

**Graduate Course Evaluation for Michael Thompson-Brusstar
School of Global Policy and Strategy**GPPS 404 - Chinese Politics
Section ID 238206
Section Number A00
Fall 2023**Number of Evaluations Submitted: 21**
Number of Students Enrolled: 33

1. What is your reason for taking this class?

10 (47.6%): Core Course Requirement
11 (52.4%): Subject Area Requirement
0 (0.0%): Elective
0 (0.0%): Interest

2. The Instructor was clear about course expectations.

13 (61.9%): Strongly Agree
8 (38.1%): Agree
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

3. The Instructor was well-prepared for class.

15 (71.4%): Strongly Agree
6 (28.6%): Agree
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

4. The Instructor organized class activities in a way that promoted learning.

11 (52.4%): Strongly Agree
7 (33.3%): Agree
3 (14.3%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

5. The Instructor promoted and encouraged questions and discussion.

16 (76.2%): Strongly Agree
5 (23.8%): Agree
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

6. The Instructor provided feedback (written/oral) in a way that promoted learning.

11 (52.4%): Strongly Agree
7 (33.3%): Agree
2 (9.5%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
1 (4.8%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

7. The Instructor was accessible to students outside of class (office hours, e-mail, etc.).

15 (71.4%): Strongly Agree
6 (28.6%): Agree
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

8. I would recommend this instructor overall.

14 (66.7%): Strongly Agree
4 (19.0%): Agree
3 (14.3%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

9. What is your overall rating of the Instructor?

14 (66.7%): Excellent
5 (23.8%): Above Average
2 (9.5%): Average
0 (0.0%): Below Average
0 (0.0%): Poor

10. General comments about the Instructor's performance

Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community

- excellent!
- Great Professor, I like him
- Micheal is good but sometimes he might be too nervous. Also, I like this course on Thursday since there's a presentation and the instructor's sharing; however, Tuesday's course is less efficient since two groups of students are conducting discussions at the same time in one class. In my view, that's not a good idea.
- Professor Brusstar-Thompson was very enthusiastic about the subject and provided extra explanations that clarified class content. In-class discussions helped improve understanding of different readings, as well as the in-class presentations assignment. Overall, a very good instructor that made class interesting.
- The instructor demonstrated in-depth knowledge of the content as well as an infectious passion for investigating and digging deeper into the course material.

11. I would recommend this course overall.

13 (61.9%): Strongly Agree
6 (28.6%): Agree
2 (9.5%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

12. What is your overall rating of this course?

16 (76.2%): Excellent
1 (4.8%): Above Average
4 (19.0%): Average
0 (0.0%): Below Average
0 (0.0%): Poor

13. What were the particular strengths of this course?

- Engaging with the content was a required part of the course and helped build understanding of the readings.

- Great professor
- Love the discussion sessions. Presentations not so much.
- The combination of historical, sociological, economic, and political perspectives enriched my understanding of the course content.
- This course pushed me to read a lot of new reading materials during class which enriched my knowledge.

14. What suggestions do you have for making this course more effective?

- Discussion part could be more creative.
- I feel like we can concentrate Mao's period into the first two weeks, and have a more detailed explanation on Deng, Jiang, and Hu periods.
- I think the group discussions were not as effective as they could have been. Usually it was only two-three people participating in each discussion. Perhaps in the future these discussions could be held in a larger number of smaller groups so that more people would feel comfortable participating.
- Maybe no discussion on Tuesday? Not effective, and separating the group is not working well
- The student led presentations were not my favorite. While individually I learned while I was presenting, it felt like a reiteration of the material that we were already expected to know. To be honest, by the end of the term I started to skim the Thursday material and listen to the reading presentations to fill in the gaps. Personally, I got lazy as a result. Presentations of optional readings would be great.

15. What one concept did you take from this class that will shape your future?

- Deep thinking skill
- The tiao-kuai view of political structures and fragmented authority within bureaucracies.
- Tiao-kuai.

16. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community

- Great professor, interesting class, but no discussion please
- I think future classes should delve further into specific case studies representing how various themes covered in the class come together.

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, School of Global Policy and Strategy, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego.

Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.

University of Michigan
 Winter 2022 Instructor Report With Comments
 POLSCI 514-001: Soc Sci Comput
 Michael Thompson-Brusstar

5 out of 7 students responded to this evaluation.

Responses to University-wide questions about the course:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	Univ-wide Median	School/College Median
This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter. (Q1631)	4	1	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.6	4.8
My interest in the subject has increased because of this course. (Q1632)	4	1	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.2	4.7
I knew what was expected of me in this course.(Q1633)	4	0	1	0	0	0	4.9	4.6	4.8
I had a strong desire to take this course.(Q4)	5	0	0	0	0	0	5.0	4.1	4.6
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). (Q891)	0	2	3	0	0	0	3.3	3.0	3.0

Responses to University-wide questions about the instructor:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	Univ-wide Median	School/College Median
Michael Thompson-Brusstar seemed well prepared for class meetings.(Q230)	5	0	0	0	0	0	5.0	4.8	4.9
Michael Thompson-Brusstar explained material clearly.(Q199)	3	2	0	0	0	0	4.7	4.7	4.9
Michael Thompson-Brusstar treated students with respect. (Q217)	5	0	0	0	0	0	5.0	4.8	4.9

Responses to questions about the course:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median
I gained a good understanding of concepts/principles in this field. (Q121)	3	2	0	0	0	0	4.7
I learned to identify main points and central issues in this field. (Q123)	2	3	0	0	0	0	4.3
I developed ability to carry out original research in this area. (Q128)	2	2	1	0	0	0	4.3
I developed an ability to evaluate new work in this field. (Q129)	2	2	1	0	0	0	4.3
Writing assignments were interesting and stimulating. (Q319)	3	1	0	0	0	1	4.8
Reading assignments seemed carefully chosen. (Q326)	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.0
Students felt comfortable asking questions. (Q892)	5	0	0	0	0	0	5.0
My expected grade in this course is (SA=A, A=B, N=C, D=D, SD=E). (Q896)	5	0	0	0	0	0	5.0

Responses to questions about the instructor:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median
Michael Thompson-Brusstar stressed important points in lectures/discussions. (Q203)	5	0	0	0	0	0	5.0
Michael Thompson-Brusstar acknowledged all questions insofar as possible. (Q216)	5	0	0	0	0	0	5.0
Michael Thompson-Brusstar was willing to meet and help students outside class. (Q219)	5	0	0	0	0	0	5.0

The medians are calculated from Winter 2022 data. University-wide medians are based on all UM classes in which an item was used. The school/college medians in this report are based on classes that are graduate level with enrollment of 1 to 15 in Division of Social Sciences in the College of LS&A.

Written Comments

Comment on the quality of instruction in this course. (Q900)

Comments
Mike is clearly very knowledgeable and wanted to share as much as possible with us to help in our own research. Sometimes, it seemed like he forgot how little first years know and the instruction was several layers above what I felt I could comprehend or retain. Overall, it was a really useful class and I think it went well.
Michael is a wonderful instructor, with great knowledge of R programming. I learned a lot in his class and I'm eager to learn more on my own.
Mike put a lot of thought and effort into the lectures for this class, and that came through. The modules were relevant, his instruction was clear, and he taught us at a level that was neither too far above or too far below our aptitude. I think we all have a stronger understanding of some of the established and emerging computational social science techniques available to us, and that's because of Mike's efforts.
Mike also regularly checked in with us about what was going well for us in the class, and what was not working. He adapted the content and structure of the class (within bounds) in response to our feedback, and that made for a much more effective learning experience than I might have had otherwise. I found the course to be a good balance of lecture and hands-on practice, though that balance will be different for different groups of students, so Mike's practice of checking in regularly is excellent teaching practice.
Finally, the milestone project gave me an opportunity to explore a topic of interest to me and apply some techniques and tools we learned in the class. Mike was always available when I had questions, but I (personally) learned a lot via independent exploration through this project. The fact that I was learning about a question of interest to me was motivating, and I expect to be using what I learned through that project, and through Mike's lectures, onward through my graduate school experience and into my career.

Please take a moment to reflect on your personal performance in the class. For example, did you attend class regularly? Did you ask questions when you were confused? Why or why not?

Comments
I attended class regularly and asked lots of questions. I chose to take this class and it was my one elective this semester so I wanted to put in the effort.
I attended class regularly and always felt comfortable asking questions. Mike was always very respectful and knowledgeable (and found answers for things he didn't know offhand), and, from my perspective, he fostered a safe classroom culture in which students were comfortable asking questions when they didn't understand something.



UNIVERSITY OF
MICHIGAN

Fall 2018 Instructor Report With Comments for POLSCI 140-008: Int Compar Pol (Michael Thompson-Brusstar)

Project Title: **Central Campus Fall 2018 Evaluation**

Course Audience: **15**

Responses Received: **9**

Response Ratio: **60.0%**

Report Comments

This report is a summary that tabulates all quantitative ratings on a single page. Results from the open-ended questions appear at the end of the report. Ratings are from the Fall 2018 teaching evaluations of POLSCI 140-008: Int Compar Pol.

Prepared by: **Office of the Registrar**

Creation Date: **Fri, Jan 04, 2019**

Responses to the University-wide questions about the course:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median	School/College Median
This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter.	6	1	1	0	0	0	4.8	4.5	4.5
My interest in the subject has increased because of this course.	4	1	1	2	0	0	4.5	4.1	4.1
I knew what was expected of me in this course.	4	3	1	0	0	0	4.5	4.4	4.3
Overall, this was an excellent course.	3	3	1	1	0	0	4.2	4.2	4.2
I had a strong desire to take this course.	3	2	1	2	0	0	4.0	4.0	3.8
As compared with other courses of equal credit, the workload for this course was... (SA=Much Lighter to SD=Much Heavier)	0	0	5	2	0	1	2.8	3.0	3.0

Responses to the University-wide questions about the instructor:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median	School/College Median
Overall, Michael Thompson-Brusstar was an excellent teacher.	6	1	0	1	0	0	4.8	4.5	4.7
Michael Thompson-Brusstar seemed well prepared for class meetings.	4	2	2	0	0	0	4.5	4.8	4.8
Michael Thompson-Brusstar explained material clearly.	4	2	0	2	0	0	4.5	4.6	4.7
Michael Thompson-Brusstar treated students with respect.	7	1	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.8	4.9

Responses to additional questions about the course:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median
I deepened my interest in the subject matter of this course. (Q140)	4	1	2	1	0	0	4.5	4.1
Work requirements and grading system were clear from the beginning. (Q232)	5	2	0	1	0	0	4.7	4.4
Writing assignments were interesting and stimulating. (Q319)	1	5	0	2	0	0	3.9	4.0
Writing assignments were relevant to what was presented in class. (Q323)	5	1	1	1	0	0	4.7	4.4
My expected grade in this course is (SA=A, A=B, N=C, D=D, SD=E)	7	1	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.8

Responses to additional questions about the instructor:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median
Michael Thompson-Brusstar stressed important points in lectures/discussions. (Q203)	6	2	0	0	0	0	4.8	4.6
Michael Thompson-Brusstar was willing to meet and help students outside class. (Q219)	5	2	0	0	0	1	4.8	4.7
Michael Thompson-Brusstar used class time well. (Q229)	5	2	1	0	0	0	4.7	4.6
Michael Thompson-Brusstar set high standards for students. (Q241)	4	3	1	0	0	0	4.5	4.4
Michael Thompson-Brusstar suggested specific ways to improve written work. (Q391)	3	3	1	1	0	0	4.2	4.1

The medians are calculated from Fall 2018 data. University-wide medians are based on all UM classes in which an item was used. The school/college medians in this report are based on classes that are lower division with enrollment of 1 to 15 in Division of Social Sciences in the College of LS&A.

Written Comments

Comment on the quality of instruction in this course. (Q900)

Comments
Mike always made himself easily available for office hours, and always very helpful regarding questions about assignments and course content
Very impressed with his teaching, always helped me understand the topics much better than the lectures. I wish the group project topics were explained better — my topic was not at all explained in class. My biggest complaint is his office hours. They were only once a week for 2 hours so it was hard to attend when I had a class during that time. Wish it was twice a week so I could have more access to help.
nice, humorous, usually good at lowering the lecture's more abstract ideas and definitions to real-life scenarios and breaking it down into comprehensive explanations
None.
I believe he well clarified confusing but key points of each lecture. If not, he provided ample opportunities for office hours which I appreciated greatly.
It was hard to follow the mini-lectures in section. There was a lot of bouncing around and partial explaining of concepts, lots of "oh, we'll talk about that in a minute," and then never getting back to it. There were some concepts that I had learned about in previous courses and I felt that the explanations of these concepts were incomplete and I could see why other students would be confused, if they didn't have background knowledge on the subject matter. I also wish that there had been more time in section to meet with our group project members, as it seemed like an afterthought and it counts for 15% of our grade.



UNIVERSITY OF
MICHIGAN

Fall 2018 Instructor Report With Comments for POLSCI 140-007: Int Compar Pol (Michael Thompson-Brusstar)

Project Title: **Central Campus Fall 2018 Evaluation**

Course Audience: **19**

Responses Received: **16**

Response Ratio: **84.2%**

Report Comments

This report is a summary that tabulates all quantitative ratings on a single page. Results from the open-ended questions appear at the end of the report. Ratings are from the Fall 2018 teaching evaluations of POLSCI 140-007: Int Compar Pol.

Prepared by: **Office of the Registrar**

Creation Date: **Thu, Jan 03, 2019**

Responses to the University-wide questions about the course:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median	School/College Median
This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter.	5	9	2	0	0	0	4.2	4.5	4.4
My interest in the subject has increased because of this course.	4	5	4	3	0	0	3.7	4.1	4.1
I knew what was expected of me in this course.	5	6	3	2	0	0	4.0	4.4	4.4
Overall, this was an excellent course.	4	7	3	2	0	0	3.9	4.2	4.2
I had a strong desire to take this course.	4	8	3	1	0	0	4.0	4.0	3.9
As compared with other courses of equal credit, the workload for this course was... (SA=Much Lighter to SD=Much Heavier)	0	0	13	3	0	0	2.9	3.0	3.2

Responses to the University-wide questions about the instructor:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median	School/College Median
Overall, Michael Thompson-Brusstar was an excellent teacher.	7	5	2	1	1	0	4.3	4.5	4.5
Michael Thompson-Brusstar seemed well prepared for class meetings.	7	8	1	0	0	0	4.4	4.8	4.7
Michael Thompson-Brusstar explained material clearly.	9	5	1	0	1	0	4.6	4.6	4.6
Michael Thompson-Brusstar treated students with respect.	10	4	2	0	0	0	4.7	4.8	4.8

Responses to additional questions about the course:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median
I deepened my interest in the subject matter of this course. (Q140)	2	5	5	3	1	0	3.3	4.1
Work requirements and grading system were clear from the beginning. (Q232)	4	3	5	3	1	0	3.3	4.4
Writing assignments were interesting and stimulating. (Q319)	2	4	3	6	1	0	2.8	4.0
Writing assignments were relevant to what was presented in class. (Q323)	3	9	2	1	1	0	3.9	4.4
My expected grade in this course is (SA=A, A=B, N=C, D=D, SD=E)	11	5	0	0	0	0	4.8	4.8

Responses to additional questions about the instructor:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median
Michael Thompson-Brusstar stressed important points in lectures/discussions. (Q203)	8	4	1	1	1	0	4.6	4.6
Michael Thompson-Brusstar was willing to meet and help students outside class. (Q219)	5	4	3	0	0	3	4.3	4.7
Michael Thompson-Brusstar used class time well. (Q229)	7	5	4	0	0	0	4.3	4.6
Michael Thompson-Brusstar set high standards for students. (Q241)	7	8	0	0	0	0	4.4	4.4
Michael Thompson-Brusstar suggested specific ways to improve written work. (Q391)	4	4	2	5	1	0	3.5	4.1

The medians are calculated from Fall 2018 data. University-wide medians are based on all UM classes in which an item was used. The school/college medians in this report are based on classes that are lower division with enrollment of 16 to 74 in Division of Social Sciences in the College of LS&A.

Written Comments

Comment on the quality of instruction in this course. (Q900)

Comments
Mike was overall good, but I think the feedback on my writing could have been more clear. We never even get our homework assignments or midterm back, so there is no way to improve. It really makes no sense whatsoever. In addition, I think a more targeted way of preparing students for exams would make more sense. It's an open book exam and yet I still felt unprepared for the midterm.
Mr. Thompson was a very good instructor and clarified a lot of the difficult topics of the lectures.
Mike is a great teacher. He's clearly passionate about the subject and explains things very clearly. He made the discussion interesting and is a very fair grader. I'm not really interested in taking another Comparative Politics class and didn't really like the material but I loved my discussion section.
Always looked forward to coming to discussion section. I always came away from class having learned something.
Was fairly low. Expected too much and thought we were PhD students like himself.
I really thought time in section added a lot of understanding to the topic and understanding of how all the components of the class were connected
Michael was a great, intelligent GSI. He really knew this stuff



UNIVERSITY OF
MICHIGAN

Fall 2018 Instructor Report With Comments for POLSCI 140-005: Int Compar Pol (Michael Thompson-Brusstar)

Project Title: **Central Campus Fall 2018 Evaluation**

Course Audience: **19**

Responses Received: **12**

Response Ratio: **63.2%**

Report Comments

This report is a summary that tabulates all quantitative ratings on a single page. Results from the open-ended questions appear at the end of the report. Ratings are from the Fall 2018 teaching evaluations of POLSCI 140-005: Int Compar Pol.

Prepared by: **Office of the Registrar**

Creation Date: **Fri, Jan 04, 2019**

Responses to the University-wide questions about the course:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median	School/College Median
This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter.	9	2	1	0	0	0	4.8	4.5	4.4
My interest in the subject has increased because of this course.	4	5	2	1	0	0	4.1	4.1	4.1
I knew what was expected of me in this course.	5	5	2	0	0	0	4.3	4.4	4.4
Overall, this was an excellent course.	6	5	0	1	0	0	4.5	4.2	4.2
I had a strong desire to take this course.	1	4	4	1	0	0	3.5	4.0	3.9
As compared with other courses of equal credit, the workload for this course was... (SA=Much Lighter to SD=Much Heavier)	0	1	7	4	0	0	2.8	3.0	3.2

Responses to the University-wide questions about the instructor:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median	School/College Median
Overall, Michael Thompson-Brusstar was an excellent teacher.	6	5	0	1	0	0	4.5	4.5	4.5
Michael Thompson-Brusstar seemed well prepared for class meetings.	8	3	1	0	0	0	4.8	4.8	4.7
Michael Thompson-Brusstar explained material clearly.	7	3	2	0	0	0	4.6	4.6	4.6
Michael Thompson-Brusstar treated students with respect.	9	2	1	0	0	0	4.8	4.8	4.8

Responses to additional questions about the course:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median
I deepened my interest in the subject matter of this course. (Q140)	3	5	3	1	0	0	3.9	4.1
Work requirements and grading system were clear from the beginning. (Q232)	3	8	0	0	0	0	4.2	4.4
Writing assignments were interesting and stimulating. (Q319)	1	6	1	3	0	0	3.8	4.0
Writing assignments were relevant to what was presented in class. (Q323)	4	6	1	1	0	0	4.2	4.4
My expected grade in this course is (SA=A, A=B, N=C, D=D, SD=E)	8	3	0	0	0	1	4.8	4.8

Responses to additional questions about the instructor:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median
Michael Thompson-Brusstar stressed important points in lectures/discussions. (Q203)	9	3	0	0	0	0	4.8	4.6
Michael Thompson-Brusstar was willing to meet and help students outside class. (Q219)	8	2	1	0	0	1	4.8	4.7
Michael Thompson-Brusstar used class time well. (Q229)	8	3	0	1	0	0	4.8	4.6
Michael Thompson-Brusstar set high standards for students. (Q241)	6	4	1	0	0	0	4.6	4.4
Michael Thompson-Brusstar suggested specific ways to improve written work. (Q391)	5	4	2	0	0	0	4.4	4.1

The medians are calculated from Fall 2018 data. University-wide medians are based on all UM classes in which an item was used. The school/college medians in this report are based on classes that are lower division with enrollment of 16 to 74 in Division of Social Sciences in the College of LS&A.

Written Comments

Comment on the quality of instruction in this course. (Q900)

Comments
His discussion sections were formulated mostly as lectures rather than stimulating discussions.
Mike was a fantastic GSI who clarified material and made the class more interesting
Although challenging, Michael Thompson–Brusstar was an amazing GSI. I sometimes felt his standards were set too high, especially at the beginning, but it encouraged me to keep working harder and go above and beyond. I met with him during office hours a few times to get feedback on assignments/exams and ask questions for other assignments/exams/projects. He has super specific feedback for my personal work and specific suggestions for me that enabled me to do much better the next time. He is understanding and helpful. During discussion section, he always explained topics thoroughly and answered our questions, which was very helpful.
I really thought section was interesting, and I was always learning something new. We were never doing things to take up time. I really liked listening to what Mike had to say. He always had a plan and came prepared and had a deep understanding of the concepts he was teaching. I also really liked the format of discussion where there were times to participate but focused on him lecturing so I could really grasp the material. I was skeptical in the beginning because I am not really into political science, but it ended up being my favorite section!
Very obvious that Mike has had experience teaching because he knows how to command a classroom with clarity and confidence. He outlines course readings by asking for class participation in a way that requires not only understanding but also critical thinking. Time in discussion cements and expands upon lecture content.
I thought you did a great job. Sometimes you seemed to come in without a plan and talked a bit fast. But overall you answered questions and explained the material well.



Instructor with Comments Report

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

Instructor: Thompson, Michael R
POLSCI 140 003

	Responses from your Students**							Other Users of This Item*			School/College		
	5	4	3	2	1	Your	University Wide			75%	50%	25%	
	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA	Median	75% Above	50% Above	25% Above	75% Above	50% Above	25% Above
4 I had a strong desire to take this course.	2	2	0	0	0	0	4.50	3.70	4.17	4.63	3.88	4.11	4.40
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	0	1	1	2	0	1.50	2.80	3.10	3.40			
1631 This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter.	1	1	0	2	0	0	3.00	4.10	4.42	4.73			
1632 My interest in the subject has increased because of this course.	0	2	1	0	1	0	3.50	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	1	0	1	1	0	3.00	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)	3	1	0	0	0	0	4.83	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	1	0	0	0	0	4.83	4.25	4.67	4.88			
217 The instructor treated students with respect.	3	1	0	0	0	0	4.83	4.70	4.87	4.95			
1 Overall, this was an excellent course.	0	2	1	0	1	0	3.50	3.88	4.30	4.70	3.83	4.17	4.50
2 Overall, the instructor was an excellent teacher.	3	1	0	0	0	0	4.83	4.33	4.75	4.90	4.17	4.63	4.83
3 I learned a great deal from this course.	0	2	2	0	0	0	3.50	4.00	4.38	4.70	4.00	4.20	4.50
140 I deepened my interest in the subject matter of this course.	0	2	1	0	1	0	3.50	3.88	4.25	4.63			
201 The instructor gave clear explanations.	3	1	0	0	0	0	4.83	4.22	4.64	4.83			
203 The instructor stressed important points in lectures/discussions.	2	0	1	1	0	0	4.00	4.33	4.70	4.88			
207 The instructor appeared to have a thorough knowledge of the subject.	3	1	0	0	0	0	4.83	4.67	4.86	4.94			
219 The instructor was willing to meet and help students outside class.	3	1	0	0	0	0	4.83	4.50	4.79	4.90			
222 One real strength of this course was the classroom discussion.	0	2	0	1	1	0	3.00	3.70	4.17	4.63			
229 The instructor used class time well.	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	4.23	4.65	4.83			
232 Work requirements and grading system were clear from the beginning.	0	2	1	1	0	0	3.50	4.00	4.33	4.67			
241 The instructor set high standards for students.	0	3	1	0	0	0	3.83	4.25	4.59	4.80			
319 Writing assignments were interesting and stimulating.	1	0	1	1	1	0	2.50	3.80	4.07	4.50			
323 Writing assignments were relevant to what was presented in class.	1	1	0	1	1	0	3.00	4.13	4.31	4.58			
325 Writing assignments were returned promptly.	0	2	0	2	0	0	3.00	3.75	4.25	4.71			
329 Reading assignments required a reasonable amount of time and effort.	0	1	0	0	2	1	1.25	3.93	4.13	4.38			
391 The instructor suggested specific ways to improve written work.	1	0	0	2	1	0	2.00	4.03	4.50	4.75			
392 The students seemed well prepared for each class.	1	3	0	0	0	0	4.17	3.67	4.00	4.13			
393 Students frequently contributed to class discussions.	1	2	1	0	0	0	4.00	3.79	4.08	4.32			

Written Comments

900 Comment on the quality of instruction in this course.

Student 1

Mike was an awesome GSI. He was willing to go over things one-on-one, and provided clear examples and explanations that really deepened my understanding of the course material. Outside of his control were the



Instructor with Comments Report

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

Instructor: Thompson, Michael R

POLSCI 140 003

readings; I felt there were too many and were too long. I also felt the textbook and lecture were almost identical, which made me less inclined to read the textbook.

Student 2

Awful readings.

Student 3

I thought that the grades solely depend on how the GSI likes your writing or not. If he doesn't then you are screwed. Luckily he did like my writing because I did well on pretty much every homework but many of my friends were struggling even though they knew what was taught in class. I thought the homework assignments did not accurately reflect what we learned in class. Also, i thought discussion time was not used effectively. I don't think group activities helped us or stimulated our brains. I wish we had recapped what Gallagher had taught so we had a better understanding of class material instead of simulations and readings.

Student 4

It was a great class. Professor Gallagher is incredibly knowledgeable in her field, and the GSIs were very enthusiastic. My GSI Michael Thompson was awesome and made the class much better.

* 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 lower 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.



Instructor with Comments Report

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

Instructor: Thompson, Michael R
POLSCI 140 004

	Responses from your Students**							Other Users of This Item*			School/College		
	5	4	3	2	1	Your	University Wide			75%	50%	25%	
	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA	Median	75% Above	50% Above	25% Above	75% Above	50% Above	25% Above
4 I had a strong desire to take this course.	3	4	1	0	0	0	4.25	3.70	4.17	4.63	3.88	4.11	4.40
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	4	2	0	0	3.00	2.80	3.10	3.40			
1631 This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter.	3	4	1	0	0	0	4.25	4.10	4.42	4.73			
1632 My interest in the subject has increased because of this course.	3	3	1	1	0	0	4.17	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).	3	2	2	1	0	0	4.00	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)	8	0	0	0	0	0	5.00	4.53	4.81	4.93			
199 The instructor explained material clearly. (SA=Almost Always, A=Frequently, N=Sometimes, D=Occasionally, SD=Hardly Ever)	7	1	0	0	0	0	4.93	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.	4	2	2	0	0	0	4.50	3.88	4.30	4.70	3.83	4.17	4.50
2 Overall, the instructor was an excellent teacher.	7	1	0	0	0	0	4.93	4.33	4.75	4.90	4.17	4.63	4.83
3 I learned a great deal from this course.	4	3	1	0	0	0	4.50	4.00	4.38	4.70	4.00	4.20	4.50
140 I deepened my interest in the subject matter of this course.	3	3	1	1	0	0	4.17	3.88	4.25	4.63			
201 The instructor gave clear explanations.	7	1	0	0	0	0	4.93	4.22	4.64	4.83			
203 The instructor stressed important points in lectures/discussions.	7	1	0	0	0	0	4.93	4.33	4.70	4.88			
207 The instructor appeared to have a thorough knowledge of the subject.	7	1	0	0	0	0	4.93	4.67	4.86	4.94			
219 The instructor was willing to meet and help students outside class.	4	3	0	0	0	0	4.63	4.50	4.79	4.90			
222 One real strength of this course was the classroom discussion.	6	1	0	1	0	0	4.83	3.70	4.17	4.63			
229 The instructor used class time well.	4	4	0	0	0	0	4.50	4.23	4.65	4.83			
232 Work requirements and grading system were clear from the beginning.	2	2	2	2	0	0	3.50	4.00	4.33	4.67			
241 The instructor set high standards for students.	5	3	0	0	0	0	4.70	4.25	4.59	4.80			
319 Writing assignments were interesting and stimulating.	2	3	2	1	0	0	3.83	3.80	4.07	4.50			
323 Writing assignments were relevant to what was presented in class.	1	7	0	0	0	0	4.07	4.13	4.31	4.58			
325 Writing assignments were returned promptly.	3	3	2	0	0	0	4.17	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.	6	1	0	1	0	0	4.83	4.03	4.50	4.75			
392 The students seemed well prepared for each class.	0	8	0	0	0	0	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.13			
393 Students frequently contributed to class discussions.	2	6	0	0	0	0	4.17	3.79	4.08	4.32			

Written Comments

900 Comment on the quality of instruction in this course.

Student 1
Mike Thompson was a fantastic GSI, but the overall workload was at times confusing with odd requirements. It worked for me though because I was fully interested in the subject material



Instructor with Comments Report

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

Instructor: Thompson, Michael R

POLSCI 140 004

Student 2

NA

Student 3

NA

Student 4

NA

Student 5

Class discussion was extremely inclusive; Thompson was sure to give unheard students a chance to voice their opinions. Feedback for writing assignments was helpful not only in the context of the class, but academic writing in general as well. Thompson was extremely knowledgeable and accessible, and was able to explain topics clearly. His teaching style was engaging, and I heard from many students that he was a better lecturer than Gallagher. In my opinion, they both were excellent teachers, but I thought that was notable.

Writing assignment 4, an annotated bibliography, was relatively unrelated to subject matter taught in class, but will be extremely helpful in future academic writing situations.

Student 6

Mike was a great GSI, he was very enthusiastic and always available for help outside of class. I would just make discussion activities more interactive in the future, with visuals, multimedia, etc.

Student 7

NA

Student 8

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 lower 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.



Instructor with Comments Report

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

Instructor: Thompson, Michael R
POLSCI 140 013

	Other Users of This Item*												
	Responses from your Students**						University Wide			School/College			
	5 SA	4 A	3 N	2 D	1 SD	NA	Your Median	75% Above	50% Above	25% Above	75% Above	50% Above	25% Above
4 I had a strong desire to take this course.	4	2	1	0	0	0	4.63	3.70	4.17	4.63	3.88	4.11	4.40
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).	2	1	2	2	0	0	3.25	2.80	3.10	3.40			
1631 This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter.	5	2	0	0	0	0	4.80	4.10	4.42	4.73			
1632 My interest in the subject has increased because of this course.	4	2	0	0	1	0	4.63	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).	5	1	1	0	0	0	4.80	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)	7	0	0	0	0	0	5.00	4.53	4.81	4.93			
199 The instructor explained material clearly. (SA=Almost Always, A=Frequently, N=Sometimes, D=Occasionally, SD=Hardly Ever)	6	1	0	0	0	0	4.92	4.25	4.67	4.88			
217 The instructor treated students with respect.	5	1	1	0	0	0	4.80	4.70	4.87	4.95			
1 Overall, this was an excellent course.	4	2	1	0	0	0	4.63	3.88	4.30	4.70	3.83	4.17	4.50
2 Overall, the instructor was an excellent teacher.	6	1	0	0	0	0	4.92	4.33	4.75	4.90	4.17	4.63	4.83
3 I learned a great deal from this course.	4	2	1	0	0	0	4.63	4.00	4.38	4.70	4.00	4.20	4.50
140 I deepened my interest in the subject matter of this course.	2	4	0	0	1	0	4.13	3.88	4.25	4.63			
201 The instructor gave clear explanations.	6	1	0	0	0	0	4.92	4.22	4.64	4.83			
203 The instructor stressed important points in lectures/discussions.	7	0	0	0	0	0	5.00	4.33	4.70	4.88			
207 The instructor appeared to have a thorough knowledge of the subject.	7	0	0	0	0	0	5.00	4.67	4.86	4.94			
219 The instructor was willing to meet and help students outside class.	6	0	1	0	0	0	4.92	4.50	4.79	4.90			
222 One real strength of this course was the classroom discussion.	4	1	2	0	0	0	4.63	3.70	4.17	4.63			
229 The instructor used class time well.	5	1	1	0	0	0	4.80	4.23	4.65	4.83			
232 Work requirements and grading system were clear from the beginning.	5	2	0	0	0	0	4.80	4.00	4.33	4.67			
241 The instructor set high standards for students.	6	0	1	0	0	0	4.92	4.25	4.59	4.80			
319 Writing assignments were interesting and stimulating.	2	1	2	1	0	1	3.50	3.80	4.07	4.50			
323 Writing assignments were relevant to what was presented in class.	2	4	1	0	0	0	4.13	4.13	4.31	4.58			
325 Writing assignments were returned promptly.	2	4	0	1	0	0	4.13	3.75	4.25	4.71			
329 Reading assignments required a reasonable amount of time and effort.	4	0	1	2	0	0	4.63	3.93	4.13	4.38			
391 The instructor suggested specific ways to improve written work.	6	0	1	0	0	0	4.92	4.03	4.50	4.75			
392 The students seemed well prepared for each class.	3	2	2	0	0	0	4.25	3.67	4.00	4.13			
393 Students frequently contributed to class discussions.	3	4	0	0	0	0	4.38	3.79	4.08	4.32			

Written Comments

900 Comment on the quality of instruction in this course.

Student 1
NA



Instructor with Comments Report

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

Instructor: Thompson, Michael R

POLSCI 140 013

Student 2

Discussion was more helpful than lecture and more on target with the textbook

Student 3

NA

Student 4

NA

Student 5

NA

Student 6

NA

Student 7

I think the scale that the homework assignments were graded on was relatively rigorous and felt like it was impossible to receive a 5/5.

* 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 lower 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.