



Instructor with Comments Report

2017-11-30 - 2017-12-13 Report ID: MSR04734

Instructor: Baltz, Samuel

POLSCI 391 002 - CMPLXSYS 391 002

	Responses from your Students**												Other Users of This Item*		
							Your Median	University Wide			School/College				
	5 SA	4 A	3 N	2 D	1 SD	NA		75% Above	50% Above	25% Above	75% Above	50% Above	25% Above		
4 I had a strong desire to take this course.	3	6	1	0	0	0	4.17	3.70	4.17	4.63					
891 As compared with other courses of equal credit, the workload for this course was (SA=Much Lighter, A=Lighter, N=Typical, D=Heavier, SD=Much Heavier).	0	1	5	4	0	0	2.70	2.80	3.10	3.40					
1631 This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter.	6	4	0	0	0	0	4.67	4.10	4.42	4.73					
1632 My interest in the subject has increased because of this course.	4	5	1	0	0	0	4.30	3.75	4.17	4.63					
1633 I knew what was expected of me in this course. (SA=Almost Always, A=Frequently, N=Sometimes, D=Occasionally, SD=Hardly Ever).	1	6	3	0	0	0	3.83	4.00	4.36	4.68					
230 The instructor seemed well prepared for class meetings. (SA=Almost Always, A=Frequently, N=Sometimes, D=Occasionally, SD=Hardly Ever)	9	0	1	0	0	0	4.94	4.53	4.81	4.93					
199 The instructor explained material clearly. (SA=Almost Always, A=Frequently, N=Sometimes, D=Occasionally, SD=Hardly Ever)	8	1	1	0	0	0	4.88	4.25	4.67	4.88					
217 The instructor treated students with respect.	10	0	0	0	0	0	5.00	4.70	4.87	4.95					
1 Overall, this was an excellent course.	6	4	0	0	0	0	4.67	3.88	4.30	4.70	4.00	4.48	4.69		
2 Overall, the instructor was an excellent teacher.	6	4	0	0	0	0	4.67	4.33	4.75	4.90	4.40	4.75	4.89		
3 I learned a great deal from this course.	5	4	1	0	0	0	4.50	4.00	4.38	4.70	4.10	4.50	4.73		
140 I deepened my interest in the subject matter of this course.	5	4	1	0	0	0	4.50	3.88	4.25	4.63					
201 The instructor gave clear explanations.	7	1	2	0	0	0	4.79	4.22	4.64	4.83					
203 The instructor stressed important points in lectures/discussions.	6	3	1	0	0	0	4.67	4.33	4.70	4.88					
207 The instructor appeared to have a thorough knowledge of the subject.	8	1	1	0	0	0	4.88	4.67	4.86	4.94					
219 The instructor was willing to meet and help students outside class.	9	1	0	0	0	0	4.94	4.50	4.79	4.90					
222 One real strength of this course was the classroom discussion.	4	3	2	1	0	0	4.17	3.70	4.17	4.63					
229 The instructor used class time well.	7	2	0	1	0	0	4.79	4.23	4.65	4.83					
232 Work requirements and grading system were clear from the beginning.	3	5	1	1	0	0	4.10	4.00	4.33	4.67					
241 The instructor set high standards for students.	4	4	2	0	0	0	4.25	4.25	4.59	4.80					
319 Writing assignments were interesting and stimulating.	3	3	4	0	0	0	3.83	3.80	4.07	4.50					
323 Writing assignments were relevant to what was presented in class.	5	3	2	0	0	0	4.50	4.13	4.31	4.58					
325 Writing assignments were returned promptly.	3	4	2	1	0	0	4.00	3.75	4.25	4.71					
329 Reading assignments required a reasonable amount of time and effort.	2	6	2	0	0	0	4.00	3.93	4.13	4.38					
391 The instructor suggested specific ways to improve written work.	5	3	1	1	0	0	4.50	4.03	4.50	4.75					
392 The students seemed well prepared for each class.	2	5	2	1	0	0	3.90	3.67	4.00	4.13					
393 Students frequently contributed to class discussions.	3	5	1	1	0	0	4.10	3.79	4.08	4.32					

Written Comments

900 Comment on the quality of instruction in this course.

Student 1

The group activities in the class are not as helpful as the lecture format. I would suggest short (2 min) group activities interspersed in a lecture format where you go through and mirror the model notebook format (i.e.



Instructor with Comments Report

2017-11-30 - 2017-12-13 Report ID: MSR04734

Instructor: Baltz, Samuel

POLSCI 391 002 - CMPLXSYS 391 002

assumptions, core model, extensions).

Student 2

It was very interesting material, but the exams were very hard and a lot of information to cover. I liked the more structured discussion sections that focused on a specific lecture/concept that was difficult.

Student 3

I was very intimidated by this class going in, but I've never had such a caring and considerate GSI who was so willing to help and explain things in different ways outside of class time. His energy about the course material made me excited about the course material as well. While I sometimes felt lost in lecture, I felt reassured in section and never completely out of my element thanks to Samuel. The most helpful part of section was always when we worked through problems slowly on the board or when Samuel introduced us to different applications not presented in lecture. Thank you for all the time you put in this semester!

Student 4

Good

Student 5

The quality of instruction was great! I think there were some challenges with the structure of the lectures as they relate to an ability to give quality discussion but I think that Samuel overcame those challenges well. I really enjoyed the discussions where we applied the models and discussed what models we used and why they were good for certain problems. I also think those classes were the best for preparing for the final. I wish that our classes had been less focused on the math (maybe leave that for office hours?). I could be biased because I am pretty comfortable with math but I do think it would have been nice to take the time we used on the mathematical bases of the models and used it to talk through applications/critiques of the model

Student 6

Samuel did an awesome job. He taught at a reasonable pace and had a clear understanding of topics that were covered quickly in class. I appreciated how approachable he was. I never felt like I couldn't ask a question in discussion which was really important for a class like this in which topics are covered really quickly in lecture.

Student 7

NA

Student 8

Excellent! Other than classwork (which he picked out the important or difficult ones and went through them slower or more clearly with group work or additional explanation), there are some extension of theories outside the class and useful resources (software). They added to the class and it was great to be in his discussion.

Student 9

NA

Student 10

NA

* The quartiles are calculated from Fall 2017 data. The university-wide quartiles are based on all UM classes in which an item was used. The school/college quartiles in this report are based on upper division classes with an enrollment of 16 to 74 students in Division of Social Sciences in the College of LS&A.

** SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, N - Neutral, D - Disagree, SD - Strongly Disagree, NA - Not Applicable.