content, boardwork, examples, clarity, willingness to answer questions, attitude toward students, office hours, homework, exams, grading).

examples, attitude, assures arestors,

3. What are the instructor's weaknesses? How could the instructor improve his/her teaching?

X-7 me = ONE

4. Please rate the overall course on a scale of 1 to 7:

not at all

21

ロ 本 moderately effective



extremely effective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruct	tor RIBET	Miller the second the second	Course	MATH 55			PAIM6 2015
Enrolle	dX		_ Auditing	211		Your Major 🔑	MICS /APPLICA
follo	se evaluations wing ways: (1 re teaching; (2) for use by th	e instructo	r (after grade	s have been	turned in) in	
1.		ooth the limitat				natter and co	urse, how would
	not at all	12 1	(3)	moderately effective	(5)	*180.	extremely effective
2 .	boardwork, ex	instructor's st xamples, clari vork, exams, ç	ty, willingne				ures, content, d students, office
		VERZY	CLEAR	AHD	GREAT	BOARDY	0/2/5
. 4		As	MEIL AS	AMO OMAR	ACI+ 70	STUPEN	, e
3.	What are the						her teaching?
	ä.	BETTI	E/2	Exam	PRES		
						ž	
4.	Please rate th	ne overall <i>cou</i> l	rse on a so	cale of 1 to 7:			
	ा ct at all	2 1	3 1	্ৰেচ moderately effective	480	ු දිට	extremely effective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	tor	Pibet	(Course _	Math !	5	Semester_	Spring 2015
Enrolle	d		/	Auditing	8.1		Your Major	Spring 2015 unded ared
follo	wing wa	ays: (1)	for use by th	ul to the De	epartment of	Mathematics es have bee	s in one or r n turned in)	nore of the in improving
1. S		e the ov			oossibilities of this increased of this increased of this increased on the contract of the con		matter and	course, how would extremely effective
2 ,	boardw hours,	ork, exa homewo	amples, clar ork, exams,	ity, willingn grading).	i.e. preparati ess to answe	er questions,		ectures, content, vard students, office
	Posit	in, W	to Migh	ntude	towards s	tudents		· ·
	Clear	Nectu	wei			204	18. B	s 50
97°			x lot abov	nt stude	MTJ			-
3.						I the instruct	or improve l	nis/her teaching?
	Ð	cam	were o	difficult	+			
	O _l	-			ii K			
				er.			ž:	
4.	Please	rate the	overall cou	irse on a s	cale of 1 to 7	:		
	ा not at all		12 1	C 3 D		(B)	16 0	extremely effective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruct	tor Ribet	Course	Math 5	5	Semester	Spring 2015
Enrolle		Auditing _		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Your Major <u></u>	con, Applied
follo	se evaluations will be help wing ways: (1) for use by re teaching; (2) for use by	oful to the Dep the instructor	partment of No. (after grade	Mathematics i es have been	in one or mor turned in) in i	e of the
1.	Considering both the limityou rate the overall teach				natter and co	urse, how would
	not at all	3	ঞ moderately effective	(5)	161	本 extremely effective
2.	What are the instructor's boardwork, examples, clahours, homework, exams	arity, willingne , grading).	ss to answe	r questions, a	attitude toward	d students, office
, ř	Ribet is great is awe some! questions and	at en. He's ver Feedback	gaging gabie	with sh	chormative	uhich W/
3.	What are the instructor's			-		•
n	Maybe be a and a bit v	hittle bi	amples	in lect	for le	chres
		a			žš	
4.	Please rate the overall co	ourse on a sca	ale of 1 to 7:			13
	cp c2 not at all	(3)	moderately effective	(151)	□6 0	⊄⊐ extremely effective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

Instruc	tor Ril	et	Course	Nath	<u> </u>	Semester	Spring 2015.
Enrolle	d		Auditing	X.22		Your Major	Underlared.
The follo	ese evaluations owing ways: (1) are teaching; (2) for use by the) for use by th	I to the Dep instructor e students	(after grade in selecting o	fathematics s have beer courses and	in one or mo turned in) in instructors.	improving
1.	Considering by you rate the o					matter and co	ourse, how would
	ದ್ದು not at all	(2)	-3 3	ক্ষ moderately effective	(5)	161	extremely effective
2.	What are the boardwork, exhours, homew	kamples, clarit	y, willingne			attitude towar	ures, content, d students, office
3.	What are the	instructor's we	eaknesses?	How could	the instructo	r improve his	/her teaching?
SF	tā.				Generally	Good!	
						ts.	
4.	Please rate th	e overall <i>cour</i>	se on a sca	ale of 1 to 7:			
	not at all	2	(\$1)	moderately effective	(\$)	780	extremely effective
5.	improved, adv	and the same of th	who have t	o take it, etc	,	s content, tex	t, how it could be
		CO			2 10		

		ILA	CHINGEYA	LOAHONS	OKVETT	NIZIWI	
Instruc	tor <u>Ken Ribe</u>	t	Course	Math 55	Se	emesterS	ering 2015
Enrolle	be	1 a 1 a 1 b 1 b 1 a 1	Auditing _	0.00	Yo	our Major <u>C</u>	gnitive Science
folio	owing ways: (1) for use b	elpful to the De y the instructor by the students	(after grades	have been to	urned in) in i	
1 ₂	_		nitations and pe ching effectiver		-	atter and cou	urse, how would
	ा not at all	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(3)	ক্ৰ moderately effective	5		extremely effective
2.		xamples, c			_		ires, content, I students, office
	,				outent inte	exesting au	nd all concepts
	were nell-	explained	1. Great led	nuver!			
6. m.							(S)
3.	What are the	instructor'	s weaknesses'	? How could th	ne instructor i	mprove his/t	ner teaching?
	Could have	given w	ore general	review of u	rain concep	oks before	jumping
	into exam		7		×		
						8	
4.	Please rate t	he overall	course on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:			
	ा not at all	12 1	(3)	्रवा moderately effective	(5)	480	extremely effective
5.			r relevant aspe		rse such as o	ontent, text,	how it could be

Not a huge fan of the textbook. Honenorh was help hil and exams

were fair. Good class!

Continue on back, if needed.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruct	tor <u>Ken</u>	Ribet	Course	Math	55	Semester	Spring	2015
Enrolle	d	V	Auditing _)23		_ Your Major	Econ	
follo	wing ways: (1) for use b	elpful to the Dep y the instructor by the students	(after grade	es have be	en turned in)	in improving	c g
. 1 ₈			nitations and po ching effectiven			ct matter and	l course, how	would
	not at all			moderately effective		31	extrem effecti	-
2.	boardwork,	examples, o	s strengths? (i. clarity, willingne ns, grading).	e. preparations to answe	on and orga r questions	anization of l	ectures, cont vard students	ent, s, office
entil	<i>Year</i>	lectuve	s, very	friendly	and h	old lots	of breakfa	ets.
3.	What are th	e instructor'	s weaknesses?	How could	the instruc	ctor improve	his/her teach	ing?
	Exams	s are	too havd					
*1	Make	the	exams e	asiev,		0		
4.	Please rate	the overall	course on a sca	ale of 1 to 7				
	ा not at all	:2 1	(3)	moderately effective	(5)	160.	extrem effect	nely

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

		1)			44 ()		C	v	
Ins	struct	or <u>Ken</u>	Kibet	Course	Moth 55		Semester	pring 2015	٨
En	rolle	d		Auditing _	F. (5)		Your Major	Applied N	
	follo	wing ways:	(1) for use by t	he instructoi	partment of Mat r (after grades h in selecting cou	nave been	turned in) in	re of the improving	12
5	1.				ossibilities of the ness of this instr		matter and co	ourse, how would	ļ
		not at all	2	13 0	moderately effective	(\$)	: 196 1	extremely effective	
,	2.	boardwork,	e instructor's s examples, cla ework, exams,	rity, willingne	.e. preparation a ess to answer qu	and organi uestions, a	ization of lect attitude towar	ures, content, d students, office	Э
		(clear logi	6			22	13	
y ³¹			91			## E	12	e	
	3.	What are th	e instructor's \	weaknesses	? How could the	instructo	r improve his	/her teaching?	
		8	need mo	re pow	er in cla	\$\frac{1}{2}			
	4.	Please rate	the overall co	<i>urse</i> on a so	cale of 1 to 7:		,	ē	
		व्म not at all	-2 -	3 3	ाक moderately effective	5	y 6 3	extremely effective	

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	tor Ken Rub	et	_ Course	Math 55		SemesterS	pny
Enrolle	1/-/		Auditing	No		Your Major	Applied Mark
The follo	ese evaluations owing ways: (1) are teaching; (2)	for use by the	I to the De	partment of M r (after grades	athematics is have been	in one or mo turned in) is	ore of the
1.	Considering by you rate the o					natter and o	course, how would extremely
	not at an			effective			effective
2.	boardwork, exhours, homew	amples, clarit ork, exams, g	y, willingne rading).	ess to answer	questions, a	zation of led	ctures, content, ard students, office
	- he is ever	in Piazzay tric	is to answ	ure agrands "	questions		
.34		81			9 W		1.66
3.	What are the i	nstructor's we	eaknesses	? How could the	ne instructor	improve hi	s/her teaching?
	NIA						
£1					2		
			29		*	£	
4.	Please rate th	e overall <i>cour</i>	se on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:			
	व्म not at all	Ż	(3)	moderately effective	5 1	15 1	extremely effective
5.	Comments on	•	-		rse such as	content, tex	kt, how it could be

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

- Kind I nive - holds many social events.

University of California, Berkeley

					TALOAHON	CITTLI	ω I XIIII	
Ir	etruct	or Ribbet	-	Course	Math 53		Semester <u>S</u>	oring 2015
Ε	nrolle	d	7	Auditin	gh D		′our Major 🗘	agritive Science
	follo	wing ways: (1) for use b	y the instruc	Department of Notes of the Control of Notes of the Control of the	s have been	turned in) in	
	1.				d possibilities of veness of this in	_	natter and co	ourse, how would
		ा not at all	C 2 3	(3)	ক moderately effective	:\$ 1	. (181)	extremely effective
	2.	boardwork,	examples, c	larity, willing		questions, a	ttitude towar	ures, content, d students, office
		Really	00/ 374	Pretty	good tead	her tool	i.	e
Wisi			ie:			22.00+	*	
	3.	What are the	e instructor'	s weakness	es? How could t	he instructor	improve his	/her teaching?
	V.					1.5		· ·
		diffic	It. M	at i	oroblemtl	diffi	celt!	
				×	7			
	4.	Please rate	the overall	co <i>urse</i> on a	scale of 1 to 7:			
		not at all	1 21	(3)	moderately effective	5	16 0	extremely effective
	5.		•		spects of the couve to take it, etc.		content, text	, how it could be
		Don't .	take	if a	A uhles	s you	like	math.
		(A)	1	:4	-11	()	(a) A	

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	tor <u>Ken</u>	Ribert	Course _	Math 55		Semester_	Spring	2015
Enrolle	dX	*;	Auditing	o ti	,	You r Major	Cognitive	Science
follo	owing way ire teachir	ations will be he vs: (1) for use by ng; (2) for use b	the instructory the students	r (after grades in selecting co	athematics in have been bourses and	in one or i turned in instructors	more of the in improving	•
1.		ring both the lim the overall teac	•		•	natter and	l course, how	would
	not at all	2 2	III III	moderately effective	:50	28 Table 1	extrem effecti	•
2. 	boardwo hours, ho	e the instructor's rk, examples, comework, exam great entity and way frie	larity, willingnes, grading).	ess to answer	questions, a	ttitude tov	ward students	s, office
3.	What are	the instructor's	weaknesses	? How could th	ne instructor	improve	his/her teachi	na?
4.	thin he fly	Though he it is the string (as own at the overall of	s address	helpfu atical a can f	himsely to to rollow,	write at a	class, on the ometime of think	Lotell Loans
4.	cto		ourse on a sca	ale of 1 to 7;			_	
	not at all	2	بها	moderately effective	(5)	agu	extremented	*

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

Thank you!!

5.

Continue on back, if needed.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

						4 1 (1)		
Instruc	ctor Ribet		Course	Math 55		Semester	Spirity	-
Enrolle	ed ye		Auditing _	No		Your Major	Applied	1_H_
follo	owing ways: (1) ure teaching; (2)	for use by the for use by the for use by the formuse by the formuse by the formuse by the formuse the formuse by the formuse b	ne instructor he students	partment of Mat (after grades he in selecting cou	nave beer urses and	n turned in) I instructors	in improving	ould
2	you rate the o	verall teachir	ng effectiver	ness of this instr	uctor?			
	ा not at all	(2)	3 3	ৰে: moderately effective	(5)	10 0 1	extremely effective	
2.	boardwork, ex	amples, clari	ity, willingne	e. preparation a ess to answer qu and tr	uestions,	attitude tow	ard students, o	ffice
3.				? How could the				?
			it.			a .2		
4.	Please rate th	e overall <i>cou</i>	rse on a sca	ale of 1 to 7:			2	
	ा ct at all	2 1	[3]	moderately effective		_ 050	extremely effective	

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	tor Ribert	Course	Math 55	Semester	Spring 2015
Enrolle	d	_ Auditing _	<u></u>	Your Major	Undeclared
follo	ese evaluations will be helpful owing ways: (1) for use by the are teaching; (2) for use by the	e instructor	(after grades have	been turned in)	in improving
1	Considering both the limitati	-			course, how would
	not at all	:3 0	क छ moderately effective		extremely effective
2.	What are the instructor's str boardwork, examples, clarit hours, homework, exams, g	y, willingne			
y ²⁷	He's always willing His lectures are inte what we need to kn				
3.	What are the instructor's we some times it is diff				
8			я в		
		8			
4.	Please rate the overall cour	se on a sc	ale of 1 to 7;		£3
	다 그 not at all	C3:1	moderately effective	50 (Sp.)	extremely effective
5.	Comments on any other rele	evant aspe	ects of the course su	ch as content, t	ext, how it could be

One should definitely read the book before lecture! Things will

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

make more sense after,

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instructor Piket	Course Marth 55	Semester Spr 2015
Enrolled	Auditing	Your Major Applied March
These evaluations will be helpful	to the Department of Mathematics	s in one or more of the

These evaluations will be helpful to the Department of Mathematics in one or more of the following ways: (1) for use by the instructor (after grades have been turned in) in improving future teaching; (2) for use by the students in selecting courses and instructors.

1. Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor?

rp not at all **3**1

□
 □
 moderately
 effective

` 6

extremely effective

2. What are the instructor's strengths? (i.e. preparation and organization of lectures, content, boardwork, examples, clarity, willingness to answer questions, attitude toward students, office hours, homework, exams, grading).

Giving

very gove

examples

3. What are the instructor's weaknesses? How could the instructor improve his/her teaching?



4. Please rate the overall course on a scale of 1 to 7:

a⊐ not at all **-2**3

C**3**II

moderately effective **5**

(B)

extremely effective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

N T 2 O N CUSTOM FORM NO. F-19933-U

10N CORPORATION 2005 IM7 4205 515 5 4 3 2

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruct	or Ribet, Ke	yreth	Course _	Math 65	s	semester <u>≤ρ</u> κ	ing 15
	d Tus		Auditing				influe science
follo	wing ways: (1) for use by	the instructo	partment of Ma r (after grades in selecting co	have been t	turned in) in it	
1₁ 8	•		•	ossibilities of th	T.	atter and cou	ırse, how would
	rp not at all	C 2 2	13 1	व्या moderately effective	(5)	: : : 	extremely effective
	boardwork, e. hours, homeways well-purp	vork, exams	arity, willingness, grading). IZ Y access ch so I ch so I ch so I	es preparation assists to answer q	uestions, at	titude toward	students, office
3.	orealcfasts me ne	V		? How could the	a inetructor	improve his/k	ner teaching?
Pre	-exam revi	ew 5055,00	's would have	ebeen nict			
Prot	F Ribet sometime	mes went itself ra	alithe fas	foult against	that's -	nore a limi	notion of the
			- 10			7)	
4.	Please rate th	ne overall <i>c</i>	<i>ourse</i> on a so	cale of 1 to 7:			18
	ഥ not at all	(2)	(3)			15 1	extremely effective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

STAT , N TOP OF ASSIGNMENTS AND TAKE GOOD POTES.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	ctor Ken Kl	bet	Course _	Math 55	_	Semester 5/14	mg 2015
Enrolle			Auditing	100		Your Major	ndeddred
foll	owing ways: (1) for use by	the instructo	partment of Ma r (after grades s in selecting co	athematics have beer	in one or more turned in) in i	e of the
,1 _ξ				ossibilities of the		matter and co	urse, how would
	rot at all	(2)	13 0	क moderately effective	(\$)	(161)	extremely effective
2.	boardwork, e hours, home - ek - or - ek - ve	examples, clawork, exams examples, clawork, exams examples, clawork, e	arity, willingnos, grading). Aepala Zengagno Zopen, a	-	questions, - He Progr	attitude toward	students, office
3.	What are the	instructor's Mes am	weaknesses	? How could the	e instructo I he B Hadt a	or improve his/l d professo professor	her teaching?
			7				
4.	Please rate t	he overall co	o <i>urse</i> on a so	cale of 1 to 7:			9
	्रा not at all	垃	3 31	moderately effective	(5)	(10)	extremely effective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

study hard & be prepared.

5.

Continue on back, if needed.

University of California, Berkeley

Instructor	Course	Semester Spring 2015 Your Major Math (applied)
Enrolled	Auditing	Your Major Math (applied)
These evaluations will be helpful following ways: (1) for use by the future teaching; (2) for use by the	instructor (after grades have be students in selecting courses a	en turned in) in improving
	effectiveness of this instructor?	#
rd⊐ r 2 ⊃ not at all	moderately effective	extremely effective
boardwork, examples, clarity		s, attitude toward students, office
paparation, willight to	answer questions,	good attitude, very nice,
	建 富	
e ê		
3. What are the instructor's we fix and are two had we have were home work. 4. Please rate the overall cours not at all	se on a scale of 1 to 7:	extremely effective
5. Comments on any other releasing roved, advice to people of the such that the such t		ren the difficulty to yayr it you Continue on back, if needed.
	T	9.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

University of California, Berkeley

These evaluations will be helpful to the Department of Mathematics in one or more of the following ways: (1) for use by the instructor (after grades have been turned in) in improving future teaching; (2) for use by the students in selecting courses and instructors. 1. Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor? 1. Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor? 1. Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor? 1. Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor. 2. What are the instructor's strengths? (i.e. preparation and organization of lectures, content, boardwork, examples, clarity, willingness to answer questions, attitude toward students, office hours, homework, exams, grading). Professor was always definitely prefared depite his busy schedules. 4. Helpfung to help answer questions (as he always passes for do so during class). However, was a bit lengthy, especially in the end. 3. What are the instructor's weaknesses? How could the instructor improve his/her teaching? Because the course is difficult is covers (of a content, lengthy). Can see why the professor just subrocluced the bard with www. Though if would have been before to go over where examples, as we always jumped around the place super quickly.
These evaluations will be helpful to the Department of Mathematics in one or more of the following ways: (1) for use by the instructor (after grades have been turned in) in improving future teaching; (2) for use by the students in selecting courses and instructors. 1. Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor? 1. Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor? 1. Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would you rate the overall teaching effective extremely extremely effective extremely effective extremely effective extremely effective extremely extremely effective extremely effec
you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor? not at all moderately effective effective 2. What are the instructor's strengths? (i.e. preparation and organization of lectures, content, boardwork, examples, clarity, willingness to answer questions, attitude toward students, office hours, homework, exams, grading). Professor was always definitely prepared despite his lossy schedules. He was always willing to help answer questions (as he always passes to do so during class). Homework was a bit lengthy, especially in the end. 3. What are the instructor's weaknesses? How could the instructor improve his/her teaching? Because the course is difficult to overs (of a Content, and see why the professor just introduced the bard minimum. Though if would have been better to go over
boardwork, examples, clarity, willingness to answer questions, attitude toward students, office hours, homework, exams, grading). Professor was always definitely prefared despite his large schedules. He was always willing to help answer questions (as he always passes to do so during class). Homework was a bit lengthy, especially in the end. 3. What are the instructor's weaknesses? How could the instructor improve his/her teaching? Because the course is difficult to covers lofs of content, can see why the professor just introduced the bank minimum. Though it would have been better to go over
especially in the end. 3. What are the instructor's weaknesses? How could the instructor improve his/her teaching? Because the course is difficult? covers (of of content, I can see why the professor just introduced the bane minimum. Though it would have been better to go over
More examples, as we always jumped around the place super quickle Also, it seemed like he expected students to name read the maferial. 4. Please rate the overall course on a scale of 1 to 7: before class, which wasn't alway not at all moderately extremely
effective effective 5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be
improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc. Feffer (751s. The 51s were unhelpful in a lot of ways. But I do understand it's "discrete" math, so teaching It would be hard for anyone to do.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	tor Ken Ribet	Course	55		Semester	oring 2015
Enrolle	~	Auditing	4.3		Your Major <u>F</u> c	~
The follo	ese evaluations will be helpful owing ways: (1) for use by the are teaching; (2) for use by the Considering both the limitation	to the Dep instructor students	partment of Math (after grades h in selecting cou	hematics i ave been irses and i	in one or more turned in) in ir instructors.	of the nproving
8	you rate the overall teaching	•		•		,
	ct⊐ c2⊃ not at all	3 1	如 moderately effective	10000	15 1	extremely effective
2.	What are the instructor's street boardwork, examples, clarity hours, homework, exams, grant Very extrumentic	/, willingnes rading).	ss to answer qu	_		
				¥2	£	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
. "			V			
3.	What are the instructor's we	aknesses?	How could the	instructor	improve his/h	er teaching?
	Exams seem to be Course, not re Could be more proofs.	of repre	sentative of	Course	as a wh	ole.
4.	Please rate the overall cours	se on a sca	ale of 1 to 7:			2
			and to			-7-

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

moderately effective

N/A.

not at all

extremely

effective

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruct	tor <u>Ken</u> Ril	oet	Course _	Math 55		Semester	pring 2015
	d Yay		Auditing _	Muth 55 Nay		Your Major \iint	pp red Math.
follo	wing ways: (1)	for use by th	ul to the De le instructo	partment of Ma r (after grades s in selecting co	thematics i have been	n one or more turned in) in i	e of the
1,				ossibilities of th	•	natter and co	urse, how would
	rp not at all	(2)	(3)	ক moderately effective	串	□\$ □	⊄⊐ extremely effective
2.	boardwork, ex	amples, clari	ty, willingne		uestions, a	ttitude toward	ures, content, d students, office to uses the intuitive,
3.	What are the i	netructor'e w	aaknassas	? How could the	a instructor	improve his/	her teaching?
3.		lass inclu Class	ude mo torfa	re challeng			•
4.	Please rate th	e overall <i>cou</i>	rse on a so	cale of 1 to 7:			E)
	rot at all	[2]	C 3 31	moderately	- 1	r 6 3	extremely

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

5.

University of California, Berkeley

Instruc	ctor Ribet	Course Mo	th 55	Semester	Spring 2015
Enrolle	ed	_ Auditing	* 11	Your Major	Applied Math
follo	ese evaluations will be helpfu owing ways: (1) for use by th ure teaching; (2) for use by th	ul to the Depart e instructor (af	ment of Mather ter grades have	matics in one or e been turned in	more of the) in improving
1 #	Considering both the limitaryou rate the overall teaching not at all	g effectiveness			d course, how would extremely
	flot at all		fective		effective
2.	What are the instructor's st boardwork, examples, clari hours, homework, exams, g	ty, willingness t		_	
	Always available	during of	fice hours		
	Willingato soci or make Trical to rem	alize with	h studen	its	3 g *
H (E	Trical to rome	our bac	tudents'	names	•:
3.	What are the instructor's w	eaknesses? Ho	w could the ins	structor improve	his/her teaching?
55	Posting helpfurl	answers	to the	homework	: will be
4.	Please rate the overall cou	rse on a scale	of 1 to 7:		
	中 立 not at all		derately	(5)	extremely effective
5.	Comments on any other re improved, advice to people	who have to ta	ake it, etc.		
	Math 55 is a protosee if prof	acked clo	tes on th	times it's ne board.	really hard
	Very helpful i	f profess	or can d	resent the	e lecture
	with the projection to	ector. The	notes (makes in a pay att	e lecture t easier for ention to the tinue on back, if needed

CANIZON CUSTOM FORM NO. F-19933-UCB

SCANTHON CORPORATION 2005 IM7 4205 515 5

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruct	torR56	et /	Course	Maff 5.	SemYou	nester	Spring 15 Econ
follo	wing ways: ((1) for use by t	he instructor	partment of Ma (after grades in selecting co	have been tur	ned in) in i	e of the mproving
1: 2				ossibilities of theses of these		ter and co	urse, how would
	ा not at all	-2 2	3 31	ক moderately effective	100m	16 1	extremely effective
2.	boardwork, hours, home	examples, cla ework, exams	rity, willingne , grading). world Se	hl, cesy	questions, attitudes	ude toward	d students, office
හැරි	He also	colourage	strus to	ark 24	inten,	3 8	5 5
3.	What are th	e instructor's	weaknesses′	? How could th	e instructor im	prove his/	her teaching?
	He world	go more	in durth	into explaining h)s multimetical	steps.	
-							
						8	
4.	Please rate	the overall co	<i>urse</i> on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:			25
	¤⊐ not at all	: 2 :	යුත	طی moderately effective	15 0		extremely effective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instructor _	Ribet	Course _	Math	55	Semester 50 15
Enrolled		Auditing _		W.S.	Your Major Bus Admin

These evaluations will be helpful to the Department of Mathematics in one or more of the following ways: (1) for use by the instructor (after grades have been turned in) in improving future teaching; (2) for use by the students in selecting courses and instructors.

1. Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor?

⊏⊐ not at all

কে moderately effective (5)

2. What are the instructor's strengths? (i.e. preparation and organization of lectures, content, boardwork, examples, clarity, willingness to answer questions, attitude toward students, office hours, homework, exams, grading).

Talked slow, answered every question

3. What are the instructor's weaknesses? How could the instructor improve his/her teaching?

Not enough examples

4. Please rate the overall course on a scale of 1 to 7:

व्य⊐ not at all

ಡು moderately effective (5)

□5□

extremely effective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

none

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruct	tor Ribet		Course _	Math 55		Semester	Spring 2015
Enrolle	d		Auditing _	20 B		Your Major	Cog sci/App Ma-
follo	se evaluations owing ways: (1) re teaching; (2)	for use by the	instructor	r (after grades	have beer	turned in) in improving
12	Considering bo				St. Committee Contract	matter and	d course, how would
	not at all	(2)	4 31	rac moderately effective	(151)	16 3	extremely effective
2.	boardwork, exa hours, homewo (ontent	amples, clarity	y, willingne rading). Herestiy	ess to answer	questions,	attitude to	lectures, content, ward students, office agenoally
68)	W.	0			E e		ver "
3.	What are the in Unitent (WHD (nstructor's we of leetur ancepts west mo	eaknesses s th that i re dif	? How could the ough inte	ne instructo restina reed to	r improve SOME	his/her teaching? thme? jumped I or that we
					F		
4.	Please rate the	e overall <i>cour</i>	se on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:			
	cti not at all	12 1	C3 33	াক moderately effective	E 5 5	16 0	extremely effective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

Instruc	tor <u>libe-</u>	1	Course	55	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH	Semester	Spring 15	
Enrolle	ed		Auditing _	0(-9)		Your Major _	Math	
The follo	ese evaluations owing ways: (1 are teaching; (2	will be help	ful to the De he instructo	partment of M r (after grade:	lathematics s have been	in one or m turned in)	ore of the in improving	
1,	Considering by					matter and	course, how wo	oulc
	rot at all	c2 3	3 0	മാ moderately effective	(5)	- 16 1	extremely effective	
2.	boardwork, ex hours, homew	xamples, cla vork, exams, olds	rity, willingne, grading).	e. preparationess to answer	questions,	attitude tow	ectures, content ard students, of	ffico
e F	go	of res	JON TOP (9.2		e e	0
3.	What are the			? How could t			is/her teaching	?
	10				¥			
			* ,					
4.	Please rate th	ne overall <i>co</i>	<i>urse</i> on a so	ale of 1 to 7:				
	ආ not at all	_	C 3 3	ঞ moderately effective	(5)	⊞ \$0	extremely effective	
5.	Comments or improved, ad	n any other rovice to peopl	elevant aspe e who have	ects of the cou to take it, etc.	urse such as	s content, te	ext, how it could	l be
	Overall	gine al.	1 would	l have	nore of	I frault	than n to post r we turn	F
	up the	correct	ar switt	ALL.	SAL MONEY	· xayea	S 13946	
	MVVm	in for	NETELL	8				

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instructor _	Ken	Ribet	Course	Math II	- 1111111111111111111111 1	Semester	Spring 2017
Enrolled	/ii		Auditing _	¥7.1		Your Major	Flat
following future te	g ways: (′ eaching; (ː	1) for use by the 2) for use by th	e instructor e students	partment of Mat (after grades h in selecting cou	ave been irses and	turned in) in instructors.	
	-		•	ess of this instr	-		,
	t⊐ at all	(2)	43 0	কা moderately effective	(153)	(6)	extremely effective
boa	ardwork, e urs, home	examples, clarif work, exams, g vevy cleav	ty, willingne grading). in his le	ecture, though	uestions, a	ttitude toward	ures, content, d students, office
		sometimes	too albe	Aract.			
. 4					×12	ě.	ă u
3. Wh	at are the	e instructor's we	eaknesses?	How could the	instructor	improve his/	her teaching?
ø	,		. /		n n	9	
							× .
4. Ple	ase rate t	the overall <i>coul</i>	rse on a sca	ale of 1 to 7:	\rightarrow		
	‡⊐ at all	2	C3 33	moderately effective	(151)	15 0	extremely effective
5. Cor	mments o	on any other rel	evant aspe	cts of the cours	e such as	content, text	, how it could be

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

H's great to take class of Ribert.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Inst	ruct	or <u>ken</u> Ribet		_ Course _	Math 17		Semester _	Spring 2013	
Enr	olle	dV		Auditing				Undeclared	
f	ollo	se evaluations vowing ways: (1) re teaching; (2)	for use by the	e instructo	r (after grades	have been	turned in)	in improving	
્ર ફ	·	Considering bo you rate the ov ap not at all					matter and	course, how verteened effective	у
2	2.	What are the ir boardwork, exa hours, homework	amples, clarit	ty, willingn	i.e. preparation ess to answer	and organiquestions, a	ization of le attitude tov	ectures, contervard students,	nt, office
		6	attitude,	exams, g	rading				77
e =						8.6			e .
3	3 .	What are the in	nstructor's we	eaknesses	? How could the	ne instructo	r improve	his/her teachin	g?
	,	P	ratty good.		3	¥			
				D)					
4	1.	Please rate the	overall cou	rse on a s	cale of 1 to 7:	\cap			
		not at all	r 2 0	4 31	क moderately effective	(5)	116 3	extreme effective	

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

5.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	tor	Ribet	Course	- 316		Semester	
Enrolle	d	n a naos	Auditing	40		Your Major _	Mathematics
follo	ese evaluations owing ways: (1) are teaching; (2	for use by the	instructo	r (after grad	es have bee	n turned in)	in improving
1. !!	Considering by you rate the one not at all					matter and	course, how would extremely effective
2.	boardwork, ex		y, willingne				ctures, content, ard students, office
. 1		×	PY	ety	good		3 2 °
3.	What are the	instructor's we	aknesses	? How could	I the instructo	or improve h	is/her teaching?
	Ä		pre	etty	good	/ 1.	
4.	Please rate th	e overall <i>cour</i>	se on a so	ale of 1 to 7			2
	rot at all	12 1	C\$ 3	rately moderately effective	(5)	16 3	⊏ 7 ⊐ extremely effective

 Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

CANTEON CUSTOM FORM NO. F-19933-UCB SCANTRON.C

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	tor Kenneth	Riber	Course	Math SS	Sen	nester <u>Sp</u>	ring 2015		
Enrolle				W (3					
follo futu	These evaluations will be helpful to the Department of Mathematics in one or more of the following ways: (1) for use by the instructor (after grades have been turned in) in improving future teaching; (2) for use by the students in selecting courses and instructors. 1. Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would								
1.				ess of this instru		ter and cou	urse, now would		
	not at all	· · · 2	13 11	四 moderately effective	COMPANY NO.	18 1	extremely effective		
2.	What are the in boardwork, ex- hours, homew	amples, clarity	, willingne	e. preparation a ss to answer qu	nd organizat estions, attiti	ion of lectu ude toward	ires, content, I students, office		
	Prof.	essor Ribe	et is v	eny appro	achable a	nd will	ing to		
				Also gives		the state of the s			
ϵ^{0}				lot outside classisettings					
3.				How could the					
ę	Coura	l be Uno	rganize	ed at time	.S				
4.	Please rate the	e overall <i>cours</i>	se on a sca	ale of 1 to 7:			8		
	not at all	②	C3 3	മാ moderately effective	E\$30.	± 6 0	extremely effective		

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instructor Ken Ribet	Course Mc	th 55	Semest	ter Spring	g 2015
Enrolled JUS	Auditing	<u> </u>	Your Ma	ajor Econ/	Cog Sci
These evaluations will be helpt following ways: (1) for use by t future teaching; (2) for use by t	he instructor (af	<mark>ter</mark> grades ha	ve been turned	d in) in impr	
1. Considering both the limitaryou rate the overall teaching not at all	ng effectiveness mo			⊑§ ⊒	e, how would
2. What are the instructor's someone boardwork, examples, claim hours, homework, exams, keally knows his	rity, willingness t	o answer que	estions, attitude	e toward stu	
a a			89		S 0
3. What are the instructor's very kind of hard to for Own inability to the	llow, but t	ow could the i	nstructor impro	to my	eaching?
	2		22		
4. Please rate the overall con	urse on a scale	of 1 to 7:			ie.
ा वा वा not at all		derately ffective	150	15 3	r z ⊐ extremely effective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instrue	ctor R	1686	Course	66	Se	emester	AP 15
Enroll	9.8	yes	Auditing _	151	Yo	our Major	Multo
' Th	ese evaluat owing ways	s: (1) for use b	elpful to the De by the instructor by the students	(after grades	s have been to	urned in) in	
1.			nitations and pe ching effectiver			atter and co	ourse, how would
	rot at all	123	:31 :31	moderately effective	Nga-	16 1	extremely effective
2.	boardwor	the instructor k, examples, o mework, exan		ess to answer	n and organize questions, at MUSSI H	titude towai	tures, content, od students, office
9.7					*0		A - R0
3.	What are	the instructor	's weaknesses	? How could t			
						0 80	ASTANGOTION!
	Ceres	beand	up myn	other	bands		
						1.0	
4.	Please ra	te the overall	course on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:			8
	rp not at all	121	c3 3	本 moderately effective	5	761	extremely effective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

CUSTOM FORM NO. F-19933-U

NTRON CORPORATION 2005 IM7 4205 515 5 4 3 2

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	tor ken Rab	Ribet	Course M	ath 55	Made 2005 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 -	Semester _	Spring 2015
Enrolle							La declared
The follo	ese evaluations vowing ways: (1) are teaching; (2)	will be helpful for use by the	to the Dep	artment of N (after grade	Mathematics s have bee	s in one or in turned in	more of the) in improving
1.	Considering bo					matter and	d course, how would
	not at all	2	;	व्या moderately effective		6 3	extremely effective
2.	boardwork, exa hours, homewo	amples, clarity ork, exams, g	y, willingne: rading).	ss to answer	questions,	attitude to	ectures, content, ward students, office
	TIC Seen	ed 70 km	in the	CONTON	well	<i>]1.</i>	8
	the seem	s peaking			224	5	e
e^{V_i}		·					6
3.	What are the ir	nstructor's we	aknesses?	How could	the instructo	or improve	his/her teaching?
	The only	real po	blan I	had was	the	homewood	Ļ
<u>k</u>)	Exams, lectura						
						Đ	
4.	Please rate the	overall cour	se on a sca	ale of 1 to 7:			e e
	ा not at all	12 1	C 3 33	本 moderately effective	5	□\$ 3	⊄⊃ extremely effective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	tor Ken RI	oet	Course	Math 55	<u> </u>	Semester _	pring 2015
Enrolle	ed yer			No. 1		Your Major _	Applied Mall
follo	ese evaluations owing ways: (1 are teaching; (2) for use by t	he instructe	or (after grade	es have bee	n turned in) it	
1.				possibilities of eness of this ir moderately effective		matter and c	extremely effective
2.		xamples, cla vork, exams,	rity, willingr				ctures, content, ard students, office
	U					£2	
.182 ⁷⁴							100
3.	What are the	instructor's	weaknesse	s? How could	the instruct	or improve hi	s/her teaching?
	Sometin	es defic	alt to	under star	4		
2	8				Ŕ		
			.0				
4.	Please rate th	ne overall co	<i>urse</i> on a s	cale of 1 to 7:			
	¤्⊐ not at all	_2	C 3 C	¤b moderately	(15)) nga	⊄⊐ extremely

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

effective

Study hard!

effective

SCANTON CUSTOM FORM NO. F-19933-UCB SCANTON CORPORATION 2005 IM7 4205 515 54 3 2 WWW.sc

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instru	ctor Ribet	-11	Course	Math 55		Semester Spri	ing 2015
Enroll	led Yes		Auditing	No ter	<i>t</i>	Your Major <u>St</u>	atistics
Th fol	ese evaluations lowing ways: (1) for use b	y the instructor	epartment of Ma or (after grades s in selecting co	have been	turned in) in ir	of the mproving
1. 2.				possibilities of the eness of this inst moderately effective		natter and cou	extremely effective
2.	What are the boardwork, exhours, homev - Organization - Clear in Aladi - Very frien	xamples, ovork, examoles, or website increased in the condition of the con	clarity, willingr ns, grading). and ossignments announcements	(i.e. preparation ness to answer q	and organi	zation of lectu ttitude toward	res, content, students, office
, a							
3.		ct (ertal	n proofs (un	s? How could the		improve his/h	ner teaching?
			*			12	
4.	Please rate th	ne overall	course on a s	cale of 1 to 7:			
	ा not at all	12 1	C 3 33	moderately effective	:- 50 *	16 1	extremely effective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

prefer more facult on one area, more applications.

5.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	ctor <u>Ken</u>	Ribet	Course _	Math 55	Se	mester <u>Sp</u>	2015
Enrolle	ed		Auditing		You	ur Major <u>M</u>	ath?
foll	owing ways	tions will be hel s: (1) for use by g; (2) for use by	the instructo	r (after grades	have been tu	ırned in) in ir	
1.		ng both the lim he overall teacl				ntter and cou	extremely effective
2.	boardwor	the instructor's k, examples, cl mework, exam	arity, willingne		_		res, content, students, office
		clarity	d hun	101			
. Fa		i) š			15 m	2.0	a *
3.	What are	the instructor's	weaknesses	? How could th	e instructor in	mprove his/h	ner teaching?
	22	Sometimes				t . l.	
		in: ten	rns of b	now Conct	upto are	related	
4.	Please ra	te the overall c	<i>ourse</i> on a so	ale of 1 to 7:			2
	्रा not at all	12 1	C 3 3		:5)		extremely effective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

S C A N T 2 0 N CUSTOM FORM NO. F-19933-UCB © SCANTHON CORPORATION 2005 IM7 4205 515 5 4 3 2 WWW.sc

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

University of California, Berkeley

		ILA	CHING EV	ALUATION UC			
Instruct	tor Ken R	Libet	Course	Math 55	Semest	er	Spmg 2015
Enrolle	d	X	Auditing		Your Ma	ajor <u>U</u>	ndeclared / Log Sc
follo	wing ways: re teaching;	(1) for use by (2) for use b	y the instruct by the student	epartment of Mat or (after grades h ts in selecting cou	nave been turned urses and instruc	l in) in ctors.	improving
1.				possibilities of the eness of this instr		and co	ourse, how would
	¤⊐ not at all	(2)	(3)		18	□6 □	extremely effective
2.	boardwork hours, hom Immuns	, examples, c nework, exam e enthusi	elarity, willing ns, grading).	Knowledge	uestions, attitude	towar	d students, office
e/***	Person The B	able, the	ough the			00/9	share Ulus
3.	Lecture descrip	s seemee stive path stopic (n	d a bit h dhad od to say	introduces,	rather the defines, ar didn't do th	id di	ollowing a set emanstrates just scattered
4.				scale of 1 to 7:			Dalana
	¤⊐ not at all	(2)	C3 1	ক্র moderately effective	•	≘6 3	extremely effective
5.	Even to letter	advice to peo though er grade this c	Diple who have Lim go Li Feel Lass on	pects of the course to take it, etc. The regard y to better	e to retal dless of A underst	Le f	t, how it could be his class for act I'd still the topics are on back, if needed

highly abstract but because they are highly fascinating, and highly applicable when well understood (another thing for me to work on). And seeing as I hadn't done well in Moth 1A (to retake as well) or Moth 1B, I think that's saying something. Professor Ribert is great! I have the Breakfasts and Lunches, even though I was reverable to attendance, they're still a GIREAT idea—honestly more professors should follow that example.

I truly hope Prof. Ribet's path and my own cross again someday, I've's as fascinating as the Knowledge he bequeaths unto (teaches) us. (That's the quote I'd like you to use in future first lecture slides—whether it's bequeaths or teaches is your call.)

Keep on Keeping on Professor Ribet!

(I'd like to see your take on the expression:
"Turtles all the vay down")

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruct	tor Kill	et	_ Course _	Math 55	S	emester	spring 2015
Enrolle	d	/	_ Auditing _	909	Y	our Major <u></u>	ognitive Science
follo	wing ways: (1)	for use by th	e instructoi	partment of Mar r (after grades l in selecting co	nave been t	urned in) in	
1,				ossibilities of th		atter and c	ourse, how would
	rot at all	(2)	30	moderately effective		16 0	中 extremely effective
2.	boardwork, ex hours, homew — Extremel	amples, clari ork, exams, ç y opentyen	y, willingne grading) www.ed	e. preparation assists to answer questions in though	uestions, at	titude towa	tures, content, rd students, office
0 F	- Marage	able exams					
3.	- I wou	ldue liked n	ore struct	? How could the use to the le going on atan	ctures.	improve his	s/her teaching?
10				, ,	4		
						er er	
4.	Please rate the	e overall <i>coul</i>	rse on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:			
	rot at all	:2 1	(3)	rately moderately effective		(15)	⊏7⊐ extremely effective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be 5. improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	tor Ribet		Course	Marh55		Semester_	Spr15	
Enrolle							Mech. Eng	2.
The follo	ese evaluations owing ways: (1) are teaching; (2)	will be helpful t for use by the i	o the Dep	partment of M (after grades	lathematics s have beer	in one or in turned in	more of the in improving	6
1.	Considering bo you rate the ov not at all		•		_		extremely effective	
2.		amples, clarity, ork, exams, gra	willingne ading). 🚜	ss to answer	questions,	attitude to	ectures, content ward students, o	
e ⁷⁵		i i				4	=	
3.	What are the in		1			1277992 SALE-PAR	his/her teaching M to cover ppis to disco	
						36		
4.	Please rate the	overall course	on a sca	ale of 1 to 7:				
	⊏⊐ not at all	-2 1	c3 ::	moderately	(151)	± 6 0	extremely	

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

5.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

1		TOURING PAY		CONVETTO	I XIVI	
Instruct	tor O	Course _/	math 5	Se	emester <u></u>	P115
Enrolle	d X	Auditing _	10.00	Yo	our Major 🧘	Da sci
follo	se evaluations will be howing ways: (1) for use to teaching; (2) for use	by the instructor	r (after grade	s have been to	urned in) in i	
1.	Considering both the linguage you rate the overall tea	•		-	atter and co	urse, how would
	not at all	13 0	ঞ moderately effective	(5)	□\$ □	extremely effective
2.	What are the instructor boardwork, examples, hours, homework, examples,	clarity, willingne				
						91
200						(a), (X)
3.	What are the instructor	's weaknesses'	? How could t	he instructor i	mprove his/l	her teaching?
55		COURSE	15 h PNOVE NOA	and . (fo be a [MSTMC]	exam fiffili tovs f	s ult, ault
4.	Please rate the overall	course on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:			9
	not at all	C3 31	moderately	5	11237	⊄⊃ extremely

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be 5. improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

effective

effective

University of California, Berkeley

Instructor	libet	Course	Moth 55	Se	emester	Bring
Enrolled	X	Auditing _	*.*	Yo	our Major	ICB / Cey Sei
following wa	uations will be he ays: (1) for use by ling; (2) for use b	y the instructor	r (after grades h	nave been t	urned in) in i	
	ering both the lime the overall teach	•		-	atter and cou	urse, how would
ದಾ not at all	(2)	(3)	moderately effective	15 1	16 0 €	extremely effective
boardy	re the instructor's vork, examples, conserved and manify	larity, willingne	ess to answer d	uestions, at	titude toward	students, office
9 ¹⁶						
	re the instructor's morel before					=
w	mores better	Concrete	example	ly.		
					9	
4. Please	rate the overall of	course on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:			3
व्⊐ not at all	:2 2	C \$33	moderately effective	15 0	(5)	extremely effective
	ents on any other ed, advice to peo					

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	tor Ken Ribe	et	Course_	Math	55	Semester	Spring	2015
Enrolle	ed		Auditing		# <u>\$</u> 7	Your Majo	r <u>Cogniti</u>	ne Science
follo	ese evaluations of the evaluations of the evaluations of the evaluations (1) are teaching; (2)	for use by the	instructo	or (after gr	ades have b	een turned i	n) in improv	
1.	Considering bo		•		_		nd course, h	now would
	not at all	2 3	_3 0	moderate effective) ₅	r 6 :	ext	r⊅ tremely fective
2.	What are the ir boardwork, exa	amples, clarity	y, willingn	ess to ans	wer question	ns, attitude to	oward stude	ents, office
	hours, homewo Comprehensive interact with	knowled	ge of	mater-U	Copulou	ory), ver	y eager	TO
	interact wi	Students	onel	answer	of westi	ons.		(5
ra III					50	2	<u>k</u> j	s
3.	What are the ir	nstructor's we	aknesses	s? How co	uld the instru	uctor improve	e his/her tea	aching?
	tes can a	get very	Confusin	ig, 1 of	the oyet lo	st and ve	ny very	-
12	very ven			Q. Y	8			
						Wi e		
4.	Please rate the	e overall <i>cour</i> s	se on a s	cale of 1 to	7:			
	not at all	12 1	C 3 31	moderate effective		:16	ex	⊏z tremely fective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

	or Ribet			IATIL C	0		a IMS
Instruct	or <u>MIDULI</u>		Course L	MITIO			ng 2015
Enrolled	d		Auditing _	100	You	r Major Tr	in. Math/stat.
follo	wing ways: (1)	for use by the	instructor	partment of Math (after grades had in selecting coul	ave been tur	ned in) in ir	of the enproving
1.				ossibilities of the ness of this instru		ter and cou	rse, how would
	not at all	12 1	:3 3	moderately effective	(5)	□\$ □	extremely effective
3.	boardwork, exhours, homework the stremely Aftitude all State Really What are the in Hand With	amples, clarity ork, exams, got toward was worked with the work of	y, willingnerading). Tastic Style K/8Mi Kwa Taknesses	? How could the fruit to	estions, attituded the standing	the ward	students, office eat t +D Know and of Overhead whors) er teaching? iggur and
				ama	frither was the yes The	e kni	the typics but we exactly acture has
4.	Please rate the	e overa⊪ <i>cour</i> 	se on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:	150	176 31	c 7 0
İ	not at all	-		moderately effective			extremely effective
5.	improved, adv	ice to people	who have	ects of the course to take it, etc. Baye's More out of the course of the course out of the course ou			

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Ins	struct	tor Ribet	Manager Calvan - Calvan - Calvan	Course	55		Semester	SP15
En	rolle	d						Appled north
	follo	se evaluations wing ways: (1) re teaching; (2)	for use by th	ıl to the Dep e instructor	partment of Mat (after grades h	thematics nave been	in one or me turned in) i	ore of the
9	1.				ossibilities of the less of this instr moderately effective	-	matter and o	extremely effective
	2.		amples, clarit	ty, willingne	e. preparation a	_		ctures, content, ard students, office
				-				2 55 0
	3.	What are the i	nstructor's we	eaknesses?	How could the	instructo	r improve hi	s/her teaching?
	7	Y	False	Papulot	L 2	s		
	4.	Please rate the	e overall <i>coul</i>	rse on a sca	ale of 1 to 7:			
		व्च not at all	(2)	c3 1	moderately effective	©50	□6 □	⊏⊃ extremely effective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be 5. improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	tor <u>ken</u>	Ribet	Course	Math 55	S	emester	Spring 2015
Enrolle				(*.			
follo	owing ways: are teaching;	(1) for use b (2) for use b	y the instruct by the student	epartment of Macor (after grades in selecting co	have been to ourses and in	urned in) ir istructors.	
2				eness of this ins		±6∋	extremely effective
2 .	boardwork,		clarity, willingr	(i.e. preparation ness to answer	_		tures, content, rd students, office
			p zvennoj				-
N ^{Ž4}	- Though	rii luk	Nie Ject	2710	95 as	,	. *
3.			s weaknesse	s? How could the	ne instructor i	mprove his	her teaching?
	W						
			8				
4.	Please rate	the overall	course on a s	cale of 1 to 7:			-
	d⊐ not at all	12 1	C3 II	moderately	(5)	m \$ 0	⊏⊐ extremely

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

effective

effective

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruct	tor Ribet		Course	MATHT		Semester	SPRING 2015
Enrolle	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						Eron & APPLLED
follo	ese evaluations owing ways: (1) are teaching; (2)	for use by	the instructor	(after grades	have been	turned in) it	
1. 8	Considering b		•		_	matter and o	ourse, how would
	not at all		13 0	moderately effective	:5 3	16 1	r⊅ extremely effective
2.		amples, cla	rity, willingne		_		ctures, content, ard students, office
	Good lecturer					8	
, la i		S			16-25	:8	9 ×
3.	What are the i	nstructor's	weaknesses?	How could th	e instructo	r improve his	s/her teaching?
	cluss was neo	illy long, s	onetines kind	of dry			
8					ñ		
			e			15	
4.	Please rate th	e overall co	urse on a sca	ale of 1 to 7:			9
	्रा not at all	-2 3	C 3 33	moderately effective	15 1	15 3	extremely effective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	ctor Rivel	Course Moth	S	Semester 201	2 Spring
Enrolle	ed Spring 2015 /	Auditing	ri t	Your Major\	erded State
follo	ese evaluations will be helpfo owing ways: (1) for use by thure teaching; (2) for use by the	e instructor (afte	er grades have l	been turned in) in in	
1.	Considering both the limita you rate the overall teaching	g effectiveness	of this instructor	?	i7 0
	not at all		erately ective	8	extremely effective
2.	What are the instructor's st boardwork, examples, clari hours, homework, exams, g Firdress, willing	ty, willingness to	answer question	ons, attitude toward	students, office
				,	
	+)#			× 300
3.	What are the instructor's w Nowe work and midterns there or	exams does	nH seem to	on come lote.	er teaching?
		8			
4.	Please rate the overall cou	rse on a scale of	f 1 to 7:		5
	中 立 not at all		erately		⊄⊐ extremely

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

5.

effective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

effective

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	tor Ribet		Course	Math 55		Semester Semester	ins 2015
Enrolle	ed			(8) × 1			
follo	owing ways: (1) for use by t	the instructo	epartment of Ma r (after grades s in selecting co	have bee	n turned in) in i	
1.	~			possibilities of th ness of this inst		matter and co	urse, how would
	ा not at all	(2)	(3)	moderately effective	(\$)	□6 □	extremely effective
2.	boardwork, exhours, homev	xamples, cla vork, exams,	rity, willingn , grading).		uestions,	attitude toward	d students, office
	He really	y cares	about	the class	and + con	about Ausire &	his students
	Maybe	it was	6 C 0	of my 10	مداحة	of mate	unstructure experience
$e^{i\hat{a}}$	but n	e lan	sue age	t notat	ion (often m	ade ne
3.	con fu	8001		? How could the			
55	ž			, "	Ę		
			-			51	
4.	Please rate th	ne overall co	urse on a so	cale of 1 to 7:			
	⊄⊐ not at all	12 3	(33)	moderately	5 0	£3	cz⊃ extremely effective

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	tor Ribet		Course _	neth	55		Semester SA	ring tols
Enrolle	d		Auditing		2.1		our Major	
folio	ese evaluations owing ways: (1) are teaching; (2)	for use by the	instructo	r (after gr	ades ha	ve been	turned in) in	
1.	Considering bo you rate the ov cp not at all				is instru		natter and co	extremely effective
2,	What are the in boardwork, ex- hours, homewo	amples, clarity	, willingne					tures, content, od students, office
							30	9
₂₈ =		9				×,	Ж	9*
3.	What are the in	nstructor's we	aknesses	? How co	uld the i	nstructor	improve his	/her teaching?
3	3			a				
		0					ä	
4.	Please rate the	e overall <i>cours</i>	se on a sc	ale of 1 to	7:			
	ा not at all	12	C3 33	moderate		(5)	15 0	extremely

Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be

improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

University of California, Berkeley

	7	/ (0					
Instruc	ctor <u>Ken</u>	Ribet	Course	Math 55	Se	mester	pnng 2015
Enrolle	ed	7	Auditing _	8.8	Yo	ur Major	Mosth
The follo	ese evaluation owing ways: (ns will be help 1) for use by	oful to the De the instructor	partment of Ma (after grades I in selecting co	thematics in nave been tเ	one or mor irned in) in	e of the
12	-			ossibilities of th	_	atter and co	urse, how would
	rp not at all	- 23	3 3	moderately effective	ජුව	⊑§ ⊒	extremely effective
2.	boardwork, hours, home	examples, cla ework, exams	ırity, willingne , grading).		uestions, att	itude toward	d students, office
	Very o though	pen envi	100 nmint	to ask	question	s, prep	aves motes,
çı.		′ V •					6
3.	What are the	e instructor's	weaknesses'	? How could the	e instructor i	mprove his/	her teaching?
	Proofs or	e help	al some	times for xx. May be	-intukor	i lat	they
,s	confise 1	ne a	lot 10	is. May be	more t	examples	> proof.
	and prev	5	good (ores un	en thu	y avis	2
4.	Please rate	the overall co	urse on a sc	ale of 1 to 7:			
	ದು not at all	12 1	3 3	moderately effective	:5 3	16 1	extremely effective
5.		•	•	ects of the cours to take it, etc.	se such as c	ontent, text	, how it could be
		1001 +	n have	go Hen	Polos	fr 1	7

University of California, Berkeley

Instructor Ken Ribet	Course <u>Discrete M</u>	nath 55	Semester Spri	ng 2011/2
Enrolled	Auditing		Your Major <u>Unc</u>	lecared (inte
These evaluations will be helpful to following ways: (1) for use by the future teaching; (2) for use by the	to the Department o instructor (after gra	f Mathematics i des have been	in one or more o turned in) in im	of the
1. Considering both the limitatio you rate the overall teaching not at all	•	instructor?	natter and cours	extremely effective
2. What are the instructor's stre boardwork, examples, clarity, hours, homework, exams, graph office how movinges questions.	, willingness to answ	ver questions, a	ttitude toward s	tudents, office
3. What are the instructor's wear Sometimes Lectures foillow when fort. In "New Topiz" on the Juhan Jon unfer to Smaller when Jon	are hard to bels small board. I big on the iting ensier. e on a scale of 1 to	titles really ay to see.	easter Example " op reciate (as oppos	to or ed
not at all	moderately effective	(5)	Œ \$ D	extremely effective
5. Comments on any other releving improved, advice to people we read textbook before the start homework carty affect of the start of th	ho have to take it, e		content, text, h	ow it could be

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.

Topics could be more interesting if you go more in dipth.

University of California, Berkeley

TEACHING EVALUATION SURVEY FORM

Instruc	ctor KENN	ETHRIBE	Course M	AHSS	Sc	emester_ <u>S</u>	PRING2015
	ed yes		Auditing	X. 61			PPLIED MATT
The follo	ese evaluatio owing ways:	(1) for use by t	ful to the Depar the instructor (a the students in	fter grades h	hematics in ave been t	one or mo urned in) in	ore of the
1.			ations and possing effectivenes			atter and c	ourse, how would
	not at all			oderately effective			extremely effective
2,	boardwork, hours, home easy theis of the force	examples, cla ework, exams, to follow eyestow guestows s to osk	grading). He when he wood challe and he had he had he	to answer que has a mitter on and en and en	the classics at pa	titude towa lowpa low 15 bis low 15 bis y stra uses 1	rd students, office ce that's and. Lents to n Lecture.
3.	What are th	e instructor's	weaknesses? H	low could the	instructor	improve his	s/her teaching?
4.	HIS E	xpectati	efeels +1 itdisus en of the envente ncepts for	it was	coull	hears!	por enterly mesthat recently
	ा not at all	(2)	r33	noderately effective	151	C 6 3	extremely effective

5. Comments on any other relevant aspects of the course such as content, text, how it could be improved, advice to people who have to take it, etc.