

University of Michigan  
 Fall 2019 Instructor Report With Comments  
 EECS 398-003: Special Topics  
 Kevin Angstadt

5 out of 8 students responded to this evaluation.

**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. (Q1631)	4	1	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.5	4.5
My interest in the subject has increased because of this course. (Q1632)	4	1	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.2	4.2
I knew what was expected of me in this course.(Q1633)	5	0	0	0	0	0	5.0	4.4	4.3
Overall, this was an excellent course.(Q1)	4	1	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.2	4.2
I had a strong desire to take this course.(Q4)	4	0	1	0	0	0	4.9	4.0	4.1
As compared with other courses of equal credit, the workload for this course was...(SA=Much Lighter to SD=Much Heavier) (Q891)	1	2	2	0	0	0	3.8	3.0	2.8

**Responses to University-wide questions about the instructor:**

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median	School/College Median
Overall, Kevin Angstadt was an excellent teacher.(Q2)	5	0	0	0	0	0	5.0	4.6	4.7
Kevin Angstadt seemed well prepared for class meetings.(Q230)	5	0	0	0	0	0	5.0	4.8	4.8
Kevin Angstadt explained material clearly.(Q199)	4	1	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.6	4.7
Kevin Angstadt treated students with respect.(Q217)	4	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
Prerequisites provided adequate preparation for this course. (Q61)	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.0	4.3
The textbook made a valuable contribution to the course. (Q64)	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.0	3.6
I developed confidence in my abilities as an engineer. (Q1769)	2	2	1	0	0	0	4.3	4.1
I developed the ability to solve real world engineering problems. (Q1770)	2	1	2	0	0	0	4.0	4.1

The medians are calculated from Fall 2019 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 upper division with enrollment of 1 to 15 in College of Engineering.

## Written Comments

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

Comments
It was fantastic!
Instruction was more discussion-style, which was an effective way to present the content of the class.
Kevin was a very high-quality teacher! He was prepared, enthusiastic about the topics, asked and implemented student feedback, and was more than willing to meet with us outside of class.
Great

### What were the strengths of the course ? (Q953)

Comments
Round table discussions were very meaningful, the class provided a very hands-on approach to learning.
The expectations of this class were very clear, the students were motivated, and the discussions were productive and interesting.
The small-scale and round-table structure was very conducive to discussion. Kevin actively encouraged this discussion, which made for topics very relevant to things we wanted to talk about.
Learning how to teach and communicate.

### What suggestions would you make for improving the course ? (Q955)

Comments
I think it is fantastic the way it is.
Not much—there are a lot of topics to cover so maybe modifying them based on student interest
I would suggest taking more breaks when lecturing/explaining a certain topic. Sometimes Kevin or another student would speak for a long time, and I found it difficult to break into the conversation.
I would also love to see some guest lecturers come in to offer their perspective and teaching experiences.
None

### Among the courses you have already taken, which proved the most (or least) effective in preparing you for this course, and why? (Q1098)

Comments
There were no prereqs, but getting a TA position definitely helped, since it allowed me to explore my teaching and how I can improve.
No courses that I can speak of. Being an IA for EECS 280 was the most helpful experience.
N/A