

Summary Report

Zeying Wu
Term: Spring19

Quantitative Report

| Course Sections | Key | Report Status | Enrolled Students | Responded Students | Response Rates |
|--|----------|---------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| <u>IR 271 (B1): Introduction to International Relations</u> | A | Released | 19 | 16 | 84.21% |
| <u>IR 271 (B2): Introduction to International Relations</u> | B | Released | 19 | 15 | 78.95% |
| <u>IR 271 (F1): Introduction to International Relations</u> | C | Released | 17 | 17 | 100% |
| <u>PO 171 (B1): Introduction to International Relations</u> | D | Released | 15 | 13 | 86.67% |
| <u>PO 171 (B2): Introduction to International Relations</u> | E | Released | 16 | 14 | 87.5% |
| <u>PO 171 (F1): Introduction to International Relations</u> | F | Released | 15 | 15 | 100% |
| Overall | | | 101 | 90 | 89.11% |

| | | (1) Low | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) High | Mean | Standard Deviation | Did Not Answer | Total Responses |
|--------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Relevance of assigned readings | A | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 12.5% (2) | 25% (4) | 62.5% (10) | 4.5 | 0.71 | 0 | 16 |
| | B | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 6.67% (1) | 33.33% (5) | 60% (9) | 4.53 | 0.62 | 0 | 15 |
| | C | 5.88% (1) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 52.94% (9) | 41.18% (7) | 4.24 | 0.94 | 0 | 17 |
| | D | 0% (0) | 15.38% (2) | 23.08% (3) | 23.08% (3) | 38.46% (5) | 3.85 | 1.1 | 0 | 13 |
| | E | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 7.14% (1) | 35.71% (5) | 57.14% (8) | 4.5 | 0.63 | 0 | 14 |
| | F | 0% (0) | 6.67% (1) | 0% (0) | 53.33% (8) | 40% (6) | 4.27 | 0.77 | 0 | 15 |

| | | Easy | Moderately Easy | Neither Easy nor Difficult | Moderately Difficult | Difficult | Mean | Standard Deviation | Did Not Answer | Total Responses |
|----------------------|----------|-----------|-----------------|----------------------------|----------------------|-----------|------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Difficulty of course | A | 0% (0) | 12.5% (2) | 50% (8) | 37.5% (6) | 0% (0) | 3.25 | 0.66 | 0 | 16 |

| | Easy | Moderately Easy | Neither Easy nor Difficult | Moderately Difficult | Difficult | Mean | Standard Deviation | Did Not Answer | Total Responses |
|----------|--------------|-----------------|----------------------------|----------------------|-----------|------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| B | 6.67% (1) | 13.33% (2) | 66.67% (10) | 13.33% (2) | 0% (0) | 2.87 | 0.72 | 0 | 15 |
| C | 0% (0) | 35.29% (6) | 35.29% (6) | 29.41% (5) | 0% (0) | 2.94 | 0.8 | 0 | 17 |
| D | 0% (0) | 30.77% (4) | 38.46% (5) | 30.77% (4) | 0% (0) | 3 | 0.78 | 0 | 13 |
| E | 7.14% (1) | 7.14% (1) | 21.43% (3) | 64.29% (9) | 0% (0) | 3.43 | 0.9 | 0 | 14 |
| F | 0% (0) | 26.67% (4) | 40% (6) | 33.33% (5) | 0% (0) | 3.07 | 0.77 | 0 | 15 |

| | Light | Moderately Light | Neither Light nor Heavy | Moderately Heavy | Heavy | Mean | Standard Deviation | Did Not Answer | Total Responses |
|--------------------------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--------------|------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Workload in course A | 0% (0) | 12.5% (2) | 56.25% (9) | 25% (4) | 6.25% (1) | 3.25 | 0.75 | 0 | 16 |
| B | 13.33% (2) | 6.67% (1) | 53.33% (8) | 20% (3) | 6.67% (1) | 3 | 1.03 | 0 | 15 |

| | Light | Moderately Light | Neither Light nor Heavy | Moderately Heavy | Heavy | Mean | Standard Deviation | Did Not Answer | Total Responses |
|----------|--------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------|---------------|------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| C | 0% (0) | 17.65% (3) | 35.29% (6) | 35.29% (6) | 11.76% (2) | 3.41 | 0.91 | 0 | 17 |
| D | 7.69% (1) | 7.69% (1) | 38.46% (5) | 38.46% (5) | 7.69% (1) | 3.31 | 0.99 | 0 | 13 |
| E | 0% (0) | 21.43% (3) | 21.43% (3) | 57.14% (8) | 0% (0) | 3.36 | 0.81 | 0 | 14 |
| F | 0% (0) | 26.67% (4) | 26.67% (4) | 33.33% (5) | 13.33% (2) | 3.33 | 1.01 | 0 | 15 |

Course Evaluation

| | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent | N/A | Mean | Standard Deviation | Did Not Answer | Total Responses |
|---|---------------|-----------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-----------|------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Overall rating of discussion instructor (if applicable) | | | | | | | | | | |
| A | 12.5% (2) | 0% (0) | 18.75% (3) | 25% (4) | 43.75% (7) | 0% (0) | 3.88 | 1.32 | 0 | 16 |
| B | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 6.67% (1) | 46.67% (7) | 46.67% (7) | 0% (0) | 4.4 | 0.61 | 0 | 15 |
| C | 11.76% (2) | 0% (0) | 5.88% (1) | 29.41% (5) | 52.94% (9) | 0% (0) | 4.12 | 1.28 | 0 | 17 |

| | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent | N/A | Mean | Standard Deviation | Did Not Answer | Total Responses |
|--|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| D | 0% (0) | 30.77% (4) | 7.69% (1) | 23.08% (3) | 38.46% (5) | 0% (0) | 3.69 | 1.26 | 0 | 13 |
| E | 7.14% (1) | 0% (0) | 14.29% (2) | 14.29% (2) | 64.29% (9) | 0% (0) | 4.29 | 1.16 | 0 | 14 |
| F | 0% (0) | 6.67% (1) | 20% (3) | 20% (3) | 53.33% (8) | 0% (0) | 4.2 | 0.98 | 0 | 15 |
| Overall rating of lab instructor (if applicable) | | | | | | | | | | |
| A | 0% (0) | 6.25% (1) | 0% (0) | 6.25% (1) | 18.75% (3) | 68.75% (11) | 4.2 | 1.17 | 0 | 16 |
| B | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 13.33% (2) | 26.67% (4) | 60% (9) | 4.67 | 0.47 | 0 | 15 |
| C | 5.88% (1) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 11.76% (2) | 0% (0) | 82.35% (14) | 3 | 1.41 | 0 | 17 |
| D | 0% (0) | 7.69% (1) | 7.69% (1) | 23.08% (3) | 7.69% (1) | 53.85% (7) | 3.67 | 0.94 | 0 | 13 |
| E | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 28.57% (4) | 71.43% (10) | 5 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| F | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 6.67% (1) | 6.67% (1) | 86.67% (13) | 4.5 | 0.5 | 0 | 15 |
| Usefulness of assignments and papers | | | | | | | | | | |
| A | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 18.75% (3) | 43.75% (7) | 25% (4) | 12.5% (2) | 4.07 | 0.7 | 0 | 16 |

| | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent | N/A | Mean | Standard Deviation | Did Not Answer | Total Responses |
|-----------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| B | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 33.33% (5) | 26.67% (4) | 40% (6) | 0% (0) | 4.07 | 0.85 | 0 | 15 |
| C | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 23.53% (4) | 29.41% (5) | 41.18% (7) | 5.88% (1) | 4.19 | 0.81 | 0 | 17 |
| D | 0% (0) | 15.38% (2) | 15.38% (2) | 30.77% (4) | 30.77% (4) | 7.69% (1) | 3.83 | 1.07 | 0 | 13 |
| E | 7.14% (1) | 0% (0) | 14.29% (2) | 21.43% (3) | 42.86% (6) | 14.29% (2) | 4.08 | 1.19 | 0 | 14 |
| F | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 46.67% (7) | 20% (3) | 20% (3) | 13.33% (2) | 3.69 | 0.82 | 0 | 15 |
| Overall course rating | | | | | | | | | | |
| A | 0% (0) | 18.75% (3) | 6.25% (1) | 43.75% (7) | 31.25% (5) | 0% (0) | 3.88 | 1.05 | 0 | 16 |
| B | 0% (0) | 6.67% (1) | 13.33% (2) | 40% (6) | 40% (6) | 0% (0) | 4.13 | 0.88 | 0 | 15 |
| C | 0% (0) | 5.88% (1) | 5.88% (1) | 41.18% (7) | 47.06% (8) | 0% (0) | 4.29 | 0.82 | 0 | 17 |
| D | 7.69% (1) | 15.38% (2) | 0% (0) | 23.08% (3) | 53.85% (7) | 0% (0) | 4 | 1.36 | 0 | 13 |
| E | 0% (0) | 7.14% (1) | 21.43% (3) | 28.57% (4) | 42.86% (6) | 0% (0) | 4.07 | 0.96 | 0 | 14 |

| | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent | N/A | Mean | Standard Deviation | Did Not Answer | Total Responses |
|----------|-----------|-----------|------------|---------------|---------------|-----------|------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| F | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 40% (6) | 26.67% (4) | 33.33% (5) | 0% (0) | 3.93 | 0.85 | 0 | 15 |

Faculty Evaluation

| | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Mean | Standard Deviation | Did Not Answer | Total Responses | |
|--------------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|----|
| Effectiveness in explaining concepts | A | 6.25% (1) | 6.25% (1) | 25% (4) | 31.25% (5) | 31.25% (5) | 3.75 | 1.15 | 0 | 16 |
| | B | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 60% (9) | 40% (6) | 4.4 | 0.49 | 0 | 15 |
| | C | 5.88% (1) | 5.88% (1) | 11.76% (2) | 47.06% (8) | 29.41% (5) | 3.88 | 1.08 | 0 | 17 |
| | D | 7.69% (1) | 23.08% (3) | 7.69% (1) | 23.08% (3) | 38.46% (5) | 3.62 | 1.39 | 0 | 13 |
| | E | 7.14% (1) | 0% (0) | 21.43% (3) | 28.57% (4) | 42.86% (6) | 4 | 1.13 | 0 | 14 |
| | F | 6.67% (1) | 6.67% (1) | 0% (0) | 60% (9) | 26.67% (4) | 3.93 | 1.06 | 0 | 15 |

| | | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Mean | Standard Deviation | Did Not Answer | Total Responses |
|--|----------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Ability to stimulate interest in subject | A | 12.5% (2) | 0% (0) | 31.25% (5) | 50% (8) | 6.25% (1) | 3.38 | 1.05 | 0 | 16 |
| | B | 0% (0) | 6.67% (1) | 26.67% (4) | 33.33% (5) | 33.33% (5) | 3.93 | 0.93 | 0 | 15 |
| | C | 11.76% (2) | 11.76% (2) | 17.65% (3) | 35.29% (6) | 23.53% (4) | 3.47 | 1.29 | 0 | 17 |
| | D | 7.69% (1) | 23.08% (3) | 15.38% (2) | 23.08% (3) | 30.77% (4) | 3.46 | 1.34 | 0 | 13 |
| | E | 7.14% (1) | 7.14% (1) | 35.71% (5) | 7.14% (1) | 42.86% (6) | 3.71 | 1.28 | 0 | 14 |
| | F | 6.67% (1) | 0% (0) | 33.33% (5) | 20% (3) | 40% (6) | 3.87 | 1.15 | 0 | 15 |
| Encouragement of class participation | A | 0% (0) | 12.5% (2) | 31.25% (5) | 31.25% (5) | 25% (4) | 3.69 | 0.98 | 0 | 16 |
| | B | 0% (0) | 6.67% (1) | 26.67% (4) | 33.33% (5) | 33.33% (5) | 3.93 | 0.93 | 0 | 15 |
| | C | 5.88% (1) | 5.88% (1) | 29.41% (5) | 23.53% (4) | 35.29% (6) | 3.76 | 1.16 | 0 | 17 |
| | D | 0% (0) | 15.38% (2) | 23.08% (3) | 23.08% (3) | 38.46% (5) | 3.85 | 1.1 | 0 | 13 |

| | | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Mean | Standard Deviation | Did Not Answer | Total Responses |
|-------------------------------------|----------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | E | 0% (0) | 21.43% (3) | 0% (0) | 35.71% (5) | 42.86% (6) | 4 | 1.13 | 0 | 14 |
| | F | 0% (0) | 6.67% (1) | 6.67% (1) | 40% (6) | 46.67% (7) | 4.27 | 0.85 | 0 | 15 |
| Fairness in grading | A | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 25% (4) | 37.5% (6) | 37.5% (6) | 4.13 | 0.78 | 0 | 16 |
| | B | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 13.33% (2) | 33.33% (5) | 53.33% (8) | 4.4 | 0.71 | 0 | 15 |
| | C | 11.76% (2) | 5.88% (1) | 5.88% (1) | 35.29% (6) | 41.18% (7) | 3.88 | 1.32 | 0 | 17 |
| | D | 0% (0) | 7.69% (1) | 7.69% (1) | 23.08% (3) | 61.54% (8) | 4.38 | 0.92 | 0 | 13 |
| | E | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 21.43% (3) | 21.43% (3) | 57.14% (8) | 4.36 | 0.81 | 0 | 14 |
| | F | 6.67% (1) | 13.33% (2) | 6.67% (1) | 20% (3) | 53.33% (8) | 4 | 1.32 | 0 | 15 |
| Promptness in returning assignments | A | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 12.5% (2) | 43.75% (7) | 43.75% (7) | 4.31 | 0.68 | 0 | 16 |
| | B | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 6.67% (1) | 46.67% (7) | 46.67% (7) | 4.4 | 0.61 | 0 | 15 |

| | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Mean | Standard Deviation | Did Not Answer | Total Responses |
|---------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| C | 5.88% (1) | 0% (0) | 11.76% (2) | 17.65% (3) | 64.71% (11) | 4.35 | 1.08 | 0 | 17 |
| D | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 30.77% (4) | 15.38% (2) | 53.85% (7) | 4.23 | 0.89 | 0 | 13 |
| E | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 7.14% (1) | 35.71% (5) | 57.14% (8) | 4.5 | 0.63 | 0 | 14 |
| F | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 13.33% (2) | 33.33% (5) | 53.33% (8) | 4.4 | 0.71 | 0 | 15 |
| Quality of feedback to students | | | | | | | | | |
| A | 0% (0) | 12.5% (2) | 31.25% (5) | 43.75% (7) | 12.5% (2) | 3.56 | 0.86 | 0 | 16 |
| B | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 20% (3) | 40% (6) | 40% (6) | 4.2 | 0.75 | 0 | 15 |
| C | 11.76% (2) | 0% (0) | 11.76% (2) | 29.41% (5) | 47.06% (8) | 4 | 1.28 | 0 | 17 |
| D | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 30.77% (4) | 69.23% (9) | 4.69 | 0.46 | 0 | 13 |
| E | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 35.71% (5) | 14.29% (2) | 50% (7) | 4.14 | 0.91 | 0 | 14 |
| F | 6.67% (1) | 13.33% (2) | 20% (3) | 40% (6) | 20% (3) | 3.53 | 1.15 | 0 | 15 |

| | | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Mean | Standard Deviation | Did Not Answer | Total Responses |
|-------------------------------|----------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Availability outside of class | A | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 18.75% (3) | 43.75% (7) | 37.5% (6) | 4.19 | 0.73 | 0 | 16 |
| | B | 0% (0) | 6.67% (1) | 20% (3) | 26.67% (4) | 46.67% (7) | 4.13 | 0.96 | 0 | 15 |
| | C | 5.88% (1) | 11.76% (2) | 23.53% (4) | 29.41% (5) | 29.41% (5) | 3.65 | 1.19 | 0 | 17 |
| | D | 0% (0) | 7.69% (1) | 23.08% (3) | 0% (0) | 69.23% (9) | 4.31 | 1.07 | 0 | 13 |
| | E | 0% (0) | 7.14% (1) | 28.57% (4) | 21.43% (3) | 42.86% (6) | 4 | 1 | 0 | 14 |
| | F | 0% (0) | 6.67% (1) | 20% (3) | 33.33% (5) | 40% (6) | 4.07 | 0.93 | 0 | 15 |
| Overall rating of instructor | A | 0% (0) | 12.5% (2) | 6.25% (1) | 50% (8) | 31.25% (5) | 4 | 0.94 | 0 | 16 |
| | B | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 20% (3) | 33.33% (5) | 46.67% (7) | 4.27 | 0.77 | 0 | 15 |
| | C | 11.76% (2) | 0% (0) | 5.88% (1) | 52.94% (9) | 29.41% (5) | 3.88 | 1.18 | 0 | 17 |
| | D | 0% (0) | 23.08% (3) | 7.69% (1) | 23.08% (3) | 46.15% (6) | 3.92 | 1.21 | 0 | 13 |

| | | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Mean | Standard Deviation | Did Not Answer | Total Responses |
|--|----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | E | 7.14% (1) | 0% (0) | 14.29% (2) | 21.43% (3) | 57.14% (8) | 4.21 | 1.15 | 0 | 14 |
| | F | 0% (0) | 6.67% (1) | 20% (3) | 20% (3) | 53.33% (8) | 4.2 | 0.98 | 0 | 15 |

| | | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent | Mean | Standard Deviation | Did Not Answer | Total Responses |
|---|----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Were the grading criteria clearly stated? | A | 0% (0) | 6.25% (1) | 12.5% (2) | 25% (4) | 56.25% (9) | 4.31 | 0.92 | 0 | 16 |
| | B | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 13.33% (2) | 33.33% (5) | 53.33% (8) | 4.4 | 0.71 | 0 | 15 |
| | C | 5.88% (1) | 0% (0) | 35.29% (6) | 17.65% (3) | 41.18% (7) | 3.88 | 1.13 | 0 | 17 |

Discussion Section Evaluation (if applicable)

| | | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent | N/A | Mean | Standard Deviation | Did Not Answer | Total Responses |
|--------------------------------------|----------|-----------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-----------|------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Effectiveness in explaining concepts | D | 0% (0) | 27.27% (3) | 18.18% (2) | 9.09% (1) | 45.45% (5) | 0% (0) | 3.73 | 1.29 | 0 | 11 |

| | | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent | N/A | Mean | Standard Deviation | Did Not Answer | Total Responses |
|--|----------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | E | 7.14% (1) | 0% (0) | 14.29% (2) | 7.14% (1) | 64.29% (9) | 7.14% (1) | 3.93 | 1.79 | 0 | 14 |
| | F | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 6.67% (1) | 33.33% (5) | 40% (6) | 20% (3) | 3.33 | 2.24 | 0 | 15 |
| Ability to stimulate interest in subject | D | 0% (0) | 27.27% (3) | 9.09% (1) | 27.27% (3) | 36.36% (4) | 0% (0) | 3.73 | 1.21 | 0 | 11 |
| | E | 7.14% (1) | 7.14% (1) | 7.14% (1) | 21.43% (3) | 50% (7) | 7.14% (1) | 3.71 | 1.79 | 0 | 14 |
| | F | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 33.33% (5) | 13.33% (2) | 33.33% (5) | 20% (3) | 3 | 2.16 | 0 | 15 |
| Encouragement of class participation | D | 9.09% (1) | 0% (0) | 45.45% (5) | 9.09% (1) | 36.36% (4) | 0% (0) | 3.64 | 1.23 | 0 | 11 |
| | E | 0% (0) | 7.14% (1) | 14.29% (2) | 21.43% (3) | 50% (7) | 7.14% (1) | 3.86 | 1.64 | 0 | 14 |
| | F | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 6.67% (1) | 13.33% (2) | 66.67% (10) | 13.33% (2) | 3.93 | 2.02 | 0 | 15 |
| Fairness in grading | D | 0% (0) | 9.09% (1) | 18.18% (2) | 9.09% (1) | 54.55% (6) | 9.09% (1) | 3.73 | 1.81 | 0 | 11 |
| | E | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 14.29% (2) | 14.29% (2) | 64.29% (9) | 7.14% (1) | 4.14 | 1.6 | 0 | 14 |

| | | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent | N/A | Mean | Standard Deviation | Did Not Answer | Total Responses |
|-------------------------------------|----------|-----------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | F | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 6.67% (1) | 26.67% (4) | 40% (6) | 26.67% (4) | 3 | 2.48 | 0 | 15 |
| Promptness in returning assignments | D | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 27.27% (3) | 18.18% (2) | 45.45% (5) | 9.09% (1) | 3.73 | 1.71 | 0 | 11 |
| | E | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 14.29% (2) | 14.29% (2) | 64.29% (9) | 7.14% (1) | 4.14 | 1.6 | 0 | 14 |
| | F | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 40% (6) | 40% (6) | 20% (3) | 3.4 | 2.24 | 0 | 15 |
| Quality of feedback to students | D | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 18.18% (2) | 27.27% (3) | 45.45% (5) | 9.09% (1) | 3.82 | 1.7 | 0 | 11 |
| | E | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 28.57% (4) | 14.29% (2) | 50% (7) | 7.14% (1) | 3.86 | 1.6 | 0 | 14 |
| | F | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 20% (3) | 40% (6) | 26.67% (4) | 13.33% (2) | 3.4 | 1.85 | 0 | 15 |
| Availability outside of class | D | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 36.36% (4) | 0% (0) | 54.55% (6) | 9.09% (1) | 3.73 | 1.76 | 0 | 11 |
| | E | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 21.43% (3) | 21.43% (3) | 50% (7) | 7.14% (1) | 3.93 | 1.58 | 0 | 14 |
| | F | 0% (0) | 6.67% (1) | 13.33% (2) | 33.33% (5) | 33.33% (5) | 13.33% (2) | 3.4 | 1.93 | 0 | 15 |

| | | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent | N/A | Mean | Standard Deviation | Did Not Answer | Total Responses |
|----------------------------------|----------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Overall rating of section leader | D | 0% (0) | 27.27% (3) | 18.18% (2) | 9.09% (1) | 45.45% (5) | 0% (0) | 3.73 | 1.29 | 0 | 11 |
| | E | 7.14% (1) | 0% (0) | 14.29% (2) | 14.29% (2) | 57.14% (8) | 7.14% (1) | 3.86 | 1.77 | 0 | 14 |
| | F | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 6.67% (1) | 26.67% (4) | 40% (6) | 26.67% (4) | 3 | 2.48 | 0 | 15 |

| | | None | Less than half | Half | Most | All | Did Not Answer | Total Responses |
|---|----------|-----------|----------------|-----------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Percentage of course assignments you completed: | D | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 18.18% (2) | 81.82% (9) | 0 | 11 |
| | E | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 28.57% (4) | 71.43% (10) | 0 | 14 |
| | F | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 33.33% (5) | 66.67% (10) | 0 | 15 |

| | | F | D | C | B | A | Did Not Answer | Total Responses |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|----------------|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | Did Not Answer | Total Responses |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| | | F | D | C | B | A | | |
| Grade you expect in this course | D | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 36.36% (4) | 63.64% (7) | 0 | 11 |
| | E | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 28.57% (4) | 71.43% (10) | 0 | 14 |
| | F | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 13.33% (2) | 86.67% (13) | 0 | 15 |

Qualitative Report

| Course Sections | Key | Report Status | Enrolled Students | Responded Students | Response Rates |
|--|------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| <u>IR 271 (B1): Introduction to International Relations</u> | A | Released | 19 | 16 | 84.21% |
| <u>IR 271 (B2): Introduction to International Relations</u> | B | Released | 19 | 15 | 78.95% |
| <u>IR 271 (F1): Introduction to International Relations</u> | C | Released | 17 | 17 | 100% |
| <u>PO 171 (B1): Introduction to International Relations</u> | D | Released | 15 | 13 | 86.67% |

Overall

101

90

89.11%

| Course Sections | Key | Report Status | Enrolled Students | Responded Students | Response Rates |
|---|-----|---------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| <u>PO 171 (B2): Introduction to International Relations</u> | E | Released | 16 | 14 | 87.5% |
| <u>PO 171 (F1): Introduction to International Relations</u> | F | Released | 15 | 15 | 100% |
| Overall | | | 101 | 90 | 89.11% |

Responses

STRENGTHS of the course and of the Instructor: -

A

- Zeying tries her best to encourage class participation. Unfortunately, the class lacks energy and does not particularly do the work assigned. She tries to accommodate the students' preferences and really tries to explain the course concepts in more detail. Her exam preparation slides are also very well tailored to the exam.
- I think she does a great job with explaining material that students struggled with and gives great examples to help us understand the material. She tries very hard to balance class participation and her talking which I think is great.
- She is a very good explainer who gives many examples to help student understand concept, which helps a lot for the exams.
- Very good at making sure each student has the same opportunity to understand the information.
- Zeying is very passionate about IR and her students. She shows genuine interest and knowledge in the course material, and she is enthusiastic in class. She encourages class participation and tries to stimulate discussions.
- She is very passionate about IR and really tried to stimulate interest.
- Encouraged group work. Prepared slideshows with key points for revision.
- instructor Wu is great at explaining and reframing course topics in ways that are more parsimonious. Her explanations for certain concepts are more concise than the professor's and her drive to cover the topic results in a comprehensive understanding of the material.

Responses

- The course made you realize if your actually want to major in IR it gives you insight into the major topics. Drying was always very nice and helpful. Her slides were excellent for review and she always explained the main topics well.
 - She gives us a clearer understanding of the course and helps us to learn more
 - I think Zeying explains concepts very well and knows what she is doing. She also helps us prepare for the test and her powerpoints are always very helpful
 - She prepares us very well for exams.
 - Very knowledgeable about the course material Ties current events into the discussion
 - She is the best TA i've ever saw
-

Responses

- B**
- I liked how she really tried to cover what her students were specifically struggling with; she seemed to be really interested in answering our questions that we had to her fullest extent.
 - Best in BU
 - She gives really concise but practical slides where she discusses key terms and topics that are the most relevant. She also is really good at helping understand the readings and the importance of the readings. Great TA!
 - She really helps us to do well in Exam
 - Great overall guidelines. Often Professor gives us too many details, and I will feel lost in all the details. Zeying gives us a very very crystal clear structure to give us a general idea about the concept which is excellent. I love this TA, I would like to take her class again!!!
 - She is patient while explaining concepts and thoroughly goes through them
 - Zeying is a very thorough instructor and shows commitment to helping students understand concepts. She was very approachable and objective towards people's thoughts and questions.
 - Very knowledgeable in the topics we discuss in class Very Organized A good class leader
 - I like Ms. Wu's discussion class. She helps a lot.
 - She had very helpful discussion slides that elaborate on concepts from the lecture slides. She made sure that we understood concepts. Her slides before exams were extremely helpful and I was never confused about what would be on an exam.
 - She was good at supplementing the lectures with her slides and hitting key topics.
 - Her slides are very very helpful and she really helps prepare us for the exams
-
- C**
- Zeyin was really helpful when it came to simplifying large and complicated concepts. More than once, the discussion has assisted in me having a better understanding of ideas explained during the lecture thanks to useful examples and I believe my grades definitely are better because of it.
 - Very bias and not enjoyable
 - engages in the material and loves when students ask questions passionate on the subject

Responses

- Very knowledgeable and enthusiastic about the subject
 - Zeying was very helpful in answer questions and explaining concepts by giving concrete examples.
 - Zeying is very engaging and proficient in explaining concepts/theories in a way which is easy to grasp as well as providing ample examples.
 - I appreciated how detailed the slides were because they allowed me to further understand the concepts first presented in lecture. Also, Zeying was great in explaining concepts and providing examples that allowed for easier understanding. The group case studies, for example, allowed me to gain a better understanding of what we were learning and gave me a great example for the exam.
 - Zeying really cares that all of her students understand the material and keep up with the class. She is very knowledgeable and good at putting together informative slides in a way that is easy to understand.
 - Enthusiastic and worldly, good at applying concepts to real life
 - summarized professor's teaching very well during discussion sections to ensure that we all understood the topics being covered
 - Her instructions are so helpful
 - Explaining theories excellently Organized slides
 - Very Knowledgeable
 - Ability to explain complex concepts well... very engaging. One of the best instructors I've had!
 - Very dedicated and helpful throughout the course
 - - encouraging the class to participate
-

Responses

D

- Ability to fully describe a topic and teach it to the class. Very friendly, leads to a good atmosphere in the classroom
 - Very receptive to feedback. Kind and helpful when students needed help.
 - Fair grader, review slides are well put together, is able to meet outside of class, encourages students to participate
 - Really wants her students to pass, goes out of her way for feedback and making sure we understand the course content.
 - Very knowledgeable and provides amazing examples to help drive her points home. Clear and concise and knows material very well. It is clear she wants her students to succeed and gives us plenty of resources to do so. Awesome TA!
 - She really knows what she's talking about and tries to simplify the information for us.
 - Tries her best to explain concepts
 - very good
 - You do very well at explaining concepts, getting us ready for the exams and giving as many examples as you can.
 - Very engaging and has a willingness to help students understand the course material.
 - Zeying was great! She went over Professor Cappella's material in a concise way at the end of every week and always seemed to know what she was talking about. Sometimes she could misstate a definition, but every time that happened someone pointed it out and she apologized and went over the correct definition of the term. She always encouraged class participation and her review slides for midterms were really helpful for studying.
-

Responses

E

- Responded well to feedback from students. When we told her that her teaching style wasn't working for us, she made an effort to change. Grades fairly and quickly. Wants students to succeed.
 - Zeying Wu did a fantastic job! She worked hard to help her students, and always encouraged participation. She also kept a positive and helpful outlook even if students were not participating.
 - Good at condensing and simplifying the topics from the lectures into quick slides to study from
 - Strengths: The material on her slideshow presentations was very very helpful for studying for the midterms and was an excellent summary of the class material.
 - Explained concepts very well and very knowledgeable and gave great examples
 - Very effective in summarizing and explaining the course material. She took the information in the lectures and explained it in a way that made me better understand the course.
 - Explaining concepts mentioned in class and providing examples to help me understand it better
 - Zeying was better at teaching us the material than the actual professor. She outlined everything very clearly and made the abundance of information a little easier to understand.
 - Answers questions directly. Can always give me constructive feedback
 - Great at prepping for exams. Don't change a thing!
 - So helpful with creating slides for us to know what information we had to know. Also great at trying to encourage our participation and making sure we understood everything.
 - Wonderful TF! Made excellent conceptual powerpoint that clarified key class concepts that may have been confusing. Really helpful at breaking down material and summarizing the readings and getting rid of the clutter
-

Responses

- F**
- Explained concepts very well
 - Had very good review slides that help to tie up any loose ends and explain the concepts as they related to one another which gave me a better idea of the bigger picture.
 - She did a great job of displaying her passion for the subject as well as breaking down concepts into digestible pieces.
 - Enthusiastic and helpful at clarifying complex concepts
 - I like her slides and I can tell that she is very passionate about IR. can see her expertise in this course. her explanation of the concepts are sometimes easier/clearer than that of the professor's
 - The slides made during discussion were very helpful and did a good job of summarizing the readings and lectures
 - She cares so much about what she's teaching and how her students are doing in the class. She is probably the best TA I've ever had. She tries to use relatable examples and asks discussion questions to gain interest in the subject matter.
 - Good at keeping class engaged and very passionate about the how well we do in class.
 - Passionate Very Informative Nice Knowledgable
 - A clear explanation of terms and concepts

Responses

WEAKNESSES of the course
and of the Instructor: -

- A**
- N/A
 - Group activities didn't really add anything
 - There was one time where I don't think she explained a concept very well. It was when we were trying to figure out the difference between the Organizational Process Model and the Bureaucratic Politics Model. However, this was just a one time thing for me
 - Maybe more interactive discussions and activities will make people more engaged in the class because sometimes it can be very boring.

Responses

- Sometimes she makes examples that are too big pictures, which is great but can be a little confusing and harder to follow
 - The course had a lot of readings.
 - she can sometimes rush a subject in class.
 - Always went over time, finishing everything late. Often was sidetracked by her personal opinions about current world politics, instead of the topics she was supposed to teach. Personal opinions about current political situations were more important to her than facts, this led to most of the class not paying attention. Constantly referred to the lecture slides as wrong, encouraged us to challenge the lead professor in her definitions of key concepts, and this made the class more confusing. Overall, the TA was very easily distracted going on rants of her own, and she spent so much time criticizing the US government in each class that I began doubting her knowledge of the class material.
 - Discussions felt hard to participate in if you're not already an expert in IR/ know exactly what the answers are. I was stressed out all the time.
 - She can sometimes be a little unclear when explaining things
 - Class participation was low, but there was nothing the TA could have done. The type of people in the class were just naturally quiet.
 - Could add more extra study beyond the lecture instead of just explain them.
 - I think she could work on find better ways for class participation because most of the group discussions we have are unsuccessful and people don't want to participate.
 - Can't think of too many weaknesses. The actual students are more of the problem here (are not prepared to work or contribute).
-

Responses

B

- NA
 - She didn't get great class participation
 - I can't think of any -- truly an extremely helpful TA.
 - Always goes over the 50 min discussion so she doesn't finish discussing everything
 - Zeying can work a little bit on time management of lessons, since whenever we have group activities they sometimes feel rushed towards the end.
 - She sometimes moves to fast from topic to topic leaving the class behind
 - No really have a weakness.
 - I think she can organize the course content better. So the discussion section can cover more topics.
 - Not really anything significant but maybe the fact that the discussion section is too short to have everything explained, so we often run out of time.
 - None
 - She would ask us questions and then get frustrated when we didn't answer them right away. I think a helpful tip instead would be to have awkward silence until someone was forced to answer the question because they were too uncomfortable.
-

Responses

- C**
- - inability to understand student questions - inability to clearly explain topics - forcing students to meet a mold she expects rather than learning in their own way - did not overall help with understanding course material
 - none
 - NONE
 - Sometimes her accent is hard to understand and she needs to rephrase things, but it is not a big issue at all
 - More interesting topics for group discussions More case studies maybe?
 - Pronunciation
 - no weaknesses
 - Somewhat of a language barrier sometimes but not bad
 - She was definitely too easy on us as far as giving us information that could have been found through reading, and there wasn't a lot of actual discussion in class.
 - Sometimes discussion would veer off topic and we would not have enough time to cover what was important.
 - None!
 - The readings for the course were sometimes difficult to understand and relate to class.
 - A little bit unclear when it comes to explaining why an answer was wrong on an exam
 - can get sidetracked caught up in explanations
 - has a unfair bias and vendetta towards students. Will call you out in class for nothing, and unfair grader. Would prefer a meeting between TF and Professor. Zeying does not listen to her students if they have requests or complaints
 - I have no recommendations when it comes to a weakness at the time.
-

Responses

- D**
- Again, she misstated a couple definitions, but it wasn't really a problem because she would immediately realize when she made a mistake and go over the correct terminology.
 - Course at times missing current events which could be added to the Syllabus.
 - none
 - no weakness
 - Unorganised
 - Sometimes it's hard to understand or follow what she's saying.
 - There is not much class participation, but that is mainly because she must go through so much in such little time!
 - none
 - Can get sidetracked, sometimes gives hard to follow examples
 - Significant language barrier impeded her ability to explain concepts. Has a tendency to go on tangents that don't relate to the course material. Over-reliance on case studies and examples rather than actually reviewing lecture concepts that we will be tested on. Overall, very disorganized discussions in which we usually went late while failing to review crucial concepts.
 - Needs to engage the class a bit more. Speed up examples and/or projects. I.e. the amount of time it takes to set up and do them.
-

Responses

E

- none
 - Sometimes the class ran past time but that was fixed for the last few weeks.
 - N/a
 - None
 - I don't think participation should be counted because I learn by sitting and taking it all in and writing down notes so I just don't like to raise my hand and talk.
 - None
 - Sometimes the information was dry
 - sometimes hard to understand
 - Weaknesses: ability to articulate points in a concise manner and time management.
 - Most of the information I learned was just from the readings and on my own. I barely get anything out of the lectures.
 - n/a
 - Is not good at explaining course material. Often times she actually gave us wrong information that directly contradicted with what Prof. Capella said during lecture. Tries to cover too much information in too little time and doesnt have time to go over important concepts. Should focus more on important details and main ideas. Tried too hard to make group work a part of discussion, which in my opinion is a lazy way of teaching. Its her job to teach me, not the kid sitting next to me. And frankly, group work was often more confusing because other students did not understand the material either.
-

Responses

F

- Difficult to hear and understand
- Examples can sometimes be confusing
- Sometimes small group discussions are not helpful.
- There could have been more group work or participation encouraged to make sure everyone understands the concepts
- can't really think of one
- I see where the orientation to group work can be helpful but I think it would be best learned through lecture or amazing examples she gives.
- I can't think of any !
- There weren't any glaring weaknesses that I noticed in the class. I would only recommend that there be more group projects or group discussions in the class.
- I did not find any weaknesses

Responses

General Comments: -

A

- I think Zeying is a great TA and she is eager to be better as a TA every time I see her. She always makes herself available for office hours and to answer questions I have.
 - Very good instructor, explaining things clearly, and caring her students.
 - Classes always ended late, and she didn't let us leave in time for the next class
 - I really enjoyed this class and the discussions were instrumental to my success
 - Amazing
 - Best Teacher
-

Responses

- B**
- easy A
 - Great TA, could not have asked for a better one who really helps her students understand the key concepts and makes it easier to do readings for us!
 - Great!
 - Great teacher!
 - Thank you so much for being a wonderful TF who genuinely cares!
 - I really enjoyed this class and coming to this discussion was interesting, she made it enjoyable and helped us a lot
-
- C**
- I loved having Zeying as my TF and I would recommend to any one taking the class that they should try to get her as a discussion TF!!
 - Zeying was a great TF and made discussion very enjoyable.
 - I enjoyed taking the class and would recommend Zeying as an instructor.
 - good!
 - Excellent and dedicated teaching assistant!
 - Had a fun time, good discussion leader
 - Zeying is awesome.
 - Spending discussion periods making criticisms of the professor is not constructive to the class.
-

Responses

- D**
- Very good, would have again
 - This discussion shouldn't take attendance. For many students like myself, I learned very little in a given class period and would have been better served reviewing independently during the class time. Some better coordination with the course processor would have made the review periods more helpful.
 - n/a
 - excellent TA
 - Great discussion section, learned a lot thanks to Zeying!
 - N/A
 - love this class
-
- E**
- Thank you! I had a great semester in your class
 - Great TA!
 - Zeying is a great TF that really helped me do well in the course and become interested in the topics mentioned during the class
 - Zeying is great and so so helpful, nothing bad to say about her!
 - Loved the class
 - The class was huge and she did a great job of making sure we all followed along in the class
 - GREAT
-

Responses

F

- Zeying was a great TA
 - Overall, I really liked all the content we covered and I thought Zeying was a great instructor for discussions outside of class. I truly enjoyed everything we did.
 - This course has me appreciating International Relations more than I ever expected.
 - Great TA probably one of my favorites
 - Great TA
 - Zeying Wu TF is very nice and supportive.
-

© 2019 Campus Labs