2.006 Thermal-Fluids Engineering II

Survey Window: Spring 2012 End of Term | View Current Catalog Entry | Print Report

Report Includes Data for:
Students: For credit
Subjects: 2.006 Thermal-Fluids Engineering II - Lecture L01, Recitation R01, Recitation R02, Recitation R03, Recitation R04
(filter data)

Eligible to Respond: 72 **Total # of Respondents:** 40 **Response rate:** 56% **Overall rating of subject:** 5.8 out of 7

Download Set of Individual Student Responses: PDF raw data

Show/Hide Comments

INSTRUCTORS

QUALITY OF TEACHING	*1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)*								*1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)*
NAME	Stimulated interest	Defined goals	Well-organized presentations	Encouraged role in learning	Encouraged participation	Used good examples	Used media well	Available	Overall rating
Lermusiaux, Pierre, Lecturer (LEC)	**6.3** (39)	**6.2** (39)	**6.5** (40)	**6.4** (40)	**6.4** (39)	**6.2** (40)	**6.2** (38)	**6.4** (38)	**6.4** (40)
Buie, Cullen, Lecturer (LEC)	**6.3** (36)	**6.5** (36)	**6.7** (36)	**6.4** (36)	**6.5** (35)	**6.5** (36)	**6.6** (35)	**6.2** (31)	**6.4** (36)
Ku, Jason S., Teaching Assistant (LEC)	**6.3** (4)	**5.7** (3)	**5.3** (3)	**5.8** (4)	**6.0** (2)	**6.0** (4)	**6.0** (2)	**6.3** (4)	**6.3** (4)
Stempien, John Dennis, Teaching Assistant (LEC)	**2.5** (2)	**0.0** (0)	**3.0** (1)	**1.0** (1)	**2.0** (1)	**3.5** (2)	**5.0** (1)	**4.0** (1)	**2.5** (2)
Lermusiaux, Pierre, Recitation Instructor (REC)	**6.4** (9)	**6.3** (9)	**6.4** (9)	**6.6** (9)	**6.8** (9)	**6.6** (9)	**6.6** (9)	**6.6** (8)	**6.6** (9)
Buie, Cullen, Recitation Instructor (REC)	**6.3** (16)	**6.8** (16)	**6.8** (16)	**6.4** (16)	**6.8** (16)	**6.6** (16)	**6.7** (16)	**6.3** (14)	**6.5** (16)
Figliuzzi, Bruno Michel, Recitation Instructor (REC)	**5.7** (6)	**6.2** (6)	**6.2** (6)	**6.0** (6)	**5.8** (6)	**6.2** (6)	**6.2** (6)	**6.0** (6)	**6.3** (7)
Ku, Jason S., Teaching Assistant (REC)	**4.0** (1)	**6.0** (1)	**5.0** (1)	**6.0** (1)	**6.0** (1)	**5.0** (1)	**6.0** (1)	**5.0** (1)	**5.0** (1)
Stempien, John Dennis, Teaching Assistant (REC)	**5.0** (1)	**5.0** (1)	**4.0** (1)	**5.0** (1)	**5.0** (1)	**5.0** (1)	**5.0** (1)	**4.0** (1)	**4.0** (1)

Ku, Jason S., Teaching Assistant in Lecture L01 - Overall rating: 6.3

QUALITY OF TEACHING	*Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)*				
	AVG	*1 2 3 4 5 6 7*	*RESPONSES*	*MEDIAN*	*STDEV*
Stimulated interest	**6.3**		4	6.5	0.96
Defined goals	**5.7**		3	6.0	0.58
Well-organized presentations	**5.3**		3	5.0	0.58
Encouraged role in learning	**5.8**		4	6.0	1.5
Encouraged participation	**6.0**		2	6.0	1.41
Used good examples	**6.0**		4	6.0	0.82
Used media well	**6.0**		2	6.0	1.41
Available	**6.3**		4	6.5	0.96

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

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

Overall rating	**6.3**		4	6.5	0.96

Comments on Teaching:

Student 5686 - I only attended his office hours but when I did he was very helpful. He knew how to explain concepts and answered my questions well.

Student 31577 - Best TA of the class. Really helpful and willing to help out.

Ku, Jason S., Teaching Assistant in Recitation R01 - Overall rating: 0.0

QUALITY OF TEACHING	*Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)*				
	AVG	***1 2 3 4 5 6 7***	***RESPONSES***	***MEDIAN***	***STDEV***
Stimulated interest	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0
Defined goals	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0
Well-organized presentations	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0
Encouraged role in learning	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0
Encouraged participation	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0
Used good examples	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0
Used media well	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0
Available	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0

	Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)				
	AVG	***1 2 3 4 5 6 7***	***RESPONSES***	***MEDIAN***	***STDEV***
Overall rating	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0

Ku, Jason S., Teaching Assistant in Recitation R02 - Overall rating: 0.0

QUALITY OF TEACHING	*Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)*				
	AVG	***1 2 3 4 5 6 7***	***RESPONSES***	***MEDIAN***	***STDEV***
Stimulated interest	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0
Defined goals	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0
Well-organized presentations	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0
Encouraged role in learning	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0
Encouraged participation	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0
Used good examples	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0
Used media well	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0
Available	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0

	Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)				
	AVG	***1 2 3 4 5 6 7***	***RESPONSES***	***MEDIAN***	***STDEV***
Overall rating	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0

Ku, Jason S., Teaching Assistant in Recitation R03 - Overall rating: 0.0

QUALITY OF TEACHING	AVG	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
		Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)			
Stimulated interest	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0
Defined goals	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0
Well-organized presentations	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0
Encouraged role in learning	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0
Encouraged participation	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0
Used good examples	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0
Used media well	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0
Available	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0

	AVG	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
		Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)			
Overall rating	**0.0**		0	0.0	0.0

Ku, Jason S., Teaching Assistant in Recitation R04 - Overall rating: 5.0

QUALITY OF TEACHING	AVG	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
		Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)			
Stimulated interest	**4.0**		1	4.0	0.0
Defined goals	**6.0**		1	6.0	0.0
Well-organized presentations	**5.0**		1	5.0	0.0
Encouraged role in learning	**6.0**		1	6.0	0.0
Encouraged participation	**6.0**		1	6.0	0.0
Used good examples	**5.0**		1	5.0	0.0
Used media well	**6.0**		1	6.0	0.0
Available	**5.0**		1	5.0	0.0

	AVG	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
		Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)			
Overall rating	**5.0**		1	5.0	0.0

Comments on Teaching:

Student 5082 - Could be more enthusiastic towards subject

SUBJECT

FACTORS IN LEARNING	AVG	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
		Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)			
Lectures contributed to my learning	**6.3**		38	7.0	1.18
Recitations contributed to my learning	**6.2**		37	6.0	0.88
Electronic materials accessible	**5.5**		34	6.0	1.58
Textbooks and other readings accessible	**4.8**		38	5.0	1.99

Electronic materials effective	**5.1**	34	5.0	1.72
Textbooks and other readings effective	**4.8**	37	5.0	1.95

ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING

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

	AVG	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
Exams measured what I learned	**5.3**		37	6.0	1.2
Problem sets helped me learn	**6.3**		36	7.0	0.93
Feedback on assignments was helpful	**4.6**		31	4.0	1.5
I have a good understanding of the concepts	**5.5**		37	6.0	1.02
I can apply the concepts	**5.6**		37	6.0	0.93
I learned a great deal	**6.4**		37	7.0	0.98

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Too Slow, 7=Too Fast (4 is best)

	AVG	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
Pace slow... fast	**4.8**		37	5.0	0.76

	AVG	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
Avg hrs spent per week in class	**4.4**	36	5.0	1.0
Avg hrs spent per week in lab	**0.1**	27	0.0	0.27
Avg hrs spent per week on homework	**8.0**	36	8.0	2.24

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

	AVG	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
Graded fairly	**5.7**		37	6.0	1.33

Rating Scale: 1=Too Light, 7=Too Heavy (4 is best)

	AVG	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
Workload light... heavy	**4.9**		36	5.0	0.76

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

	AVG	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
Overall rating of the subject	**5.8**		38	6.0	1.27

Comments on Subject Content:

Student 5082 - Could introduce more real-life applications (e.g. techniques of modelling)

Student 5615 - Great class, very well organized! Thank you all!

Student 5686 - 2.005 was difficult for me but 2.006 has been exponentially easier because of the great teaching staff. Both professors and TA's were very friendly and willing to help if a concept was not understood. Their enthusiasm for the subject matter made me enthusiastic about learning the concepts.

Student 11173 - like i said in the teacher recommendations, there should have been way more demos and empirical understanding. also, way more emphasis on entropy and what it is.

Student 13650 - Hard class but enjoyable.

Student 15080 - Stellar class, I'm not very good at it, but I loved it nonetheless

Student 15776 - Interesting stuff. I think I would do a lot better doing actual research because I am more of a hands on learner. But still very well taught nonetheless.

Student 19831 - I really enjoyed the subject matter, and throughly read the course notes.

Student 19842 - It was a lot of very challenging material crammed into one semester. perhaps giving an expansive view of what will be covered and how the

topics relate to one another would help the class seem more cohesive.

Student 24148 - Learned a ton- taught very logically.

Student 33057 - Pure substance model and how to make use of the charts was taught in a very confusing way. That section of the course could be restructured.

Student 34753 - I understand not wanting to "teach to the test," but this class has been incredibly frustrating in the disconnect I've experienced between the material covered in lectures/recitations and the material found in tests/psets.

What additional constructive feedback can you offer the instructors which might help improve the class?

Student 5082 - TAs could publicize office hours more

Student 5686 - If you can, make the T/R classes 2 hours and eliminate the Friday class. I am usually half asleep because it is early, and may not absorb as much as I could.

Student 11173 - the stuff at the very end (diffusers, nozzles, compressors, turbines and cycles) was awesome. its kind of the whole point of learning thermal fluids engineering because thats where its actually used in the real world. way more time should have been spent on that. in particular, it would have been AWESOME if before we toured the cogen plant we spent a week or two going through exactly how the cogen plant worked and applying everything we had learned to that complex system.

Student 19831 - I was unable to attend recitations due to my schedule, which was rather unfortunate. I didn't show up to most of the lectures because I found the notes very thorough, and versatile. Was a bit annoyed with the exams, as were others I talked to, but that might just have been because I stopped attending lectures three weeks into the semester.

Student 24148 - Next year, have the copy tech bind the property tables "spiral notebook" form- that way you can fold pages over to the back- would be much easier to work with.

Student 34753 - Make Psets worth more of the term grade so that people will have a greater incentive to do them. When the Psets are worth so little, a student who is loaded down with work will often let those slip first, as they have the smallest impact (on paper, at least) on his/her grades.

Student 36441 - The psets were so difficult that it was hard for me to justify finishing them, since they weren't worth many points. It may help to either make the psets more straight forward or make them worth more points.

Student 38093 - There needs to be way more ties to things we know about everything in this class is presented as if it were a brand new and isn't related to anything, but it's still something physical we see fluid dynamics in our everyday lives, but there are very few times the lecturer will stop and make a connection to something. An example is during one of the first boiling lectures the lecturer didn't say the word pot or stove until very near the end. When fairly removed things like equations made of chalk derived from experiments that took geniuses come up with are the primary topic of discussion it's very helpful to be drug back to reality once in a while, or at least start there. The dimensional analysis and cycles lectures were very good. Of lesser importance I think the course notes should be offered online they are truly the most helpful part of this course, but shelling out $120 for something that doesn't even have an index is kind of silly.

SUBJECT SPECIFIC QUESTIONS - 2.006

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

	AVG	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
able to model many thermofluid systems & energy conversion systems, both component & systems level	**5.7**		38	6.0	1.07
2.005/2.006 sequence improved my ability to identify, formulate, and solve engineering problems.	**6.1**		37	6.0	0.91
understand & apply the fundamental priciples & laws of thermodynamics, fluid mechanics, & heat transfer	**6.0**		37	6.0	0.82

percentage of assigned reading actually read	***SELECTED***	***RESPONSES***
0-15%	34%	13
16-30%	18%	7
31-45%	8%	3
46-60%	16%	6
61-75%	5%	2
76-90%	8%	3
91-100%	11%	4

most important learning mechanism	***SELECTED***	***RESPONSES***
lectures	29%	11
recitations	8%	3
homework	53%	20
reading assignments	8%	3

discussion with other students	3%	1

Show/Hide Comments

(top of page)