We seek your *anonymous* feedback on this course so-far. Please be honest, detailed and constructive, so we can improve the class. Place the forms anonymously in one of our mail boxes. Thanks - An & Dave

1) Where does this class rate (as an integer on a scale from 0 - 10) in terms of how interesting it is to you?

8

0 = Not interesting

5 = Somewhat Interesting

10=Very interesting

2) Where does this class rate (as a number) in terms of the familiarity of the material?

4

0 = Very Familiar

5 = Somewhat Familiar

10=Not at all familiar

3) Where does this class rate (as a number) in terms of the level of the presentation?

6

0 = Too simple

5 = About right

10= Too difficult

4) Do you think the balance of the lectures should be tipped to have

7.5

0=More theory

5=no change needed

10=more examples

5) So far, how does this class change your interest in planetary surfaces?

8 (already pretty interested, but it has greatly contributed to that)

0=Less interested

5=No change

10=More interested

5) Are there subjects you would like to see covered but which are not included in the online syllabus? What are they?

Not in particular, if all of the subjects on the syllabus are actually covered. Ones in particular that I would like to see covered (that are listed as already covered or intended to be covered) are: crustal compositions/evolutions of rocky planets and small bodies, (more of) determination of planetary landscape from images, craters (geochronology, physics, classification, geological expression), surface morphology.

### A) Comments to both lecturers

If we could get more information about the presentation/paper and the dates for that sooner rather than later, that would be great so that we can get started on that or at least plan for it.

I appreciate not having a final- I think it would be very difficult to pinpoint exactly what to study and in the end would boil down to the memorization of formulas. I think we will get much more out of individual projects.

Lastly, while I enjoy the separate styles of the lectures, it might be interesting and helpful to have them tie into each other a bit better as we cross over between lecturers. Sometimes it feels like two separate classes.

### B) Comments to An Yin specifically

I like the general model that you follow where you begin by explaining the model for Earth and then you expand and apply that to other planets by explaining where the model fits and where/how it breaks down. However, it might be nice to equally split the time spent explaining the model for each planet- sometimes the spread is unequal (as with the orogenic model on Earth). This Tuesday's class though, I thought, was great, and I very much enjoyed the image examples and the illustrations of how to interpret satellite images of geologic features.

## C) Comments to David Jewitt specifically

I really like that you use the board as opposed to PowerPoints, because it helps keep a pace that we can follow easily when you are introducing concepts and equations. However, it might be helpful to use PowerPoint sometimes to show some images/examples of real data applications of some of the theories and equations that you have given us. Especially with some of the small bodies that are very far away, it can be difficult to put everything into perspective, and some images/graphs, figures, etc might be helpful.

We seek your *anonymous* feedback on this course so-far. Please be honest, detailed and constructive, so we can improve the class. Place the forms anonymously in one of our mail boxes. Thanks - An & Dave

| our mail boxes. Thanks -   | An & Dave                     | ne ionns a  | nonymously in one of |  |  |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|--|--|
| 1) Where does this class r interesting it is to you?   | ate (as an integer on a scale | from 0 - 10 | )) in terms of how   |  |  |
| 0 = Not interesting  | 5 = Somewhat Interesting      | 8           | 10=Very interesting  |  |  |
| 2) Where does this class rate (as a number) in terms of the familiarity of the material?                                   |                               |             |                      |  |  |
| 0 = Very Familiar<br>familiar  | 5 = Somewhat Familiar         | 6           | 10=Not at all        |  |  |
| 3) Where does this class rate (as a number) in terms of the level of the presentation?                                     |                               |             |                      |  |  |
| 0 = Too simple   | 5 = About right               | 7           | 10= Too difficult    |  |  |
| 4) Do you think the balance of the lectures should be tipped to have   |                               |             |                      |  |  |
| 0=More theory  | 5=no change needed            | 7           | 10=more examples     |  |  |
| 5) So far, how does this class change your interest in planetary surfaces?   |                               |             |                      |  |  |
| 0=Less interested  | 5=No change                   | 7           | 10=More interested   |  |  |
| 5) Are there subjects you would like to see covered but which are not included in the on-<br>line syllabus? What are they? |                               |             |                      |  |  |

No, it's pretty comprehensive.

A) Comments to both lecturers

You both work well together. It's nice to have opinions from 2 different backgrounds because it gives the class a nice range and depth.

B) Comments to An Yin specifically

The volcanics lecture was more of what I was expecting from this class: lots of examples of planetary surface features with a nice amount of background theory. Some of the earlier lectures had a bit too much theory that wasn't all that helpful.

C) Comments to David Jewitt specifically

Really enjoyable lectures and presentation style. There's a fast pace but I learn a lot and it's nice not just to be staring at a Powerpoint presentation. My brain is tired after the lectures but in a good way!

We seek your *anonymous* feedback on this course so-far. Please be honest, detailed and constructive, so we can improve the class. Place the forms anonymously in one of our mail boxes. Thanks.

| An & Dave  |                          |                        |  |  |  |
|--|--------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1) Where does this class rate (as an integer on a scale from 0 - 10) in terms of how interesting it is to you?   |                          |                        |  |  |  |
| 0 = Not interesting  | 5 = Somewhat Interesting | 10=Very interesting    |  |  |  |
| 2) Where does this class rate (as a number) in terms of the familiarity of the material?   |                          |                        |  |  |  |
| 0 = Very Familiar  | 5 = Somewhat Familiar    | 10=Not at all familiar |  |  |  |
| 3) Where does this class rate (as a number) in terms of the level of the presentation? 4   |                          |                        |  |  |  |
| 0 = Too simple   | 5 = About right          | 10= Too difficult      |  |  |  |
| 4) Do you think the balance of the lectures should be tipped to have 6   |                          |                        |  |  |  |
| 0=More theory  | 5=no change needed       | 10=more examples       |  |  |  |
| 5) So far, how does this class change your interest in planetary surfaces? §   |                          |                        |  |  |  |
| 0=Less interested  | 5=No change              | 10=More interested     |  |  |  |
| 5) Are there subjects you would like to see covered but which are not included in the online syllabus? What are they?  More on individual surfaces? the (possible) processes that are responsible for them. Possibly a lecture that focuses just on the major geomorphic structures of each planet? Some satellites asteroids, SEE NEXT PAGE |                          |                        |  |  |  |

### A) Comments to both lecturers

A good class so far - there is a lot of great information provided to help make the connection between geology; planetary sciences (which we all know is often lost). As stated in the previous question, a lecture that specifically focused on the features of each planet, some satellites is some asteroids might be nice, just to give us (the students) a feel for what some of the broblems without definite answers are out there. Also, I think it might be appropriate to make homework mandatory - but that's just a personal preference.

### B) Comments to An Yin specifically

extra background before jumping into mechanics is fault theory might be helpful.

## C) Comments to David Jewitt specifically

Also a great job so far. No suggestions.

We seek your anonymous feedback on this course so-far. Please be honest, detailed and constructive, so we can improve the class. Place the forms anonymously in one of our mail boxes. Thanks - An & Dave

| <ol> <li>Where does this class rate (</li> </ol> | as an integer on | a scale from 0 - 10) | in terms of how |
|--|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| interesting it is to you?                        |                  |                      |                 |

0 = Not interesting 5 = Somewhat Interesting

10=Very interesting

2) Where does this class rate (as a number) in terms of the familiarity of the material?

0 = Very Familiar

5 = Somewhat Familiar

10=Not at all familiar

3) Where does this class rate (as a number) in terms of the level of the presentation?

0 = Too simple

5 = About right

10= Too difficult

4) Do you think the balance of the lectures should be tipped to have

0=More theory

5=no change needed

10=more examples

5) So far, how does this class change your interest in planetary surfaces?

0=Less interested

5=No change

10=More interested

5) Are there subjects you would like to see covered but which are not included in the online syllabus? What are they?

No, the subject material is great! The topics seem a little scattered but they are all very interesting.

### A) Comments to both lecturers

Lectures are great and I always learn something new. The slide shows incorporate great visual aids and examples of the phenomena that are being described in the theory portion of the lecture.

The lecture topics are great but the order they are presented in seems scattered (this is probably due to this being a new class). I hope that if this class continues in coming years that a more systematic approach can be taken when introducing topics.

I was just trying to think of an example of how to arrange the topics and realized how hard it is to choose a starting place for this class. All in all, this has been a great class so far. I like the informal seminar-like atmosphere and the open-minded approach to these topics.

### B) Comments to An Yin specifically

Lecture material is solid but sometimes I get lost when following your explanations. An is very excited about the subjects he is covering but I think that this sometimes causes him to jump ahead before fully explaining the concept at hand.

The flow of information on the board can sometimes get very chaotic (this can be exhausting for students trying to follow a train of thought).

### C) Comments to David Jewitt specifically

I highly enjoy Prof. Jewitt's lecture presentations which contain just the right amount of humor, wit, and fascinating scientific methods to explaining phenomena that we have so little data for.

Most of the material that Prof. Jewitt lectures on is new to me but I feel like I am always able to keep up with his lecture pace. His constant concern for the class is evident when he pauses after each topic to judge the class's response to his choice of words. He's not afraid to change his lecturing style on the spot of he notices the class does not understand a specific concept.

We seek your *anonymous* feedback on this course so-far. Please be honest, detailed and constructive, so we can improve the class. Place the forms anonymously in one of our mail boxes. Thanks - An & Dave

| our mail boxes. Thanks - A   | n & Dave   | nonymously in one of   |  |  |  |
|--|--|------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1) Where does this class rate interesting it is to you?                                  | e (as an integer on a scale from 0 - 10  | )) in terms of how     |  |  |  |
| 0 = Not interesting  | 5 = Somewhat Interesting   | 10=Very interesting    |  |  |  |
| 2) Where does this class rate (as a number) in terms of the familiarity of the material? |  |                        |  |  |  |
| 0 = Very Familiar  | 5 = Somewhat Familiar  | 10=Not at all familiar |  |  |  |
| 3) Where does this class rate (as a number) in terms of the level of the presentation?   |  |                        |  |  |  |
| 0 = Too simple   | 5 = About right  | 10= Too difficult      |  |  |  |
| 4) Do you think the balance of the lectures should be tipped to have                     |  |                        |  |  |  |
| 0=More theory  | 5=no change needed   | 10=more examples       |  |  |  |
| 5) So far, how does this class change your interest in planetary surfaces?               |  |                        |  |  |  |
| 0=Less interested  | 5=No change  | 10=More interested     |  |  |  |
| 5) Are there subjects you wo line syllabus? What are they                                | uld like to see covered but which are in the second |                        |  |  |  |

A) Comments to both lecturers

Keep up the good sak!!!

B) Comments to An Yin specifically

Thank you!

C) Comments to David Jewitt specifically

Manle you!