Instructor with Comments Report


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Comment on the quality of instruction in this course.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The course was overall, quite excellent. Despite the massive amount of material that is presented in one semester (four subjects in which I had entire courses on in my undergrad degree), Prof. Hanquist clearly and efficiently was able to find meaningful context and applications, and illuminated them through the lectures and exams. The textbook was rife with errors, and he took care to keep track with most all of them along the way. Additionally, he was flexible with deadlines as needed, was very organized, and was a great communicator on both Canvas and in class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructor: Hanquist, Kyle Matthew
AEROSP 532 001

Student 2
NA

Student 3
NA

Student 4
Instructor was basically an audio book reading of the textbook.

Student 5
I really enjoyed MGD and found the topics fascinating, but I found the lectures to stretch on a bit. Much of the lecture wasspent deriving formulas, and not building intuition as to where all the puzzle pieces fit together. The examples are kind of helpful, but at the same time require so much "glossed over" calculation work that much of it is just being told the answer. And I think that was my major issue with the lectures; that we were just being told the answers.

I think a major improvement would have been if Dr. Hanquist helped us to develop intuition about WHY we were doing what we were doing. Just segmenting the derivation into digestable portions, stopping to consider what we've done and where we want to go next, and then moving on. Also a 5 minute break halfway through the class would have been very welcome.

Student 6
NA

Student 7
NA

Student 8
NA

Student 9
NA

Student 10
Overall it is a very good course. It would be better if we can cover some of the numerical techniques. Also it would be more helpful if more insight and personal understanding of the subject from the instructor are shared.

Student 11
NA

Student 12
NA

Student 13
Extremely interesting topic that I never knew would be so relevant to common engineering problems. Kyle really warmed to his position as time went on. He was always very patient with questions, delivered the material in a reasonably understandable fashion, and turned around graded work quickly and consistently. Sometimes he would even link material to pertinent engineering or scientific developments. Although Kyle did a good job, he was definitely bogged down by a frankly terrible textbook and the fact that the course is taught directly from it. Most of the book (at least the sections covered) consists of lengthy derivations and little explanation of the relevance of equations or explicit links to previous material. Worked examples are few and far between. The worst part of it all is how many egregious errors the textbook contains. I know the book is a first draft, but it seems like the book was slapped together and immediately published with zero editing. References in the text to equations or tables often reference the wrong figure, equations are sometimes blatantly incorrect, and typographical errors are numerous. I'm not sure if the editor or the authors are to blame, but it's a shame that a course would be built on such a shoddy book.

* The quartiles are calculated from Winter 2018 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 graduate level students in College of Engineering.
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** SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, N - Neutral, D - Disagree, SD - Strongly Disagree, NA - Not Applicable.