# Student Evaluation of Teaching, Fall 2019
## Rachel Surminsky, POLI 281-003 DATA IN POLITICS I

| Raters | Students |
|---|---|
| Responded | 13 |
| Invited | 31 |
| Response Ratio | 41.9% |

**Overall**

| | Mean | Median | SD | N | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Overall, this course was excellent. | 4.00 | 4.00 | 1.00 | 13 | 0.0% | 7.7% | 23.1% | 30.8% | 38.5% |
| 2. Overall, I learned a great deal from this course. | 4.54 | 5.00 | 0.78 | 13 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 15.4% | 15.4% | 69.2% |
| 3. Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher. | 4.54 | 5.00 | 0.78 | 13 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 15.4% | 15.4% | 69.2% |
| 4. The instructor was one of the best I have had at Carolina, fully deserving of a teaching award. | 3.92 | 4.00 | 0.86 | 13 | 0.0% | 7.7% | 15.4% | 53.8% | 23.1% |

| | N | Yes |
|---|---|---|
| 1. The instructor provided regular assessment of my work throughout the semester. | 13 | 100.0% |
| 2. The instructor held class meetings consistent with the course syllabus and the official schedule published for this course. | 13 | 100.0% |

| | Mean | Median | SD | N | Very Easy | Easy | Average | More Rigorous | Most Rigorous |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Rate the grading standards of this course compared with others you have taken at UNC. | 3.54 | 4.00 | 0.78 | 13 | 0.0% | 7.7% | 38.5% | 46.2% | 7.7% |
| 2. Rate the workload required in this course compared with others you have taken at UNC. | 3.62 | 4.00 | 0.77 | 13 | 0.0% | 7.7% | 30.8% | 53.8% | 7.7% |

**Diversity and Inclusion**

| | Mean | Median | SD | N | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The diversity of my classmates enriched my learning in this course. | 3.70 | 3.50 | 0.82 | 10 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 30.0% | 20.0% |
| 2. I increased my ability to work on a team with students from different backgrounds and perspectives. | 4.27 | 4.00 | 0.65 | 11 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 9.1% | 54.5% | 36.4% |
| 3. This course exposed me to points of view different from my own. | 3.64 | 4.00 | 0.67 | 11 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 45.5% | 45.5% | 9.1% |
| 4. I became more aware of multiple perspectives on issues of diversity. | 3.20 | 3.00 | 0.63 | 10 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 90.0% | 0.0% | 10.0% |
| 5. The instructor, Rachel Surminsky, valued the diversity of life experiences among students. | 3.91 | 4.00 | 0.83 | 11 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 36.4% | 36.4% | 27.3% |
| 6. The instructor, Rachel Surminsky, saw cultural and personal differences as assets. | 3.91 | 4.00 | 0.83 | 11 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 36.4% | 36.4% | 27.3% |
| 7. In-class activities were organized to value the diversity of life experiences among students. | 3.50 | 3.00 | 0.85 | 10 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 70.0% | 10.0% | 20.0% |

## Department Specific

### Instructor Ratings

| | Mean | Median | SD | N | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Demonstrates enthusiasm about teaching. | 4.54 | 5.00 | 0.66 | 13 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7.7% | 30.8% | 61.5% |
| 2. Communicates clearly and logically. | 4.46 | 5.00 | 0.97 | 13 | 0.0% | 7.7% | 7.7% | 15.4% | 69.2% |
| 3. Promotes a climate of mutual respect. | 4.54 | 5.00 | 0.66 | 13 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7.7% | 30.8% | 61.5% |
| 4. Encourages student questions. | 4.62 | 5.00 | 0.65 | 13 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7.7% | 23.1% | 69.2% |
| 5. Emphasizes critical thinking. | 4.46 | 4.00 | 0.52 | 13 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 53.8% | 46.2% |
| 6. Uses teaching strategies that promote active involvement. | 4.46 | 5.00 | 0.66 | 13 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7.7% | 38.5% | 53.8% |
| 7. Clearly communicates expectations for student performance. | 4.08 | 4.00 | 0.95 | 13 | 0.0% | 7.7% | 15.4% | 38.5% | 38.5% |
| 8. Regularly provides constructive criticism of student performance. | 4.54 | 5.00 | 0.66 | 13 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7.7% | 30.8% | 61.5% |
| 9. Provides timely feedback on student performance. | 4.62 | 5.00 | 0.51 | 13 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 38.5% | 61.5% |
| 10. Provides a fair evaluation of student performance. | 4.15 | 4.00 | 0.90 | 13 | 0.0% | 7.7% | 7.7% | 46.2% | 38.5% |
| 11. Is available when needed. | 4.69 | 5.00 | 0.48 | 13 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 30.8% | 69.2% |
| 12. Is well-prepared for instruction. | 4.62 | 5.00 | 0.65 | 13 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7.7% | 23.1% | 69.2% |
| 13. Overall, considering both the possibilites and limitations of the subject matter and course, I would rate this instructor as "excellent." | 4.46 | 5.00 | 0.78 | 13 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 15.4% | 23.1% | 61.5% |

### Course Quality Ratings

| | Mean | Median | SD | N | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Course goals and objectives are clearly specified. | 4.46 | 5.00 | 0.66 | 13 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7.7% | 38.5% | 53.8% |
| 2. Requirements (e.g., assignments, attendance, student responsibilities) are clearly specified. | 4.62 | 5.00 | 0.51 | 13 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 38.5% | 61.5% |
| 3. Course assignments are clearly related to the course objectives. | 4.46 | 5.00 | 0.66 | 13 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7.7% | 38.5% | 53.8% |
| 4. Instructional methods in the course facilitate my learning. | 4.38 | 4.00 | 0.65 | 13 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7.7% | 46.2% | 46.2% |
| 5. In general, the course is well-organized. Course materials stimulated critical thinking. | 4.38 | 4.00 | 0.65 | 13 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7.7% | 46.2% | 46.2% |
| 6. I know significantly more about this subject than before I took this course. | 4.69 | 5.00 | 0.63 | 13 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7.7% | 15.4% | 76.9% |
| 7. Overall, considering its content, design, and structure, I would rate this course as "excellent." | 4.15 | 4.00 | 0.80 | 13 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 23.1% | 38.5% | 38.5% |

## Open-Ended Responses

**How Did the Diversity of Your Classmates Contribute to Your Learning in This Course?**

| Comments |
| --- |
| We were able t work together in class to work through problem sets and practice coding skills which allowed me to work with peers with different experiences and perspectives. |
| Students had various statistical and coding backgrounds. |
| I do not think that the diversity of my classmates contributed to my learning in this course. |
| It was nice to work with people of different majors and years, but it didn't contribute in ways that I could see. |

**How Might the Class Climate Be Made More Inclusive of Diverse Students?**

| Comments |
| --- |
| N/a |
| I do not think that it could be more inclusive. |
| Nothing really |

## Department Specific

**Please comment on the strengths of the course.**

| Comments |
| --- |
| The content in the problem sets and projects were very hands on and the application from lecture was very clear and interesting. |
| This course was informative on the processes involved in data analytics within the political sphere. There were ample opportunities for success within the classroom while also learning about how to become involved outside the class. |
| I enjoyed the opportunity for practice in class with peers as that allowed me to more fully understand the coding lessons of the course. |
| This course was well–designed to facilitate my learning R, through in–class assignments, working as a class, individual assignments, and PowerPoints. The idea of learning R was daunting to me, but Rachel made it attainable and accessible. |
| I think this class does a great job of making a largely humanities audience think about math and statistics in a way that makes us care. |
| Content is very interesting and useful in potential careers in the field of Political Science. |
| I think that the course was very hands–on in learning R, and was easily accessible for those who had never coded before. |
| The course is interesting and I understand why research is so important. |
| Gained both theoretical and practical knowledge of data analysis. |

**Please comment on the limitations of the course.**

| Comments |
| --- |
| This course was handled extremely well, but with so many students it was difficult for one professor to handle all of the unique questions presented by the differing final group projects. As well, it was difficult for students to learn an entire programming software in a few weeks/months. |
| The material itself could be complicated especially for someone who idd not have any computer science experience. However, that is unavoidable and it allowed me to get exposure to skills that I had not developed yet. |
| The material was sometimes difficult to grasp on my own. |
| I think this course tries to pack WAY to much into the time constraint. There were many topics that we just could not get to because the material was too complicated and took longer to explain or just because there was too much material. |
| We did not cover a significant section of material that was initially included on the syllabus. Maybe there needs to be a more clear focus on particular topics or concepts. |
| We were behind for a lot of the semester because some of the lectures took too long. |
| We had a period of three weeks where we didn't do any R Practice in class. I understand that we should keep R at the front of our minds, but Problem Set 4 was way too difficult with how long we went without doing R. I think for the weeks where we learn abstract concepts about research we should start the class with a small five minute R exercise. That way we won't forget any key concepts. I was just blindsided with how difficult Problem Set 4 was especially considering how well I did on the others. |

**Please comment on the strengths of the instructor.**

| Comments |
| --- |
| Always brings great energy to class, extremely available outside of the classroom, is understanding. |
| Rachel Surminsky was always available to meet with, helpful in reinforcing material outside of class during office hours, and knew how to teach the material so that everyone could understand some of the difficult concepts. |
| Rachel created a very low stress environment for students and genuinely wanted us all to understand the material. She provided ample opportunities to visit her in office hours and get her feedback throughout the course. |
| Rachel is a clear communicator, knowledgeable on the subject, and includes everyone in the class discussions. |
| Rachel is really great at being approachable and giving reasonable and helpful feedback. She reminds us often to not get discouraged, which is super important in a difficult and challenging class like this one. I think she does a great job at knowing what pace to teach at, when a student is confused and doesn't want to show it, and is really great at being patient with those who need more explanation. |
| Rachel is clearly very knowledgable about the subject of Data in Politics and she used helpful examples in class to help explain difficult topics. |
| She is very personable, open to questions, and explains concepts well. |
| Grad students are typically fantastic teachers and Rachel was no exception. She was enthusiastic, fair, and very accessible outside of class. I would take a class with her again just for fun. |
| I really liked how Rachel had such long office hours. She was also good at explaining complex topics clearly and succinctly. |
| Explain things clearly and is energetic.<br>I like her jokes. |

**Please comment on the limitations of the instructor.**

| Comments |
| --- |
| Rachel had no limitations. She handled the class well and structured it excellently. |
| Statistical analysis and coding can be very complex and so it can be hard to understand in a lecture format occasionally. This did not happen often and Rachel did a great job at trying to avoid that but there were definitely some concepts that required more individual study to get a better understanding. |
| N/a |
| She can be long–winded and gets behind easily. |
| I think for group projects if your group members said you didn't contribute, the person should get a heads up earlier. That way they can be proactive about fixing the issue. It's hard to gauge how your group members voted about you. |