

# WUSTL Course Evaluations

5/19/2011

**Title of Course:** PRINCIPLES OF HEAT TRANSFER

**Course:** T17 3710

**Section:** 01

**Semester:** Fall 2007

**Instructors:** Michael Wendl (Instructor)

**Completed Evaluations:** 4 of 20 (20%)

**Scoring Key**

**Bold** - Score

(S) - SEAS Average Score For the Template

(D) - Department's Average Score For the Template

(M) - Median Score For the Question

**Course Section Requirements:**

Number of Quizzes	n/a
Number of Examinations	n/a
Number of short papers (1-5pgs)	n/a
Number of long papers (6 +pgs)	n/a
Number of homework assignments	n/a
Number of individual projects	n/a
Number of group projects	n/a
Number of oral presentations	n/a
Was attendance required?	No
Was class participation required?	No
Were take home exams given?	No

## Engineering Template

Organization and Grading (Michael Wendl - Instructor)

**1.00 Course requirements clearly communicated?**

(S)	1.06 of 1792	(blank)	Yes	No
(D)	1.15 of 29	0 (0.00%)	4 (100.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M)	1.00			

**1.00 Course lived up to its description?**

(S)	1.06 of 1792	(blank)	Yes	No
(D)	1.19 of 29	0 (0.00%)	4 (100.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M)	1.00			

**1.00 Understood grading procedure at the outset?**

(S)	1.13 of 1792	(blank)	Yes	No
(D)	1.26 of 29	0 (0.00%)	4 (100.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M)	1.00			

**1.00 Your grade accurately reflects understanding of the material?**

(S)	1.17 of 1792	(blank)	Yes	No
(D)	1.19 of 29	0 (0.00%)	4 (100.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M)	1.00			

# WUSTL Course Evaluations

5/19/2011

## 1.00 Exams covered what you expected?

(S) 1.09 of 1792 (blank) Yes No  
 (D) 1.13 of 29  
 (M) 1.00 0 (0.00%) 4 (100.00%) 0 (0.00%)

## 1.25 Comments on written work sufficient?

(S) 1.22 of 1792 (blank) Yes No  
 (D) 1.41 of 29  
 (M) 1.00 0 (0.00%) 3 (75.00%) 1 (25.00%)

## 8.50 Overall rating for organization/ grading

(S) 7.18 of 1792 (blank) 1 - Poor 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 - Excellent  
 (D) 6.04 of 29  
 (M) 8.50 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 2 (50.00%) 2 (50.00%)

Course Content (Michael Wendl - Instructor)

## 1.00 Work load for course was appropriate?

(S) 1.14 of 1792 (blank) Yes No  
 (D) 1.19 of 29  
 (M) 1.00 0 (0.00%) 4 (100.00%) 0 (0.00%)

## 1.00 Were you positively challenged to live up to your potential?

(S) 1.11 of 1792 (blank) Yes No  
 (D) 1.19 of 29  
 (M) 1.00 0 (0.00%) 4 (100.00%) 0 (0.00%)

## 1.00 Reasonable time to complete assignments?

(S) 1.07 of 1792 (blank) Yes No  
 (D) 1.04 of 29  
 (M) 1.00 0 (0.00%) 4 (100.00%) 0 (0.00%)

## 1.00 You found this course beneficial?

(S) 1.13 of 1792 (blank) Yes No  
 (D) 1.19 of 29  
 (M) 1.00 0 (0.00%) 4 (100.00%) 0 (0.00%)

## 1.00 Combined "real world" applications with course material?

(S) 1.07 of 1792 (blank) Yes No  
 (D) 1.11 of 29  
 (M) 1.00 0 (0.00%) 4 (100.00%) 0 (0.00%)

# WUSTL Course Evaluations

5/19/2011

## 1.25 Overall did you spend more time on this class than others?

(S)	1.41 of 1792	(blank)	Yes	No
(D)	1.48 of 29	0 (0.00%)	3 (75.00%)	1 (25.00%)
(M)	1.00			

## 8.50 Overall rating for course content

(S)	7.19 of 1792	(blank)	1 - Poor	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 - Excellent
(D)	6.70 of 29	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (50.00%)	2 (50.00%)
(M)	8.50										

Teaching (Michael Wendl - Instructor)
---------------------------------------

## 1.00 Instructor is concerned for students?

(S)	1.06 of 1792	(blank)	Yes	No
(D)	1.38 of 29	0 (0.00%)	4 (100.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M)	1.00			

## 1.00 Instructor is enthusiastic about course?

(S)	1.03 of 1792	(blank)	Yes	No
(D)	1.26 of 29	0 (0.00%)	4 (100.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M)	1.00			

## 1.00 Instructor demonstrated expertise in course material?

(S)	1.03 of 1792	(blank)	Yes	No
(D)	1.19 of 29	0 (0.00%)	4 (100.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M)	1.00			

## 1.00 Instructor made the course interesting?

(S)	1.19 of 1792	(blank)	Yes	No
(D)	1.48 of 29	0 (0.00%)	4 (100.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M)	1.00			

## 1.75 The TA for this course was effective?

(S)	1.27 of 1792	(blank)	Yes	No
(D)	1.56 of 29	0 (0.00%)	1 (25.00%)	3 (75.00%)
(M)	2.00			

## 1.00 Lecture was organized and easy to follow?

(S)	1.18 of 1792	(blank)	Yes	No
(D)	1.46 of 29	0 (0.00%)	4 (100.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M)	1.00			

# WUSTL Course Evaluations

5/19/2011

**1.00 Professor generally available for questions?**

(S) 1.06 of 1792	(blank)	Yes	No
(D) 1.15 of 29			
(M) 1.00	0 (0.00%)	4 (100.00%)	0 (0.00%)

**1.00 Homework/ Tests were returned promptly?**

(S) 1.16 of 1792	(blank)	Yes	No
(D) 1.22 of 29			
(M) 1.00	0 (0.00%)	4 (100.00%)	0 (0.00%)

**8.75 Overall rating for teaching quality?**

(S) 7.41 of 1792	(blank)	1 - Poor	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 - Excellent
(D) 5.63 of 29										
(M) 9.00	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (25.00%)	3 (75.00%)

Overall Course Evaluation (Michael Wendl - Instructor)

**8.33 Overall satisfaction with the course**

(S) 7.16 of 1792	(blank)	1 - Poor	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 - Excellent
(D) 5.65 of 29										
(M) 8.00	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (50.00%)	1 (25.00%)

Grade (Michael Wendl - Instructor)

**Expected grade for this course**

(blank)	A	B	C	D	F	P
0 (0.00%)	3 (75.00%)	1 (25.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Supplemental Course Professor Evaluation (Michael Wendl - Instructor)

**6.50 The course enhanced your ability to apply knowledge of mathematics, sciences and engineering.**

(S) 5.63 of 1792	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.40 of 29								
(M) 6.50	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (50.00%)	2 (50.00%)



# WUSTL Course Evaluations

5/19/2011

---

**5.00 The course enhanced your ability to understand the impact of engineering solutions in a global and social context.**

(S) 4.84 of 1792	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 4.32 of 29	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (25.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (75.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M) 6.00								

---

**6.25 The course helped you recognize the need for, and an ability to engage in, life-long learning.**

(S) 5.26 of 1792	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 4.46 of 29	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (25.00%)	1 (25.00%)	2 (50.00%)
(M) 6.50								

---

**2.75 The course increased your knowledge of contemporary social issues.**

(S) 4.21 of 1792	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 3.00 of 29	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (50.00%)	1 (25.00%)	1 (25.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M) 2.50								

---

**6.75 The course enhanced your ability to use the techniques, skills and modern engineering tools necessary for engineering practice.**

(S) 5.49 of 1792	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.44 of 29	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (25.00%)	3 (75.00%)
(M) 7.00								

---

**6.75 The instructor's ability to communicate in class contributed to your ability to learn the material.**

(S) 5.59 of 1792	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 4.17 of 29	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (25.00%)	3 (75.00%)
(M) 7.00								

---

**5.75 The classroom sessions/lectures for this course were worth attending each week.**

(S) 5.57 of 1792	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 4.46 of 29	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (25.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (50.00%)	1 (25.00%)
(M) 6.00								

---

**1.00 Was a course syllabus or a course information sheet distributed the first week of class?**

(S) 1.03 of 1792	(blank)	Yes	No
(D) 1.00 of 29	0 (0.00%)	4 (100.00%)	0 (0.00%)
(M) 1.00			

---

# WUSTL Course Evaluations

5/19/2011

## 1.00 Did the syllabus explain the content and administration of the course (e.g., office hours, grading)?

(S) 1.04 of 1792 (blank) Yes No  
(D) 1.00 of 29  
(M) 1.00 0 (0.00%) 4 (100.00%) 0 (0.00%)

## 1.00 In retrospect, was the syllabus an accurate reflection of how the course was actually taught?

(S) 1.06 of 1792 (blank) Yes No  
(D) 1.28 of 29  
(M) 1.00 0 (0.00%) 4 (100.00%) 0 (0.00%)

### General Comments (Michael Wendl - Instructor)

#### What did you like most about this course and professor?

- 00 I liked the lecture notes being available before class and his extreme understanding of the material and willingness to effectively answer questions
- 01 I like the way Wendl went about derivations one day, and examples another. It really helped me understand the equations fully.
- 02 COURSE COVERED MANY REAL LIFE SITUATIONS. IT WAS EASY TO SEE HOW TO APPLY WHAT WE LEARNED TO REAL LIFE.  
PROF. WENDL IS ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT THE MATERIAL AND COULD ALWAYS ANSWER QUESTIONS ASKED OF HIM.

#### How could this course and professor improve?

- 00 More examples not from the text
- 01 If the curve never hurt--only helped.
- 03 The grading system is misleading. I took fluid mechanics with the same instructor and the class grades were curved down.

#### What would you tell another student who asked you to describe this course?

- 00 Difficult, but well taught and great instructor
- 01 It's mathematically intense, challenging. It's kind of like Fluids II, same type of equations, different material covered in them.
- 02 TIME CONSUMING BUT BENEFICIAL.

#### Was the text useful? Was it understandable? Why or why not?

- 00 Yes examples were good, much better than some other texts used. The notes he wrote were also very helpful
- 01 I don't really like these textbooks, the lectures are much more worthwhile than the book.

#### Were the assigned homework or problem sets helpful and relevant to the course? Why or why not?

- 00 Yes, homework followed what we learned in class and gave a good idea of test material
- 01 The homework sets were challenging and helped me understand the course material better.

#### Please use this space to comment on any other aspect of the course. (i.e., help sessions, teaching assistants, etc.)

- 01 Wendl is one of my favorites.