

Please find below a representative sample of my most recent and relevant teaching evaluations. Complete evaluations for all courses, including evaluations for courses not listed below, are available upon request.

Social Science Inquiry II (Winter 2021 – 36 students enrolled in 2 sections; 20 evaluations)

Course description

In Social Science Inquiry II, students develop statistical, analytical, and programming skills required for conducting quantitative social science research. *In short, they learn applied statistics through linear regression.* The course combines brief lectures, reading and discussion of textbook excerpts and scholarly articles.

To facilitate student-centered learning under the remote format, I structured the course as a series of interactive, weekly modules that I then posted to my personal website. The modules laid out the learning objectives for a given week and then guided students through a series of video lectures that were each 10–15 minutes long. The modules were interactive because students were encouraged to complete tasks between videos (e.g., read an article or answer a question in preparation for the upcoming video). Students were also regularly asked to pause video lectures and answer “class questions”. A sample module is available at <http://www.markdeming.net/module-6-hypothesis-testing/>.

Structuring lectures as asynchronous modules gave students much-needed flexibility and allowed me to dedicate our regular class time to discussion in teams of 4–5 students. During these team meetings, students dissected readings that applied the core concepts introduced the online modules. For instance, as part of a module on hypothesis testing (linked above), students read and discussed *State of Texas v. the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, State of Georgia, State of Michigan, and State of Wisconsin*. This lawsuit was filed shortly after the 2020 US presidential election and used hypothesis testing to substantiate claims that the election in the defendant states had been fraudulent. I believe that this sort of reading and discussion underscored the relevance of different statistical concepts while enabling students to teach and learn from each other.

Finally, to further promote student-centered learning, I encouraged students to discuss assignments and exercises in teams of 4–5. This encouraged students to teach and learn from each other within a clear set of guidelines that I laid out in the course syllabus (attached in a later section).

Below, I include students’ complete quantitative feedback as well as a representative sample of their qualitative feedback.

Quantitative feedback from students:

	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>Total responses</i>
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)			
Overall, the instructor made a significant contribution to your learning.	0%	0%	5%	25%	70%	4.73	5.00	20

	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>Total responses</i>
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)			
The instructor stimulated your interest in the core ideas of the course.	0%	0%	5%	35%	60%	4.55	5.00	20
The instructor was available and helpful outside class.	0%	5%	0%	30%	65%	4.55	5.00	20
The instructor explained clearly the course objectives and expectations	0%	0%	5%	10%	85%	4.80	5.00	20
The instructor provided a syllabus that allowed you to plan your learning and study time effectively.	0%	0%	0%	20%	80%	4.80	5.00	20

Sample qualitative feedback from students:

Professor Deming is an amazing teacher and easily explained how to program in R. One of the best classes that I've had at Chicago!

Besides Deming being a wonderful teacher, he also treated us with tons of respect; I felt like this class was a safe place to discuss social science research and statistics methods. Such is not true of other classes at U.C. The videos were well organized and taught stats concepts in a way anyone could understand. Problem set expectations were clear.

Deming is a great professor. He is flexible and understanding especially in Covid times. No major complaints from me. He also sounds a bit like Sal Khan in his module videos. I highly recommend him for SSI if you get the chance. This was the best way to teach a class remotely that I have seen in the 3 remote quarters I've taken.

The videos gave me everything I needed to understand to do problem sets; problem sets were appropriate length and gave me transferable skills in coding and statistics. Synchronous sections were engaging. Overall this was just an excellent course and instructor.

The way he structured the course is very very good as it allows the instructor to interact with everyone and students to interact with each other.

I think the readings assignments and discussions of the readings are very helpful. They allowed me to understand how the statistics we learned are applied to real-world social sciences research.

Professor Deming is a new instructor, and it shows. He should be more careful not to muddle some key statistical concepts and to avoid including typos and unclear questions in his assignments.

[What most contributed to my learning was that] He encouraged students in the class to work together on assignments and participate on ED Discussion. He also adjusted to mid-quarter feedback.

Lectures were asynchronous and we had a 40 min long discussion once a week with a group of 5 people. I think the completion of modules (basically p-sets) was at first annoying, however, now at the end of the quarter I understand their utility.

Social Science Inquiry III (Spring 2021 – 39 students enrolled in 2 sections; 22 evaluations)

Course description

In Social Science Inquiry III, students build on the knowledge and skills developed in fall and winter quarters to complete a substantial independent research paper. As instructor, I guide them through this process. Through lectures, readings, and discussion, we examine the steps in the research process, from developing a research question and theory to elaborating and executing an effective analysis plan. We also examine the main components of a social science research paper in detail (i.e., abstracts, introductory sections, literature reviews, arguments, data and methods, and so forth). Finally, we practice giving and receiving critical but constructive written and verbal peer feedback by regularly workshopping students' own research.

Similar to SSI II above, I structured this course as a series of interactive, weekly modules coupled with regular meetings in teams of 4–5 students. A sample module on *Research areas, topics and questions* is available at <http://www.markdeming.net/module-2-research-areas-topics-and-questions/>. Structuring the course in this way made course interactive and student-centered. Students could complete readings and lectures at their own pace. Meanwhile, weekly team meetings boosted their interaction with each other and me, and helped them develop their research by supplying them with ample peer feedback.

Below, I provide students' complete quantitative feedback as well as a representative sample of their qualitative feedback.

Sample quantitative feedback from students:

	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>Total responses</i>
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)			
Overall, the instructor made a significant contribution to your learning.	5.3%	0.0%	5.3%	15.8%	73.7%	4.53	5.00	19
The instructor stimulated your interest in the core ideas of the course.	4.8%	0.0%	4.8%	14.3%	76.2%	4.57	5.00	21
The instructor was available and helpful outside class.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	85.7%	4.86	5.00	21
The instructor explained clearly the course objectives and expectations	4.8%	4.8%	4.8%	4.8%	81.0%	4.53	5.00	21

	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>Total responses</i>
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)			
The instructor provided a syllabus that allowed you to plan your learning and study time effectively.	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	9.5%	85.7%	4.71	5.00	21

Sample qualitative feedback from students:

Deming is an absolute GOAT. Super respectful professor, provides tons of feedback, actually cares about you learning and will help you through the quarter, sets up tons of office hours outside of class even though he's probably so busy, returns things in a timely manner. Really I never thought I would gain so much from this sequence, he is one of those special instructors.

Professor Deming was a great teacher who cared about his students' learning. I could tell he was invested in each one of our research papers and it made a difference in the synchronous class discussions.

His willingness to understand our research topics and go above and beyond in understanding them felt like magic. I don't think I have ever had a professor who dedicates this much time and availability for his class. He is also very understanding of problems that might arise and is flexible to adjust for them. I am definitely asking him for a rec. for med. school lol. His modules are also super helpful; I would definitely use them if you have access to them when taking this class in person.

Lectures were ok, but the most important was the reading and the format of the discussions! I really loved that Mark still tried to give us the “normal” sense of discussions during remote learning!

Short lectures were digestible and understandable. Synchronous classes were kept in small groups which made it a lot more personable and such that you got to interact a lot more with the instructor, your peers, and got to get / give lots more feedback. Work was a lot towards the end of the quarter but not unreasonable bc it's a full paper. It would've helped to have a few more required grades between essay due dates like data analysis, etc just to keep me from procrastinating.

Loved the asynchronous module / weekly synchronous 40 minute meeting structure. Thought it was the perfect balance of remote / face-to-face learning and discussion.

The online modules were really helpful and clear. For discussion, we met once a week in 40 minute sessions with a group of 4 to 5 students which was a really ingenious way of teaching at an interpersonal level. Deming really cares about his class and the structure of the class demonstrates that.

Actually having to write a research paper boosted my confidence level—it was the longest paper I've written in my life thus far.

I'd say the main thing is to be clearer in terms of the expectations for each assignment, especially for the final two we were given about a paragraph's worth of information, and it wasn't immediately clear what exactly was expected or the formatting guidelines. Additionally, for questions about assignments, especially as the due date approaches, being more responsive would be really helpful.

Excellent professor, definitely recommend. The way he did his class meetings (4–5 students meet at a time once a week) really helped us learn in a collaborative setting.

Prof. Deming is really good and always helpful in live discussions! His specific feedback on assignments was helpful as well.

Deming was always super available outside of class! Also just a super encouraging guy in general super willing to help and very understanding, not afraid to provide constructive criticism but also very empathetic with students work load!

The weekly reading Q&A were really useless to me... they feel more like things to check off my weekly to-do list instead of things that can let me learn something.

He designed the remote format of the course so that I for giving and getting more feedback. Short and well thought out / presented lectures. The expectations for how to actually succeed on the assignments were clear for the first time in any of my writing classes.

The big project was our research paper. I'm not sure that the weekly readings were really necessary; I stopped doing them about halfway through.

Initially, professor had weekly and graded R exercises. However, upon learning this section (Section 6) was handled by a different professor in Winter and was taught Stata instead of R, he removed the R requirement altogether. This allowed the class to be more inclusive and also not detract from its primary focus, which is how to conduct social science inquiry (which can be done on both Stata and R).

Introduction to Comparative Politics

Course description

Introduction to Comparative Politics is one of the main introductory courses offered by the University of Chicago's Political Science Department. Most political science majors take the course, usually in their second or third year of study. In the course, students explore a broad range of pressing political questions and begin to develop answers to these questions. For instance, why do some democracies succumb to attempts by elected incumbents to erode institutional checks and balances while others exhibit resilience? Why do some countries redistribute wealth and income while others persist in deep economic inequality? How do electoral institutions shape representation across countries? Why are some countries marred by insurgency and criminal violence but not others?

Students explore these questions through readings, lectures, and weekly discussion sections comprised of around 24 students. As a teaching intern and, later, co-instructor for the course, I taught two discussion sections and at times wrote and gave lectures. Overall, I taught this course 4 times during my graduate studies. Below, I provide a representative sample of student commentary on my instruction across all 4 courses. I lay out comments in reverse chronological order because I believe this demonstrates how my instruction has improved over time. In addition, whereas the complete evaluations focus not only on my instruction but that of my co-instructor and fellow teaching interns, I limit the sample below to commentary on my own instruction. I am more than happy to provide the complete evaluations upon request.

Sample qualitative feedback from students:

Spring 2019 – 157 students; 60 evaluations

Mark was great at facilitating discussions in the discussion section, and had some really insightful comments about many of the readings which did a lot to further my understanding of the material.

Mark is incredibly experienced and knowledgeable about the material. His discussion section is always informative.

Discussion section should not be the most stressful part of a course. Lower the standards a little bit, or allow for slightly more wiggle room. But Mark was fantastic, really.

Mark Deming made discussion sections very engaging and useful. I found the readings to be a hit or miss as far as usefulness.

Spring 2018 – 166 students; 67 evaluations

Mark was phenomenal. He was not only very good at explaining difficult concepts such that I actually understood what some of the most difficult theorists were talking about, but he was so useful outside of class it was ridiculous that so little people showed up to his office hours. He helped me learn, survive, and enjoy this course in such a way that I never would have done without him.

Mark emphasized the importance of making connections between the lectures, discussion sessions, readings, and data to have a better understanding of comparative politics. By the end of the quarter, I was able to learn how to take data and ideas from a reading, challenge them or agree with them, and then show their connections to other readings and concepts from the class.

Mark helped me understand how to speak and write about the concepts we covered in lecture, discussion, or for homework. I started off the quarter thinking only within the limits of a certain reading or topic, but Mark emphasized the importance of making connections between the lectures, discussion sessions, readings, and data to have a better understanding of comparative politics. By the end of the quarter, I was able to learn how to take data and ideas from a reading, challenge them or agree with them, and then show their connections to other readings and concepts from the class.

Mark is one of the best TAs I've had — he's great at organizing readings so that they're easier to understand and focused on the core concepts. Also he was always available to meet outside of class and was really helpful at answering questions.

Mark was incredible!! Discussion sections with him were very enjoyable and he broke down difficult and confusing readings very well. He was always willing to meet outside of discussion sections for further help. Only bad thing was that discussion sections weren't more often (something that was completely out of his control).

Mark was available outside of class and extremely helpful. He motivated students to think independently and synthesize course concepts.

Mark was an amazing TA! He was really easy to contact outside of class for help with course material/our final essay, his sections were great in ensuring that the class worked through difficult parts of the reading, and he was always really friendly (even knowing most of the class's name after the first day!). I was really glad to have had Mark as a TA and learned a lot from his sections that weren't always perfectly conveyed during lecture.

Autumn 2016 – 74 students; 38 evaluations

Mark Deming was a great TA. He had real experience, which was really cool! He did a wonderful job clarifying the readings and highlighting the important topics. He was very straight forward and real with us about the expectations of the class, tests, etc. He was always willing and available to meet during office hours.

Mark Deming had a command of the material and lead productive, engaging discussions. He seemed to have more knowledge of South America than the professor.

Mark Deming was the only saving grace of the class. He worked really hard to help us understand the material and talk through some of the big-picture concepts, and was always helpful and available.

Discussion sections were run well by Mark. He was able to always connect the discussion back to the main ideas of the lectures and he was able to ask pointed questions that directed the conversation towards appropriate conclusions.

Mark was extremely helpful, enthusiastic, clear, and approachable as an instructor. He managed to generate productive discussion in sections, and he was excellent at mapping out and explaining the core arguments of assigned readings. Overall, he was very helpful in improving our understanding of the more complex ideas and concepts presented in this course.

Mark was awesome, but I wish we had more assignments between class and discussion to ensure that we were doing the readings, and more active talks in the discussion periods. Sometimes they were kind of like the lectures and just repeated the main ideas, which wasn't all that useful if you actually did the reading.

Mark was really helpful and very easy to talk to. I don't think this was an easy class to TA for but he did a great job of making sense of the material.

Mark Deming is the best TA I've had. He always gave great effort into making himself available and ensuring that all students understood the course material.

Winter 2016 – 172 students; 69 evaluations

[Note: There are relatively few comments that focus solely on my teaching for this quarter. Many comments that address my teaching are mixed with commentary about other teaching interns. I include only commentary that cast these other interns in positive light.]

At the beginning of the course, the teaching assistants gave some what lackluster lectures, especially in comparison to Professor Slater. Mark was an exception and gave a great two lectures during his week of teaching. He also provided helpful feedback on the first paper and tried be available for office hours.

Most of the TAs were terrible at lecturing. The only good ones were Sana and Mark. The others were mediocre at best and unintelligible at worst.

Do not let the TAs lecture so much...If I had known who was lecturing ahead of time, I would have skipped the classes with most of the TAs and only gone to Sana and Mark's classes.

Introduction to International Relations

Course description:

Introduction to International Relations another one of the main introductory courses at the University of Chicago's Political Science Department. Most political science majors take the course, usually in their second or third year of study. In the course, students develop their ability to analyze inter-state relations by examining some fundamental puzzles: Why is war a perennial feature of human existence? Why do wars erupt at a particular time and place? Why do states craft treaties only to later break them? What role do international organizations and institutions play in mitigating interstate violence? Why do trade wars happen?

Students explore these questions through readings, lectures, and weekly discussion sections comprised of around 24 students. As a teaching intern, I taught two discussion sections. Overall, I taught this course 3 times during my graduate studies. On two of these occasions, I served as lead TA, which means that I helped the instructor of record mentor new teaching interns and support students who faced obstacles to participating and succeeding in the course. As above, I provide a representative sample of qualitative student evaluation of my instruction across all 3 courses, and I limit the sample to commentary that focuses solely on my own instruction. I am more than happy to provide the complete evaluations upon request.

Sample qualitative feedback from students:

Autumn 2018 – 177 students; 96 evaluations

Mark Deming was truly great — he made himself very available outside of the classroom and his office hours, was incredibly understanding and accommodating, and was invaluable in my gaining a better grasp of the material as well as succeeding on the class assignments. While he did demonstrate a clear understanding (and excitement!) for the material, he was also not afraid to have discussions with students that would challenge or change his way of thinking, which I appreciated tremendously. Throughout the quarter, he acted as both a teaching assistant and an intellectual sparring partner to his students. I really think Mark was an amazing instructor in every sense of the word, and I am very grateful I had him as my TA.

Mark challenged my questions at every turn and justified his grading. Although I am not happy with my performance on these papers, I feel as though Mark did try to make the inane paper topics more manageable and he helped clarify elements of confusion on my part.

Oh my goodness. Mark is the perfect TA. So perfect it is quite terrifying. He remembered me from a class I was in with him TWO years ago. He learns everyone's names and about irrelevant material which was very helpful. He gave positive insight on consistently uses them throughout the course. Mark leads the section in a non-nonsense way. It is everything I could have wanted in a section. He is

BEYOND fair about expectations and grades and lays it all out in the beginning. We go over material that is actually helpful for the assignments, and is often the assignment itself. I always feel less stressed about the class after section. We are given time to discuss in small groups. This allows us to have interesting conversations and allows shy people to have the chance to speak. Then we come together so we get the right and complete answers to the questions. He is very available and incredibly fair about grading and telling you why you got the grade you did. Mark's handwriting is perfect which is actually a little scary. Mark is so perfect it's like he was crafted to be the perfect TA. He's like the Ken doll of TAs. I can only wish all TAs were even half as good as he is.

Mark is an excellent TA. He organized discussion sections very clearly and is a really articulate speaker. He presented key ideas from the readings clearly which deepened my understanding of the course material. Mark was very available and helpful outside of class, and he always made clear what was expected from each assignment as well as how to improve. I would try to get into Mark's section for future classes if possible — he's such a great TA!

Mark was very good at facilitating discussion to get at the most essential concepts of the course. He also provided very helpful essay feedback when I met with him in person.

Mark is great at diving deep into the content and motivating serious intellectual discourse and thinking.

Mark was very knowledgeable on the topic. He facilitated interesting, direct discussions without talking assignments and did everything in his power to help anyone who needed it. Even when he couldn't meet in person, he was helpful over email. Great TA.

Autumn 2017 176 students enrolled; 84 evaluations

Mark was great! He was very accessible and explained things clearly. He also was a very fair grader. I loved his emphasis on conceptual understanding rather than name-dropping readings.

Mark was great meeting one on one and motivated me to work harder in class.

Mark was always very clear about what we were expected to do in the course. He effectively communicated his grading system and highlighted what he was going to be looking for.

I think that Mark knew a lot about the theorists in the texts we were reading. He really helped me understand the readings that often didn't really relate well or clearly to the class lectures. I also think that doing the quiz at the end of the discussions was helpful.

Mark was really good at organizing discussion sections around a particular set of questions that tied the readings and lectures together, and was good at parsing through the major concepts in the readings and lectures that we needed to know.

Mark was great — he facilitated our discussion section and was very knowledgeable about the materials. He was also willing to help the students to understand.

Mark was good at explaining the concepts we had covered in the context of the readings, which added significance to the stuff we were doing in class. He was also good at picking apart the more difficult parts of the readings.

Autumn 2015 199 students enrolled; 60 evaluations

Mark is simply outstanding. He demonstrated a mastery understanding of the course material did an excellent job during discussion using student responses to distill the main points of the course. On top of that, he was consistently kind and communicative outside of class. One of the best instructors I've had in the College.

Mark Deming has strong classroom presence and will make a formidable lecturer/professor someday quite soon. He is incredibly knowledgeable and inspired me to engage more with political science as a discipline. I can't say a bad word about him.

Mark was nice and knowledgeable, and he had excellent feedback on the exams.

Mark Deming is a very helpful and instructive TA, does a very good job stimulating discussion. He is a bit of a harsh grader, however, seeing as Professor Lipson gave me much higher grades (and I felt as if I did much better than Mark had graded me as well) than Mark had, once I'd asked Professor Lipson to re-grade my midterm.

Mark was great. Very positive toward his students and did his best to make sure we understood the important stuff. I only wish he had spent a bit less time reviewing concepts (which generally were easy to understand) and had spent more time going over the authors' differing views, but overall he was an excellent TA.

The first few classes were kind of useless — we spent the class answering student questions about the readings, which usually failed to better our understanding of the themes in the material. Once Mark started directing the discussions towards the readings only, they actually became productive. Students should ask their individual questions on their own time, or at least during discussion once we've covered the important material.