

## **SUBJECT: 2.57 Nano-to-Macro Transport Processes**

### **Survey Window: Fall 2019 End of Term | Responses for Student 584**

#### **INSTRUCTORS**

Song, Qichen, Teaching Assistant

Teaching in Lecture L01 meets MW11-12.30 in 1-371

#### **QUALITY OF TEACHING**

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

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

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

Overall rating of teaching	6
----------------------------	---

*Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)*

#### **SUBJECT**

##### **SUBJECT**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Overall rating of the subject	6
-------------------------------	---

*Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)*

## **SUBJECT: 2.57 Nano-to-Macro Transport Processes**

### **Survey Window: Fall 2019 End of Term | Responses for Student 6313**

#### **INSTRUCTORS**

Song, Qichen, Teaching Assistant

Teaching in Lecture L01 meets MW11-12.30 in 1-371

#### **QUALITY OF TEACHING**

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

Stimulated my interest in the subject

Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material

Helped me learn

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

Overall rating of teaching

***Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)***

#### **SUBJECT**

#### **SUBJECT**

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

Subject expectations were clearly defined

Subject's learning objectives were met

Assignments contributed to my learning

Grading thus far has been fair

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

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

6

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

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

3

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

10

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

Overall rating of the subject

6

***Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)***



## SUBJECT: 2.57 Nano-to-Macro Transport Processes

### Survey Window: Fall 2019 End of Term | Responses for Student 9963

#### INSTRUCTORS

Song, Qichen, Teaching Assistant

Teaching in Lecture L01 meets MW11-12.30 in 1-371

#### QUALITY OF TEACHING

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

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

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

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

#### *Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)*

Qichen was extremely approachable and always available to answer questions. He explained concepts well and gave good suggestions for overcoming particularly challenging problem set questions. He was super nice and someone I definitely look up to.

#### SUBJECT

#### SUBJECT

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

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

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

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

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

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	3
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	15

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

Overall rating of the subject	7
-------------------------------	---

***Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)***

I wish I could have taken a course like this in my undergrad. It gave me a fantastic primer in engineering physics, and I would strongly recommend this course to anyone regardless of their research because it comprehensively covers many relevant and fundamental concepts in physical science.

I have only one suggestion for improvement. It would be helpful if projects from previous years were posted on Stellar to give a better idea of the expected scope. I struggled a bit with coming up with a project that was doable in a month and a half that I could potentially extend beyond the course.

Overall, this was a great course and challenging in all the right ways. I also want to give especial praise to Prof. Chen making us read and review literature each week. This is an excellent idea I think more graduate-level courses should adopt.

## **SUBJECT: 2.57 Nano-to-Macro Transport Processes**

### **Survey Window: Fall 2019 End of Term | Responses for Student 27800**

#### **INSTRUCTORS**

Song, Qichen, Teaching Assistant

Teaching in Lecture L01 meets MW11-12.30 in 1-371

#### **QUALITY OF TEACHING**

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

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

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

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

*Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)*

#### **SUBJECT**

##### **SUBJECT**

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

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

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

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

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

In the classroom (lectures, recitations, labs, seminars, etc.)	3
Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.)	5

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

Overall rating of the subject	7
-------------------------------	---

*Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)*



## **SUBJECT: 2.57 Nano-to-Macro Transport Processes**

### **Survey Window: Fall 2019 End of Term | Responses for Student 39760**

#### **INSTRUCTORS**

Song, Qichen, Teaching Assistant

Teaching in Lecture L01 meets MW11-12.30 in 1-371

#### **QUALITY OF TEACHING**

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

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

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

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

*Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)*

#### **SUBJECT**

##### **SUBJECT**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Overall rating of the subject	6
-------------------------------	---

*Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)*





## **SUBJECT: 2.57 Nano-to-Macro Transport Processes**

### **Survey Window: Fall 2019 End of Term | Responses for Student 47335**

#### **INSTRUCTORS**

Song, Qichen, Teaching Assistant

Teaching in Lecture L01 meets MW11-12.30 in 1-371

#### **QUALITY OF TEACHING**

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

Stimulated my interest in the subject

Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material

Helped me learn

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

Overall rating of teaching

**Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)**

#### **SUBJECT**

##### **SUBJECT**

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

Subject expectations were clearly defined 5

Subject's learning objectives were met 4

Assignments contributed to my learning 2

Grading thus far has been fair 6

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was: 7

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

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

Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.) 20

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

Overall rating of the subject 3

**Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)**

I found the course material was conceptually hard to grasp especially after Chapter 5. It would be great if more examples and exercise problems are discussed in class.

Student: 47335



## **SUBJECT: 2.57 Nano-to-Macro Transport Processes**

### **Survey Window: Fall 2019 End of Term | Responses for Student 54459**

#### **INSTRUCTORS**

Song, Qichen, Teaching Assistant

Teaching in Lecture L01 meets MW11-12.30 in 1-371

#### **QUALITY OF TEACHING**

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

Stimulated my interest in the subject

Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material

Helped me learn

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

Overall rating of teaching

***Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)***

#### **SUBJECT**

##### **SUBJECT**

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

Subject expectations were clearly defined 5

Subject's learning objectives were met 6

Assignments contributed to my learning 6

Grading thus far has been fair 7

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

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

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

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

Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.) 9

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

Overall rating of the subject 6

***Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)***

The number of assignments was ultimately what really made this course difficult. I enjoyed many of the problems on the assignments (some problems were a little too difficult) and sometimes the

Student: 54459

assignments beat the class to the material. But considering the volume of information to learn, the class did a great job fitting it into one semester.

## **SUBJECT: 2.570 Nano-to-Macro Transport Processes**

### **Survey Window: Fall 2019 End of Term | Responses for Student 27960**

#### **INSTRUCTORS**

Song, Qichen, Teaching Assistant

Teaching in Lecture L01 meets MW11-12.30 in 1-371

#### **QUALITY OF TEACHING**

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

Stimulated my interest in the subject

Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material

Helped me learn

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

Overall rating of teaching

**Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)**

#### **SUBJECT**

##### **SUBJECT**

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

Subject expectations were clearly defined 4

Subject's learning objectives were met 3

Assignments contributed to my learning 4

Grading thus far has been fair 7

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

The pace of the class (content and assignments) was: 7

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

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

Outside of the classroom (reading, studying, papers, projects, p-sets, online activities, etc.) 6

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

Overall rating of the subject 2

**Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)**

Covers way too much material and really does require beforehand knowledge of that material to start to understand the lectures. It just feels poorly structured and not very well thought out.

Student: 27960

The concept of combining all these disciplines and seeing how they interact together is a good one, but just poorly implemented.