

Rutgers University Student Instructional Rating

(Online Survey)

| Popper F. Spring 2016, 34:970:501:01 — Hist & Theory PIng (index #08355) Enrollment= 23, Responses= 17 Part A: University- wide Questions: | Student Responses | | | | | | Weighted Means | | | |
|--|-------------------------|---|---|---|----------------------|----------------|----------------|--------|-------|------|
| | Strong Disagree 1 | | | | Strong Agree 5 | No response | Section | Course | Level | Dept |
| 1. The instructor was prepared for class and presented the material in an organized manner. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 0 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.62 | 4.57 |
| 2. The instructor responded effectively to student comments and questions. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 4.76 | 4.77 | 4.70 | 4.67 |
| 3. The instructor generated interest in the course material. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 0 | 4.76 | 4.65 | 4.55 | 4.52 |
| 4. The instructor had a positive attitude toward assisting all students in understanding course material. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 4.88 | 4.88 | 4.82 | 4.76 |
| 5. The instructor assigned grades fairly. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 4.88 | 4.88 | 4.77 | 4.73 |
| 6. The instructional methods encouraged student learning. | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 4.65 | 4.50 | 4.47 | 4.42 |
| 7. I learned a great deal in this course. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 4.71 | 4.50 | 4.49 | 4.45 |
| 8. I had a strong prior interest in the subject matter and wanted to take this course. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 4.65 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.23 |
| | Poor | | | | Excellent | | | | | |
| 9. I rate the teaching effectiveness of the instructor as: | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 4.65 | 4.50 | 4.48 | 4.44 |

| Popper F. Spring 2016, 34:970:501:01 — Hist & Theory Plng (index #08355) Enrollment= 23, Responses= 17 Part A: University- wide Questions: | Student Responses | | | | Weighted Means | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| | Strong Disagree 1 | | | Strong Agree 5 | No response | Section | Course | Level | Dept | |
| 10. I rate the overall quality of the course as: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 1 | 4.69 | 4.48 | 4.38 | 4.35 |

What do you like best about this course?:

"Love his attitude and his 'rants'"

"Encouraged us to discuss on the class, to explain our thoughts and comments"

"Prof. Popper is an engaging orator. "

"Professor is really knowledgeable, and he introduces cases and stories in an interesting way."

"The professor"

"-Knowledgeable Professor -I appreciate the paper based format of the class and thoughtful suggestions on the content and quality of writing "

"I'd been told before this semester that Prof. Popper was an entertainer in ways professors generally aren't. Having now taken the class, I can say I agree. He has a dry wit, but beyond that, things like using a passport for a demonstration of American attitudes toward cities or extended soliloquies on the pile of papers inevitably waiting for professors at the end of every semester are more, for lack of a better word, theatrical than the average professor. Personally, I loved it. It seemed to me to keep students engaged, and Prof. Popper's knowledge on an impressive array of topics - many of which, it seemed to me, were beyond the scope of "planning" per se - always shone through."

If you were teaching this course, what would you do differently?:

"As much as I liked. This course, I feel there is a lot of planning history I. Was not exposed to"

"Use sakai to distribute and collect papers "

"Nothing"

"No"

"-Perhaps a Powerpoint or other visual presentation in addition to purely lecture based classes"

"The reason I answered neutrally on "presented material in an organized manner" and "instructional methods encouraged student learning" might not even be fair - the methods worked for me, but occasionally Prof. Popper would get going on a topic and admit he was getting off-track from what the class discussion had been. That's fine by me - discussions don't always go the way you expect them to - but I wonder if what works for me might be frustrating for someone else. Additionally, while I feel we devoted more time to class discussions as the semester went on, I wonder if setting aside even more time for those might have been fruitful. It's possible it wouldn't have been - after all, much of the class might have been (understandably) hesitant to speak when we *did* have class discussions simply because English wasn't their first language - but may be worth considering in future semesters. Also in some cases he's taken a really long time to grade papers, but I'll abide by his request and think of the pile."

In what ways, if any, has this course or the instructor encouraged your intellectual growth and progress?:

"Introduce the development and influence of American urban planning on different aspects, such as the technology and economy"

"The professor had given us many examples to understand very easily"

"-Through this course I have been exposed to a variety of the dominant streams of planning thought"

"I almost surprised myself with how interested I was in the "history" part of the course - in fact, I caught myself being disappointed a couple times when the focus shifted back to how that history applied to planning. (This caused some existential thoughts as a planning student, but that's another story). The reason, I think, is that Prof. Popper is really good at talking about this stuff, and clearly knows a lot. When you're around someone like that, you can't help but feel like you're growing intellectually, even if by osmosis. Plus he was always willing to answer any questions, and his answers would often yield another interesting detail on whatever the topic of the moment was."

Other comments or suggestions::

"Use PPT, short videos or other medias may make the course more interesting"

"No"
