

# WUSTL Course Evaluations

5/19/2011

**Title of Course:** FLUID MECHANICS

**Course:** T17 3700

**Section:** 01

**Semester:** Spring 2011

**Instructors:** Michael Wendl (Instructor)

**Completed Evaluations:** 13 of 41 (32%)

**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

Course Administration (Michael Wendl - Instructor)

**Was a course syllabus or a course information sheet distributed or available online?**

(blank)	Yes	No
0 (0.00%)	13 (100.00%)	0 (0.00%)

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

(blank)	Yes	No	N/A
0 (0.00%)	13 (100.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

**6.62**

**In retrospect, the syllabus was an accurate reflection of how the course was actually taught.**

(S) 6.06 of 2874	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree	N/A
(D) 6.14 of 75	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	10 (76.92%)	0 (0.00%)
(M) 7.00									

**Early in the semester, did your professor explain the expectations for academic integrity?**

(blank)	Yes	No
0 (0.00%)	13 (100.00%)	0 (0.00%)

# WUSTL Course Evaluations

5/19/2011

**6.62 The course matched the course catalog description.**

(S) 6.17 of 2874	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.21 of 75	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	10 (76.92%)
(M) 7.00								

Instructor (Michael Wendl - Instructor)

**6.31 Instructor made the course interesting.**

(S) 5.42 of 2874	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.88 of 75	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	5 (38.46%)	6 (46.15%)
(M) 6.00								

**6.85 Instructor was enthusiastic about the course.**

(S) 6.00 of 2874	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.16 of 75	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	11 (84.62%)
(M) 7.00								

**6.50 The material was covered at a reasonable pace.**

(S) 5.71 of 2874	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.00 of 75	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	4 (30.77%)	7 (53.85%)
(M) 7.00								

**5.92 Instructor was available to answer questions (through office hours, email, etc.).**

(S) 6.00 of 2874	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.07 of 75	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	4 (30.77%)	3 (23.08%)	5 (38.46%)
(M) 6.00								

**6.62 Instructor was well-organized and prepared for class.**

(S) 6.04 of 2874	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.25 of 75	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (38.46%)	8 (61.54%)
(M) 7.00								





# WUSTL Course Evaluations

5/19/2011

## Exams and Grade (Michael Wendl - Instructor)

### 6.54 Exams reflected material taught.

(S) 5.84 of 2874	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree	N/A
(D) 6.17 of 75	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	6 (46.15%)	7 (53.85%)	0 (0.00%)
(M) 7.00									

### 6.38 Adequate time was given to complete exams.

(S) 5.76 of 2874	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree	N/A
(D) 5.67 of 75	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	4 (30.77%)	7 (53.85%)	0 (0.00%)
(M) 7.00									

### Expected grade for this course.

(blank)	A	B	C	D	F	P
0 (0.00%)	7 (53.85%)	4 (30.77%)	2 (15.38%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

### 6.38 Your grades to this point accurately reflect your understanding of the material

(S) 5.56 of 2874	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.96 of 75	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	6 (46.15%)	6 (46.15%)
(M) 6.00								

### 6.46 The grading system was consistent and equitable.

(S) 5.73 of 2874	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 6.04 of 75	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	3 (23.08%)	8 (61.54%)
(M) 7.00								

## Overall (Michael Wendl - Instructor)

### About how many hours per week did you spend on this course outside of class?

(blank)	0	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-15	Over 15
0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	7 (53.85%)	2 (15.38%)	2 (15.38%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

### What percentage of the lectures did you attend?

(blank)	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
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 (7.69%)	1 (7.69%)	7 (53.85%)	3 (23.08%)

# WUSTL Course Evaluations

5/19/2011

**6.31 You would recommend this course to others.**

(S) 5.41 of 2874	(blank)	1 - Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly Agree
(D) 5.88 of 75	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	5 (38.46%)	6 (46.15%)
(M) 6.00								

**6.23 Overall satisfaction with the course.**

(S) 5.43 of 2874	(blank)	1 - Poor	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Excellent
(D) 5.72 of 75	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	6 (46.15%)	5 (38.46%)
(M) 6.00								

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

(S) 5.64 of 2874	(blank)	1 - Poor	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Excellent
(D) 5.93 of 75	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	3 (23.08%)	8 (61.54%)
(M) 7.00								

**4.75 The course enhanced your ability to function on multidisciplinary teams.**

(S) 5.09 of 2874	(blank)	1 - Poor	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Excellent
(D) 5.02 of 75	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	1 (7.69%)	4 (30.77%)	3 (23.08%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (23.08%)
(M) 4.50								

**4.83 The course enhanced your ability to communicate effectively.**

(S) 4.96 of 2874	(blank)	1 - Poor	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Excellent
(D) 4.96 of 75	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	1 (7.69%)	3 (23.08%)	4 (30.77%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (23.08%)
(M) 5.00								

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

(S) 5.65 of 2874	(blank)	1 - Poor	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Excellent
(D) 5.88 of 75	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	4 (30.77%)	7 (53.85%)
(M) 7.00								

Course Administration (Michael Wendl - Instructor)

Please elaborate if you felt the course did NOT match the course catalog description.

09 N/A

Instructor (Michael Wendl - Instructor)

Please elaborate if you felt the material was NOT covered at a reasonable pace.

09 Very elaborate teaching style, very satisfied.

Course Materials and Assignments (Michael Wendl - Instructor)

**Please elaborate if you felt the textbooks/readings were NOT useful.**

- 01 His notes were by far better than the book in explaining concepts
- 03 The textbook was probably not necessary for the course since the instructor provided a very detailed set of notes that served as a free textbook for the course.
- 09 N/A

TA and Recitation (Michael Wendl - Instructor)

**Please comment on the effectiveness of the TA.**

- 09 Professor Wendle was by far an effective professor in the engineering program. He should be a mentor to all professors teaching at Wash U.

**Please comment on the effectiveness of the recitation section**

- 09 N/A

Exams and Grade (Michael Wendl - Instructor)

**Please elaborate if you felt the grading system was NOT consistent and equitable.**

- 09 Very fair grading system.

Overall (Michael Wendl - Instructor)

**Any comments on why you did or did not attend lecture?**

- 09 Sometimes work got in the way of class time.
- 10 I only skipped lectures because I needed to finish work for other classes. Otherwise, I would have attended all lectures

Comments (Michael Wendl - Instructor)

**What did you like most about this course?**

- 00 The real-world applications of the material.
- 04 It was taught in great detail. Every part of each solution was explained. Answers to questions were complete.
- 09 The professor was very good in teaching the concepts of fluid mechanics. Amount of examples, and the grading was fair.
- 10 The homework was challenging enough to teach the concepts well, while not overbearing in the amount of time it required.

**What did you like the most about the professor/instructor?**

- 04 He kept the lectures interesting. He was able to add interesting facts about a lot of the material (History, applications). He was always available for questions after class.
- 09 He was the best professor I have had so far in the engineering program. His teachings/lectures were excellent and very understandable. The test were very possible and fair.
- 10 His enthusiasm and extensive knowledge on the subject, and his ability to keep the class interested and engaged

**How could this course improve?**

- 04 It was difficult to make it to class on time because of its location and having a class before. I missed some explanations on homework given at the beginning of class.
- 09 Keep doing what you are doing.

10 Making each weeks' homework due that week rather than only a few times during the semester. That way students can get feedback on homework assignments within a week or so of turning it in.

**How could the professor/instructor improve?**

09 Teach thermodynamics :)

10 Not assign so many homework problems that simply require the student to derive an equation. These don't seem to help my understanding of the course material, and often seemed very difficult.

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

04 Difficult and interesting.

09 OMG! YES!

10 Prof Wendl is very intelligent and know how to keep students engaged. He lectures in conjunction with a book of notes he wrote, which is on the course website. The homework is challenging but not impossibly so, and the tests are fair.

**Have you observed any violations of academic integrity (e.g., cheating) in this course? If so, do NOT list the names of student(s) involved; only describe the violation that you observed.**

04 no

09 N/A

10 no

**Any additional comments?**

09 Thank you so much :)