



Instructor with Comments Report

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

Instructor: Baltz, Samuel

POLSCI 391 005 - CMPLXSYS 391 005

	Responses from your Students**							Other Users of This Item*			School/College		
	5 SA	4 A	3 N	2 D	1 SD	NA	Your Median	University Wide			75% Above	50% Above	25% Above
								75% Above	50% Above	25% Above			
4 I had a strong desire to take this course.	3	5	0	0	0	0	4.30	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	2	3	3	0	0	2.83	2.80	3.10	3.40	4.00	4.33	4.63
1631 This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter.	4	3	1	0	0	0	4.50	4.10	4.42	4.73			
1632 My interest in the subject has increased because of this course.	2	4	1	1	0	0	4.00	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).	0	5	1	2	0	0	3.70	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)	5	2	1	0	0	0	4.70	4.53	4.81	4.93			
199 The instructor explained material clearly. (SA=Almost Always, A=Frequently, N=Sometimes, D=Occasionally, SD=Hardly Ever)	3	4	1	0	0	0	4.25	4.25	4.67	4.88			
217 The instructor treated students with respect.	7	1	0	0	0	0	4.93	4.70	4.87	4.95			
1 Overall, this was an excellent course.	3	1	4	0	0	0	3.50	3.88	4.30	4.70	4.00	4.48	4.69
2 Overall, the instructor was an excellent teacher.	3	4	1	0	0	0	4.25	4.33	4.75	4.90	4.40	4.75	4.89
3 I learned a great deal from this course.	2	3	3	0	0	0	3.83	4.00	4.38	4.70	4.10	4.50	4.73
140 I deepened my interest in the subject matter of this course.	2	3	3	0	0	0	3.83	3.88	4.25	4.63			
201 The instructor gave clear explanations.	3	3	2	0	0	0	4.17	4.22	4.64	4.83			
203 The instructor stressed important points in lectures/discussions.	4	3	0	1	0	0	4.50	4.33	4.70	4.88			
207 The instructor appeared to have a thorough knowledge of the subject.	3	3	2	0	0	0	4.17	4.67	4.86	4.94			
219 The instructor was willing to meet and help students outside class.	5	3	0	0	0	0	4.70	4.50	4.79	4.90			
222 One real strength of this course was the classroom discussion.	2	3	1	2	0	0	3.83	3.70	4.17	4.63			
229 The instructor used class time well.	3	4	1	0	0	0	4.25	4.23	4.65	4.83			
232 Work requirements and grading system were clear from the beginning.	1	4	2	1	0	0	3.75	4.00	4.33	4.67			
241 The instructor set high standards for students.	2	4	2	0	0	0	4.00	4.25	4.59	4.80			
319 Writing assignments were interesting and stimulating.	1	2	3	2	0	0	3.17	3.80	4.07	4.50			
323 Writing assignments were relevant to what was presented in class.	0	7	1	0	0	0	3.93	4.13	4.31	4.58			
325 Writing assignments were returned promptly.	0	3	1	4	0	0	2.50	3.75	4.25	4.71			
329 Reading assignments required a reasonable amount of time and effort.	1	5	1	1	0	0	3.90	3.93	4.13	4.38			
391 The instructor suggested specific ways to improve written work.	2	4	0	2	0	0	4.00	4.03	4.50	4.75			
392 The students seemed well prepared for each class.	0	2	5	1	0	0	3.10	3.67	4.00	4.13			
393 Students frequently contributed to class discussions.	0	5	0	3	0	0	3.70	3.79	4.08	4.32			

Written Comments

900 Comment on the quality of instruction in this course.

Student 1

This is one of the best GSIs I've had. I can't stress that enough. He made material that was so dense and flew over my head much more accessible. I felt comfortable asking questions in discussion, and felt that attending



Instructor with Comments Report

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

Instructor: Baltz, Samuel

POLSCI 391 005 - CMPLXSYS 391 005

discussion actually was a good use of my time. Basically, this GSI made very hard, intimidating material easier to understand and apply, through teaching in an engaging and accessible style.

Ways to improve:

- 1. hand the homework back faster or make it a point to hand it back regularly*
- 2. maybe go over some of the harder homework problems in class after we turn it in so everyone's on the same page*

Things done well:

- 1. really engaging discussion section, wasn't boring*
- 2. really liked the mix of independent work, group work, and lecture style in discussion. good variety of teaching styles too depending on how you learn.*

Student 2

Samuel offered valuable insight into the subjects we learned in lecture, especially when it came to clarification of the details. The discussion and lecture combination format worked unusually well in this class; I think professor Page and Samuel complement each other well. While we get a lot (a lot a lot) of big picture ideas from lecture, in discussion we are able to ask all the questions we need of the finer details and together that grants a complete picture of the subject matter. I think the quality of the teaching in the discussion was very good. The format of the discussion was not my favorite; historically I have preferred classes where discussions had a lot more students talking and thinking together. For this class, however, the discussion had a bigger role for teaching more on the subjects learned in lecture rather than as reflection for the students, so I understand why it was formatted the way it was. Samuel's knowledge of the material was more than sufficient and his understanding of the math background was helpful and apparent.

Student 3

This course had barely any relation to politics, government, elections or anything that relates to most political science classes - I think this should be more clear in the description.

Student 4

Well aligned with lecture. OH were student-friendly. The one change I would make would be spending less discussion time on logistics issues. Also, we started the discussion sections thinking we would spend 20 minutes on each day of lecture from that week, but by the end that structure completely changed (and probably for the better). Group activities, comparing models notebooks, and more stimulation rather than review would have been really awesome. I thought Samuel did a phenomenal job for his first time, especially with speaking clearly and answering questions to the best of his ability.

Student 5

NA

Student 6

Samuel was an incredible GSI. He made sure to bring in background information to discussion to enhance our understanding of lectures. He also presented them in an organized fashion and in multiple ways for different learning styles. Furthermore, he kept the environment of the discussion as a collaborative and creative one. He clearly cared about not just getting good grades but more about us understanding the concepts and how to apply them to our lives, future disciplines, and the greater world.

Student 7

This class was the hardest one I've taken at Michigan. Appreciated GSI's willingness to answer questions and do tedious examples in office hours. Samuel was always super enthusiastic about the material and models, which served as its own encouragement in addition to his perceived care for students. Wanted more resources uploaded on the discussion Canvas page, especially when GSI brought up links and slides. Unclear how well GSI communicated and met with prof, made me less confident as a student. I know the GSI union has strong rules about hours worked, but I wish hw could be returned more efficiently and quickly with comments when I got things fundamentally wrong. In future, maybe send a Canvas announcement with the agenda of models to be covered/announcements written out before section meeting in order to maximize our limited time and give stronger sense of organization. Enjoyed use of chalkboard visuals in section for explanations. Sometimes his added content confused me further rather than easing my fears of Scott Page's lectures. Overall, I am so grateful for Samuel in this class in particular! Best wishes for his future classes and those lucky students!

Student 8

The class overall was great, I wish the logistics and grade requirements were described more clearly. Also homework collection and distribution could be run smoother.

* 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.