	UCLA EIP Evaluation of 171: MATH N Res	J. ANDF Instruction 131A LEC 3: o. of respons Enrollment sponse Rate	REV n P es = = 43 = 44	WS rog LYS 19 .19%	S grar sis %	n R	ерс	ort					
	LICLA Dopartment of Mathematics:	Survey Res	sult	S									
	. OCLA Department of Mathematics.												
1.1)	How would you rate your instructor as an effective teacher?	Failing	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2 H	15 9	Excellent	n=19 av.=8.63 md=9 dev.=0.83
1.2)	How would you rate the availability and helpfulness of your instructor outside of the classroom?	Failing	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2 H 8	15 9	Excellent	n=18 av.=8.78 md=9 dev.=0.55 ab.=1
— - 1.3)	What is your rating of this course independent of the effectiveness of the instructor?	Failing	0	0	1	0	1	0	2 	3	12	Excellent	n=19 av.=8.11 md=9 dev.=1.63

Profile

Subunit:

Name of the instructor: Name of the course: (Name of the survey) M.J. ANDREWS 171: MATH 131A LEC 3: ANALYSIS

MATH

Values used in the profile line: Mean



Comments Report

2. Comments:

- ^{2.1} Please use the space provided for any comments you wish to make which are pertinent to the educational process. These may include all aspects of the course: teaching, examinations, grading, textbook, etc.
- He is one of the best math professor I have in UCLA. Although the material is very hard, he tried to make it very clear by giving examples and clear explanations. He is very helpful outside of the classroom. He helped me a lot after I screwed up my quizzes. He pointed out the reasons why I made those mistakes and told me to how I could learn from those mistakes. These suggestions helped me a lot when I was preparing for the final. Thank you, Michael.
- His lecture notes are very helpful it's better than the textbook
- I haven't been doing any evaluation in a year. However, he is the only professor who really CARES about student in math department among the professors I took. If you guys can't keep him teaching real analysis, the class will eventually get fucked up.
- I thoroughly enjoyed Michael Andrews as an instructor. From his first-principles lecturing style and meticulously-labelled diagrams to his unique grading scheme and detailed lecture notes, he truly makes his teaching philosophy clear, and delivers admirably on that part. I feel that, by design of his course, I understand the concepts (sequences, continuity, differentiability) much more deeply than I would be expected to do from lower-division (and even some upper-division) courses, and feel effectively prepared for future courses in the analysis sequence. I seldom needed to refer to the textbook. I also appreciated his singularly British sense of humour.
- Michael was a very clear lecturer and the class was very well-structured. I had expected Math 131A to be very challenging, but Michael lectured in a way that made the concepts clear to understand. He has his own lecture notes, so he does not simply lecture from the textbook but has thought through how to best explain the material. In the beginning of the course, Michael spent a few lectures explaining how to properly construct proofs and emphasized a proper understanding of quantifiers. This was extremely helpful for me as I had never been given a thorough explanation of these concepts in previous classes, including Math 115A. Michael was very willing to help during office hours, and would often stay past his scheduled hours. Additionally, though homework is not collected, students are encouraged to finish practice problems and bring them to office hours to have them checked. I am glad that Michael encouraged us to do this, as this is the best way for a student to learn to write proofs. Michael is quite thorough and detailed when he grades proofs, which helped me improve my proof writing significantly. I feel that I have learned a lot from this class, and it has been an enjoyable experience for me.
- Professor Andrew is one of the best Math professors I have had at UCLA thus far. It's very hard to find Math professors who take the time to answer students' questions during lecture and are not offended. This really helps us learn as sometimes we are lost during a lecture. However he is a great lecturer (I've taken 3 classes with him) and it is always easy to follow his lectures so there are very few instances when students get lost. One thing I regret is not making the time to go to his office hours, professor Andrews seem very passionate about Math and it would have been interesting to discuss my future plans with him, I feel like he could have given me useful advice.
- Professor Andrews (and I don't know if he actually prefers to be addressed like this) was an excellent professor. First, the style of proofs that he taught us in the beginning of the course starting with truth tables and quantifiers was much clearer and explicit than proofs I have seen in textbooks for other courses and even this course. I have continued to use it after everyone else stopped halfway through the course and hope that I will eventually be able to write all proofs in the future in this format.

Second, the homework was very good at starting with the simpler problems in the beginning and leading up to the more challenging problems towards the end, which usually included proving results

that would be useful to use later in the class. The homework also was good at forcing people to use all tricks to do the proofs, such as cases, inequalities, absolute values, etc.

Some solutions to homework problems were not written because he really wanted us to try them out on our own. While this seems sensible before the quiz for that section, it does not really make sense to me why this would help a student after the quiz who really has no idea how to solve the problem and cannot make it to office hours.

The quizzes and the first final (of two) had questions similar in difficulty to the problems in the homework and were doable.

One big problem I had in the later half of the course, when proofs were no longer written in the nice format, was discerning which part of the statements were quantifiers and which statements were to be assumed as part of a sentence to be true. Usually directly verifying a sentence did not have this problem, but it led to some confusion at times which way of writing the contrapositive was correct.

The main issue I have with the course in general is power series. The power series section seems far too rushed for something that is so difficult to understand the first time around. We didn't have time to cover the proofs leading to the continuity and differentiability of power series, but the book implies that the ideas behind power series involve integration which we didn't get to. Though, I definitely prefer doing a week long intro of quantifiers and having the basis to understand proofs to getting to power series having not understood the rest of the course.

Overall, great professor, just a rushed course that I otherwise learned a lot from.

- Professor Andrews is a great professor and teaches 131A very well. Summer session was a bit rushed, but that's expected, and his grading rubric really pushed me to keep trying in the class.
- Professor Andrews is definitely the best professor I have ever met. His lectures are super clear and well explained. He made analysis into a enjoyable thing to do. Besides, he is really helpful in office hours, basically he looks through all steps of proof you write and correct it word by word. I really learned a lot in his lectures and office hours. In addition, he really cares about students. I hope he can teach more upper division classes in the future, and I will definitely go to his class if he does so.
- The course was well-organized. The notes and quiz-prep was super helpful as well. The lectures were interactive as well. Don't know how I feel regarding only a handful of top students qualifying for a second final.
- overall is good both for the teacher and the course