



Instructor with Comments Report

2014-11-26 - 2014-12-11 Report ID: MSR04734

Instructor: Persaud,Alexander
ECON 496 001

	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
1 Overall, this was an excellent course.	8	5	0	0	0	0	4.69	3.95	4.33	4.72	4.00	4.36	4.63
2 Overall, the instructor was an excellent teacher.	9	4	0	0	0	0	4.78	4.15	4.61	4.85	4.25	4.64	4.82
3 I learned a great deal from this course.	11	2	0	0	0	0	4.91	4.00	4.40	4.75	4.13	4.43	4.71
4 I had a strong desire to take this course.	5	5	3	0	0	0	4.20	3.64	4.17	4.63	3.89	4.25	4.57
120 I learned a good deal of factual material in this course.	7	3	1	0	0	1	4.71	4.00	4.30	4.67			
121 I gained a good understanding of concepts/principles in this field.	10	2	1	0	0	0	4.85	3.96	4.22	4.57			
143 I was stimulated to discuss related topics outside of class.	8	3	0	1	0	0	4.75	3.75	4.17	4.62			
185 The instructor was sensitive to multicultural issues in the classroom.	8	3	0	0	0	2	4.81	4.25	4.56	4.79			
199 The instructor explained material clearly and understandably.	9	3	1	0	0	0	4.78	4.00	4.50	4.79			
200 The instructor handled questions well.	9	3	0	0	0	0	4.83	4.00	4.50	4.80			
206 The instructor seemed to enjoy teaching.	11	2	0	0	0	0	4.91	4.32	4.71	4.90			
209 The instructor was not confused by unexpected questions.	9	4	0	0	0	0	4.78	4.00	4.42	4.71			
210 The instructor was skillful in observing student reactions.	9	4	0	0	0	0	4.78	3.95	4.50	4.75			
215 The instructor maintained an atmosphere of good feeling in class.	9	4	0	0	0	0	4.78	4.27	4.68	4.88			
217 The instructor treated students with respect.	10	3	0	0	0	0	4.85	4.56	4.79	4.90			
219 The instructor was willing to meet and help students outside class.	10	3	0	0	0	0	4.85	4.50	4.73	4.88			
223 Students in this course were free to disagree and ask questions.	9	3	1	0	0	0	4.78	4.25	4.61	4.80			
230 The instructor seemed well prepared for each class.	9	4	0	0	0	0	4.78	4.33	4.69	4.86			
231 The objectives of the course were clearly explained.	8	4	1	0	0	0	4.69	4.05	4.38	4.67			
241 The instructor set high standards for students.	9	4	0	0	0	0	4.78	4.20	4.54	4.77			
327 Reading assignments were interesting and stimulating.	7	6	0	0	0	0	4.57	3.54	4.00	4.33			
330 Reading assignments were relevant to what was presented in class.	9	3	1	0	0	0	4.78	4.00	4.33	4.70			
340 The textbook made a valuable contribution to the course.	3	3	0	0	0	7	4.50	3.33	4.00	4.50			
350 Slides/overhead transparencies were a valuable part of this course.	3	4	0	0	1	5	4.25	4.00	4.25	4.60			
356 Examinations covered the important aspects of the course.	4	2	1	0	0	6	4.63	4.10	4.38	4.67			
360 Exams were reasonable in length and difficulty.	3	3	0	1	0	6	4.33	3.87	4.14	4.50			
364 The test items were adequately explained after a test was given.	3	2	0	1	0	7	4.50	3.80	4.08	4.45			
366 The grading system was clearly explained.	7	5	0	1	0	0	4.57	4.00	4.39	4.67			
370 I attended class regularly.	10	2	1	0	0	0	4.85	4.67	4.82	4.92			
371 I utilized all the learning opportunities provided in this course.	9	3	1	0	0	0	4.78	4.00	4.20	4.50			
947 Instructor was helpful to you in the SWC writing process.	6	6	0	0	0	1	4.50	n/a	n/a	n/a			

Written Comments

943 Instructor gave clear and understandable explanations. (Answer on 5-point scale: SA, A, N, D, SD.)

Student 1

Date Printed:12/19/2014 11:38:12 AM



Instructor with Comments Report

2014-11-26 - 2014-12-11 Report ID: MSR04734

Instructor: Persaud, Alexander

ECON 496 001

100

Student 2

SA

Student 3

A

Student 4

A

Student 5

SA

Student 6

NA

Student 7

SA

Student 8

Alexander is very clear and understandable as well. 5/5

Student 9

SA

Student 10

A

Student 11

SA

Student 12

A

Student 13

sa

Written Comments

944 Instructor appeared to have a thorough knowledge of the subject. (Answer on 5-point scale: SA, A, N, D, SD.)

Student 1

100

Student 2

SA



Instructor with Comments Report

2014-11-26 - 2014-12-11 Report ID: MSR04734

Instructor: Persaud, Alexander

ECON 496 001

Student 3

SA

Student 4

A

Student 5

SA

Student 6

NA

Student 7

SA

Student 8

Alexander exhibited his knowledge in his guest lectures in a lucid, well-informed manner. 5/5

Student 9

SA

Student 10

A

Student 11

SA

Student 12

A

Student 13

sa

Written Comments

945 Instructor told students when they had done a particularly good job. (Answer on 5-point scale: SA, A, N, D, SD.)

Student 1

100

Student 2

SA

Student 3

N

Student 4

B



Instructor with Comments Report

2014-11-26 - 2014-12-11 Report ID: MSR04734

Instructor: Persaud, Alexander
ECON 496 001

Student 5
SA

Student 6
NA

Student 7
SA

Student 8
In a similar manner to Raj, Alexander has provided great feedback and shown when he was impressed with their class contributions (and written contributions).

Student 9
SA

Student 10
N

Student 11
SA

Student 12
SA

Student 13
sa

Written Comments

946 Instructor graded papers (exams, homework) fairly. (Answer on 5-point scale: SA, A, N, D, SD.)

Student 1
100

Student 2
SA

Student 3
A

Student 4
B

Student 5
SA

Student 6



Instructor with Comments Report

2014-11-26 - 2014-12-11 Report ID: MSR04734

Instructor: Persaud, Alexander

ECON 496 001

NA

Student 7

SA

Student 8

Once again, I assume so? How can I possibly know?

NA

Student 9

A

Student 10

N

Student 11

SA

Student 12

SA

Student 13

sa

* The quartiles are calculated from Fall 2014 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.



Instructor with Comments Report

2015-04-22 - 2015-04-29 Report ID: MSR04734

Instructor: Persaud,Alexander

ECON 230 005 - HONORS 230 005

	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			
1 Overall, this was an excellent course.	3	9	3	2	0	0	3.89	3.90	4.30	4.70	4.10	4.39	4.67
2 Overall, the instructor was an excellent teacher.	11	4	2	0	0	0	4.73	4.13	4.59	4.85	4.50	4.75	4.86
3 I learned a great deal from this course.	3	12	1	1	0	0	4.04	4.00	4.38	4.75	4.07	4.25	4.60
4 I had a strong desire to take this course.	1	5	9	1	0	0	3.28	3.55	4.13	4.63	4.00	4.30	4.58
120 I learned a good deal of factual material in this course.	4	12	1	0	0	0	4.13	3.92	4.28	4.64			
121 I gained a good understanding of concepts/principles in this field.	5	8	3	1	0	0	4.06	4.00	4.25	4.56			
143 I was stimulated to discuss related topics outside of class.	1	7	8	1	0	0	3.44	3.50	4.08	4.50			
185 The instructor was sensitive to multicultural issues in the classroom.	9	7	1	0	0	0	4.56	4.15	4.50	4.75			
199 The instructor explained material clearly and understandably.	10	6	1	0	0	0	4.65	4.10	4.50	4.81			
200 The instructor handled questions well.	11	5	1	0	0	0	4.73	4.13	4.58	4.81			
206 The instructor seemed to enjoy teaching.	9	6	1	1	0	0	4.56	4.35	4.71	4.90			
209 The instructor was not confused by unexpected questions.	9	7	1	0	0	0	4.56	4.00	4.38	4.70			
210 The instructor was skillful in observing student reactions.	9	7	1	0	0	0	4.56	4.00	4.48	4.75			
215 The instructor maintained an atmosphere of good feeling in class.	10	5	2	0	0	0	4.65	4.25	4.70	4.88			
217 The instructor treated students with respect.	10	7	0	0	0	0	4.65	4.56	4.79	4.92			
219 The instructor was willing to meet and help students outside class.	14	3	0	0	0	0	4.89	4.38	4.72	4.88			
223 Students in this course were free to disagree and ask questions.	7	10	0	0	0	0	4.35	4.24	4.61	4.82			
230 The instructor seemed well prepared for each class.	11	6	0	0	0	0	4.73	4.36	4.71	4.88			
231 The objectives of the course were clearly explained.	3	6	4	2	1	0	3.67	4.00	4.33	4.65			
241 The instructor set high standards for students.	10	6	1	0	0	0	4.65	4.25	4.57	4.79			
327 Reading assignments were interesting and stimulating.	3	4	5	3	2	0	3.20	3.50	4.00	4.35			
330 Reading assignments were relevant to what was presented in class.	6	6	3	1	1	0	4.08	4.00	4.38	4.71			
340 The textbook made a valuable contribution to the course.	0	0	0	3	2	12	1.67	3.36	4.00	4.50			
350 Slides/overhead transparencies were a valuable part of this course.	0	1	2	2	1	11	2.50	3.90	4.25	4.63			
356 Examinations covered the important aspects of the course.	0	0	1	0	1	15	2.00	4.06	4.37	4.70			
360 Exams were reasonable in length and difficulty.	0	0	1	0	1	15	2.00	3.80	4.13	4.50			
364 The test items were adequately explained after a test was given.	0	0	1	0	1	15	2.00	3.75	4.07	4.44			
366 The grading system was clearly explained.	2	7	2	2	3	1	3.64	4.00	4.37	4.69			
370 I attended class regularly.	13	3	1	0	0	0	4.85	4.60	4.81	4.91			
371 I utilized all the learning opportunities provided in this course.	4	8	4	0	0	0	4.00	3.90	4.17	4.50			

Written Comments

900 Comment on the quality of instruction in this course.

Student 1
NA



Instructor with Comments Report

2015-04-22 - 2015-04-29 Report ID: MSR04734

Instructor: Persaud, Alexander

ECON 230 005 - HONORS 230 005

Student 2

High level of knowledge of the class materials and tangential fields. Explained things clearly and tried to engage the class as opposed to just lecturing to blank faces. Every week was different enough to keep things interesting.

Student 3

I wrote a longer review for Professor Adams in the Lecture section of this evaluation which I think could improve the course. The Discussion section, however, was extremely well-led: Mr. Persaud is an engaging lecturer who allows students to participate actively in class discussion while also maintaining focus on the material. Discussions sections were universally worthwhile, and always provided a better understanding of the material

Student 4

Alexander is the kindest, most knowledgeable GSI that I have met at the University of Michigan. It is a shame that the GSIs were tasked with the difficult responsibility of trying to pick up the broken pieces of a class that was poorly constructed and unrealistically designed by Professor Adams this semester. The only redeeming quality that this course had was the expertise of Alexander and the other graduate student instructors. He made the effort to understand the areas of interest for individual students, and suggested resources that would spark their interests more than the assigned readings. Alexander went above and beyond the expectations of a GSI, and it felt like Discussion section was the only time in the course in which the class material made sense, or as if my time and presence was meaningful. The class would have been more successful and enjoyable if the GSIs were the professors since they could understand the students' expectations for the class.

Student 5

NA

Student 6

Alexander was a very good teacher. He kept calm and presented the materials to the class in a way in that others could understand. Jim Adams was a very good lecturer as well.

Student 7

Section was helpful in further explaining some of the topics covered in lecture. However, many times section felt like an additional lecture rather than an opportunity to clarify lecture material. I think some more time spent on reviewing some of the ideas covered in lecture would have improved the quality of instruction for me, as it would have made it easier to connect section topics with lecture topics (as sometimes they felt very separate).

Student 8

NA

Student 9

Discussion sections suffered from disorganization at the course-wide level. Though Alexander is knowledgeable and helped explain some of the more complex readings, he often spent time explaining trivial concepts or proving his academic prowess to the class.

Student 10

Instruction was high quality, but sometimes the material did not relate to lecture. Also, the coursepack was completely pointless and a waste of eighty dollars as all the readings were posted online.

Student 11

NA

Student 12

Discussion and lecture did not match. Discussion was too math and econ based.

Student 13

Alexander is the best! He explained concepts well and wrote the important stuff on the board so note taking was easy. He was also very knowledgeable about the topics, and he tried to relate to students well.

Student 14

It was good, but could be better. When we had actual discussions and student participation was high it was a great class. Most of the time it was just an extension of lecture, which while educational was not as powerful I feel as when students were allowed to flesh out ideas with each other and debate. The lecture type, however, was very useful in understanding the readings, which were very dense and hard for non economists to understand.



Instructor with Comments Report

2015-04-22 - 2015-04-29 Report ID: MSR04734

Instructor: Persaud, Alexander

ECON 230 005 - HONORS 230 005

Student 15

I thought the course was excellent. I learned a lot of information from this class. I think it might be useful to incorporate powerpoints in the explain figures or introduce the historical aspects of capitalism.

Student 16

Great class! Discussion was always helpful for clarifying lecture points. Discussion also covered aspects not covered in lecture. Discussion gave insights that I will take beyond this class.

Student 17

The discussions were always helpful in illuminating the information in the reading assignments and in presenting it in terms that were relatively easy to understand.

* The quartiles are calculated from Winter 2015 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 College of LS&A.

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



Instructor with Comments Report

2015-04-22 - 2015-04-29 Report ID: MSR04734

Instructor: Persaud,Alexander

ECON 230 007 - HONORS 230 007

	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
1 Overall, this was an excellent course.	4	4	1	2	0	0	4.13	3.90	4.30	4.70	4.10	4.39	4.67
2 Overall, the instructor was an excellent teacher.	9	2	0	0	0	0	4.89	4.13	4.59	4.85	4.50	4.75	4.86
3 I learned a great deal from this course.	4	6	1	0	0	0	4.25	4.00	4.38	4.75	4.07	4.25	4.60
4 I had a strong desire to take this course.	3	4	2	2	0	0	3.88	3.55	4.13	4.63	4.00	4.30	4.58
120 I learned a good deal of factual material in this course.	3	7	1	0	0	0	4.14	3.92	4.28	4.64			
121 I gained a good understanding of concepts/principles in this field.	4	6	0	1	0	0	4.25	4.00	4.25	4.56			
143 I was stimulated to discuss related topics outside of class.	3	5	1	2	0	0	4.00	3.50	4.08	4.50			
185 The instructor was sensitive to multicultural issues in the classroom.	6	4	1	0	0	0	4.58	4.15	4.50	4.75			
199 The instructor explained material clearly and understandably.	10	1	0	0	0	0	4.95	4.10	4.50	4.81			
200 The instructor handled questions well.	9	2	0	0	0	0	4.89	4.13	4.58	4.81			
206 The instructor seemed to enjoy teaching.	8	3	0	0	0	0	4.81	4.35	4.71	4.90			
209 The instructor was not confused by unexpected questions.	9	2	0	0	0	0	4.89	4.00	4.38	4.70			
210 The instructor was skillful in observing student reactions.	5	5	1	0	0	0	4.40	4.00	4.48	4.75			
215 The instructor maintained an atmosphere of good feeling in class.	6	4	1	0	0	0	4.58	4.25	4.70	4.88			
217 The instructor treated students with respect.	9	2	0	0	0	0	4.89	4.56	4.79	4.92			
219 The instructor was willing to meet and help students outside class.	7	3	1	0	0	0	4.71	4.38	4.72	4.88			
223 Students in this course were free to disagree and ask questions.	5	4	1	1	0	0	4.38	4.24	4.61	4.82			
230 The instructor seemed well prepared for each class.	9	2	0	0	0	0	4.89	4.36	4.71	4.88			
231 The objectives of the course were clearly explained.	3	3	3	0	2	0	3.67	4.00	4.33	4.65			
241 The instructor set high standards for students.	4	7	0	0	0	0	4.29	4.25	4.57	4.79			
327 Reading assignments were interesting and stimulating.	3	2	5	0	1	0	3.40	3.50	4.00	4.35			
330 Reading assignments were relevant to what was presented in class.	3	6	2	0	0	0	4.08	4.00	4.38	4.71			
340 The textbook made a valuable contribution to the course.	1	0	0	0	1	9	3.00	3.36	4.00	4.50			
350 Slides/overhead transparencies were a valuable part of this course.	2	0	1	0	0	8	4.75	3.90	4.25	4.63			
356 Examinations covered the important aspects of the course.	1	1	2	0	1	6	3.25	4.06	4.37	4.70			
360 Exams were reasonable in length and difficulty.	1	0	1	3	0	6	2.33	3.80	4.13	4.50			
364 The test items were adequately explained after a test was given.	1	0	1	0	1	8	3.00	3.75	4.07	4.44			
366 The grading system was clearly explained.	3	3	1	1	3	0	3.67	4.00	4.37	4.69			
370 I attended class regularly.	10	1	0	0	0	0	4.95	4.60	4.81	4.91			
371 I utilized all the learning opportunities provided in this course.	8	2	0	1	0	0	4.81	3.90	4.17	4.50			

Written Comments

900 Comment on the quality of instruction in this course.

Student 1

First and foremost: Alexander Persaud is a good teacher. He adequately conveyed the necessary information, and he clearly has a passion for the subject area; some of this passion even made it into the minds of his



Instructor with Comments Report

2015-04-22 - 2015-04-29 Report ID: MSR04734

Instructor: Persaud,Alexander

ECON 230 007 - HONORS 230 007

students. Despite this, he had some major faults. These include: being too harsh of a grader, without providing any preliminary guidance on how our papers should have looked. It is my hope that he was following some sort of agreed-upon rubric, but his reasons for not giving that rubric to us ahead of time, so that we would be better prepared, are a mystery. At the very least, he could have provided us with the rubric upon handing back our papers, thus allowing us to improve ourselves for the next one. Simply putting which paragraph was the best and which the worst was not enough to know what I had done well, and what I needed to change. In addition to his problems with grading, Alexander was simply too closed a person to lead a discussion section. Perhaps when he is lecturing this isn't a problem, but if you are leading a discussion, don't hide your passion; allow it to become a part of the conversation (as it was during the discussion of NAFTA and global capitalism). Bringing passion encourages your students to have passion, and this was lacking all around in Alexander's adequate-but-not-stellar discussion sections. I appreciated his being open to the fact that, between reading the boring articles for lecture and writing the terribly explained papers, we barely had the time, energy, or motivation to read the articles recommended for discussion section. Luckily, the articles chosen for discussion were loads more interesting than the ones chosen for lecture, and Alexander's passion (had he had any) would have encouraged the whole class to participate in the readings and subsequent discussion, as I did (despite the fact that it really wasn't rewarding, in terms of how prepared I was to write the papers). All in all, Alexander, an incredibly intelligent and passionate person, graded every paper on a non-existent rubric that was seemingly much less forgiving than the one that the other GSIs and Prof Adams were using. Indeed, on two papers which I wrote, and whose rough drafts were very similar in quality, I took one each to Alexander and Prof Adams. The one that I took to Alexander and corrected, I managed around a 90 on, whereas the one I took to Jim Adams (who told me that it was great the way it was, besides a couple minor fixes) only managed an 80. This speaks both to the lack of unanimity among grading between the instructors, and to the missed opportunity for Alexander to engage all of his students passionately for an entire semester, instead of just those who stopped by his office for 20 minutes. In the next discussion that he leads, I recommend that Alexander: 1) push hard for fairness in grading, 2) allow his passion to guide the discussion, and 3) continue to push his students to be as good as he is (just do more to help us get there!).

Student 2

The discussion was very good. The lecture I found less helpful because of all the tangents Professor Adams went on. The discussion was simply more focused which is good considering how wide of a breadth this course covered.

Student 3

Well taught and explained. However, the grading scale is still yet to be determined for the course.

Student 4

NA

Student 5

Alexander was very knowledgeable about the material being discussed, he used relevant examples, and was very helpful outside of class.

Student 6

NA

Student 7

If a GSI's sole focus was to reproduce detailed information and answer questions, then Alexander gets an A+. However, feedback on papers was vague and unhelpful and I'm not sure I really learned anything from his discussions that was helpful for a single paper. At first I thought I was alone in this experience. After talking to numerous other students in his sections, most are left fumbling to come up with any reason to why any paper received any kind of score. I'd imagine the way Alexander grades papers involves reading them, pulling a few vague comments out of a hat and then summing the score of a 5 darts he threw with his left hand while blindfolded.

Student 8

Alexander clearly organized the central ideas of each assigned reading for discussion and effectively communicated them during section. He struck a nice balance between lecture format and student participation and discussion. I realize that this course was tough balancing act in that not all students had taken Econ courses before and so it was difficult to bring in too many economics concepts. I think the entire course in general could be improved by being conceptualized as an interdisciplinary social science course (Economics, Political Science, History, and Philosophy) in order to allow a more diverse reading selection (the readings focused in economics tended to be a bit dense for students who hadn't had experience in the field) and to cover a more diverse range of student interests.

Student 9

The course was very interesting. I'm not very familiar with economics, but the class has helped me learn a lot and apply these lessons to how I understand today's economic concerns.

Student 10

The lecturer was very professional, approachable, and clear. He presented the materials in a very coherent manner and was able to explain concepts students had difficulty with very well.

Student 11

Date Printed:5/7/2015 7:38:24 AM



Instructor with Comments Report

2015-04-22 - 2015-04-29 Report ID: MSR04734

Instructor: Persaud, Alexander

ECON 230 007 - HONORS 230 007

Section was probably the best part of this course for me. Mr Persaud was able to unpack the papers we read with a simplicity that allowed me to feel like I actually understood the material. After section, I always felt like I understood the material better and was in a better position to write the papers.

* The quartiles are calculated from Winter 2015 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 College of LS&A.

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