

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2018

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 3970-001

Section Title: Ethnic Politics (HONORS)

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 4

Course Level: Upper 3000 - 4000

Section Size: X-Small 0-15

Question	Level	Mean Response	Median Response	Standard Deviation	ZScore	Responses	Percent #1	Percent #2	Percent #3	Percent #4	Percent #5	Dept Rank	College Rank
1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.47727	5	0.62835		44	0.00	0.00	6.82	38.64	54.55		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.26513	4	0.89363	0.82	909	1.54	2.53	13.31	33.11	49.50		
	COLLEGE	3.94386	4	1.01636	1.04	30,907	2.59	5.72	21.90	34.28	35.50		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.72727	5	0.54404		44	0.00	0.00	4.55	18.18	77.27		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.50110	5	0.86777	0.57	908	1.76	2.20	7.93	20.37	67.73		
	COLLEGE	4.20489	5	1.03725	0.77	30,885	2.62	5.32	13.98	25.12	52.96		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.75000	5	0.50000		4	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	75.00	88.89	75.32
	DEPARTMENT	3.86364	4	1.19283		44	4.55	11.36	15.91	29.55	38.64		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.14537	5	1.08656	0.56	908	3.52	5.73	14.43	25.33	50.99		
	COLLEGE	4.01284	4	1.13033	0.65	30,846	3.96	6.88	18.88	24.50	45.79		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.46512	5	0.73513		43	0.00	2.33	6.98	32.56	58.14		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.36604	5	0.90038	0.70	907	1.54	3.20	10.03	27.56	57.66		
	COLLEGE	4.03970	4	1.07442	0.89	30,831	3.02	6.38	18.57	27.68	44.35		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	4.75000	5	0.50000		4	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	75.00	88.89	75.32
	DEPARTMENT	4.53488	5	0.66722		43	0.00	2.33	2.33	34.88	60.47		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.29185	5	0.98369	0.47	908	2.09	4.52	11.89	25.11	56.39		
	COLLEGE	3.90349	4	1.19166	0.71	30,795	5.50	7.88	19.65	24.71	42.26		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.56818	5	0.62497		44	0.00	0.00	6.82	29.55	63.64		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.33003	5	0.95204	0.70	909	2.31	2.97	11.44	25.96	57.32		
	COLLEGE	3.96672	4	1.15797	0.89	30,828	4.78	7.27	18.24	25.90	43.81		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.75000	5	0.50000		4	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	75.00	88.89	71.52
	DEPARTMENT	4.43182	5	0.78940		44	0.00	2.27	11.36	27.27	59.09		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.29341	5	0.99761	0.46	910	2.42	4.18	12.31	23.85	57.25		
	COLLEGE	4.03265	4	1.11272	0.64	30,811	3.73	6.65	18.02	25.84	45.76		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.40909	5	0.69276		44	0.00	0.00	11.36	36.36	52.27		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.14903	4	0.90271	0.94	879	1.37	2.73	17.97	35.49	42.43		
	COLLEGE	3.82971	4	0.99529	1.18	28,815	2.38	6.14	26.76	35.54	29.17		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.50000	4	0.57735		4	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	0.00	77.78	51.63
	DEPARTMENT	3.27273	3	0.81736		44	0.00	15.91	47.73	29.55	6.82		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.57565	3	0.83674	-0.09	879	0.11	5.23	48.81	28.67	17.18		
	COLLEGE	3.42033	3	0.86367	0.09	28,818	1.34	6.81	54.61	22.96	14.28		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	4.75000	5	0.50000		4	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	75.00	88.89	86.93
	DEPARTMENT	4.43182	5	0.78940		44	2.27	0.00	4.55	38.64	54.55		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.00795	4	1.00677	0.74	880	1.59	6.48	21.25	30.91	39.77		
	COLLEGE	3.66175	4	1.05647	1.03	28,772	3.14	9.43	31.33	30.34	25.77		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.75000	5	0.50000		4	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	75.00	77.78	76.47
	DEPARTMENT	4.52273	5	0.62835		44	0.00	0.00	6.82	34.09	59.09		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.23094	5	1.00348	0.52	879	2.28	4.78	13.42	26.62	52.90		
	COLLEGE	3.85835	4	1.12657	0.79	28,796	4.15	8.09	22.40	28.52	36.85		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.95455	5	0.21071		44	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.55	95.45		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.69704	5	0.66292	0.46	878	0.34	1.71	4.21	15.38	78.36		
	COLLEGE	4.53541	5	0.78301	0.59	28,776	0.78	2.36	6.46	23.35	67.06		

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2018

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 3970-001

Section Title: Ethnic Politics (HONORS)

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 4

Course Level: Upper 3000 - 4000

Section Size: X-Small 0-15

Question

1. What were the strong points of the course?
2. What were the weak points of the course?
3. What should the instructor do to improve their teaching?
4. What is your overall opinion of this course?

Comment

1. Dr. Bracic, by virtue of her own scholarship, is extremely familiar with the breadth of readings covered and the methods behind them. The reading list is like a greatest hits of important research on ethnicity in politics. This is one of the only classes I've taken at OU that helped me visualize a career focus within academia and gave me a background that was comfortable to work with.
 2. Sometimes the readings are a little long. Not really a complaint.
 3. Sometimes the seminar style doesn't work as well because some students seem hesitant to speak. This is a difficult problem to overcome.
 4. Fantastic course that made me feel like I could do graduate-level work
1. The small class size was really helpful for making this an enjoyable experience. The readings were all very interesting. The format of each day was such that we reenforced what we'd read and also learned new things.
 2. Occasionally there were slow moments in the discussions. Some of that was the fault of individuals, lack of preparedness, etc., but it might be helpful for students to get a bit more explanation of what is expected of the various roles in a discussion so that the class can get even deeper into the material.
 3. I can't think of anything huge here. Dr. Bracic was a wonderful teacher.
 4. I loved this course. I didn't think I was going to in the beginning, but this turned into a rewarding challenge. I was very happy to be pushed to contribute, and I think in the end this group has become more of a machine. The discussions improved over the course of the semester, and it was a really beautiful thing to be a part of. I had a really great time in this class.
1. The strong points were the readings and the discussions that we did in class everyday because they helped to clarify the readings and added to our understanding of them.
 2. There were none
 3. Nothing.
 4. The course was well designed and carried out by Dr. Bracic. She made sure that we were all always on the same page and gave students as much attention and direction as they needed.
1. The readings were really interesting, and Dr. Bracic is extremely knowledgeable.
 2. I didn't feel that taking turns as discussion leaders contributed to my learning since it was so hard to get people to answer the questions without awkward silences. I also wish there were more small assignments throughout the course.
 - 3.
 4. I learned a lot about a subject I didn't previously know much about, and that was my purpose for taking the course.

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2018

Response Key

1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
7. Instructor's management of the course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
8. Amount you learned in this class	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
11. Overall, this course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
12. This course was graded fairly	1 = Never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Occasionally, 4 = Usually, 5 = Always

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2018

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 3593-001

Section Title: Nongovernmental Organizations

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 41

Course Level: Upper 3000 - 4000

Section Size: Medium 26-59

Question	Level	Mean Response	Median Response	Standard Deviation	ZScore	Responses	Percent #1	Percent #2	Percent #3	Percent #4	Percent #5	Dept Rank	College Rank
1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	INDIVIDUAL	3.60000	4	1.18322		15	0.00	20.00	33.33	13.33	33.33	11.11	17.38
	DEPARTMENT	4.17221	4	0.84779		331	0.60	2.72	16.92	38.37	41.39		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.04875	4	0.97785	-0.46	4,369	2.01	4.62	19.52	34.15	39.69		
	COLLEGE	3.94386	4	1.01636	-0.34	30,907	2.59	5.72	21.90	34.28	35.50		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	4.53333	5	0.83381		15	0.00	6.67	0.00	26.67	66.67	38.89	58.69
	DEPARTMENT	4.57100	5	0.73666		331	0.00	2.72	6.65	21.45	69.18		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.32540	5	0.97243	0.21	4,367	2.04	4.01	12.04	23.20	58.71		
	COLLEGE	4.20489	5	1.03725	0.32	30,885	2.62	5.32	13.98	25.12	52.96		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.20000	5	1.14642		15	6.67	0.00	13.33	26.67	53.33	66.67	50.97
	DEPARTMENT	3.84036	4	1.21489		332	5.72	9.34	20.48	24.10	40.36		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.03690	4	1.14143	0.14	4,363	4.15	7.01	17.42	23.84	47.58		
	COLLEGE	4.01284	4	1.13033	0.17	30,846	3.96	6.88	18.88	24.50	45.79		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	4.14286	5	1.09945		14	0.00	14.29	7.14	28.57	50.00	38.89	39.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.29518	5	0.92803		332	0.90	5.12	11.75	28.01	54.22		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.16449	5	1.04306	-0.02	4,365	2.31	6.19	15.07	25.59	50.84		
	COLLEGE	4.03970	4	1.07442	0.10	30,831	3.02	6.38	18.57	27.68	44.35		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	3.66667	5	1.49603		15	13.33	6.67	26.67	6.67	46.67	16.67	26.64
	DEPARTMENT	4.18976	5	1.02395		332	2.71	3.31	18.37	23.49	52.11		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.03532	4	1.15753	-0.32	4,360	4.84	6.49	16.77	24.11	47.80		
	COLLEGE	3.90349	4	1.19166	-0.20	30,795	5.50	7.88	19.65	24.71	42.26		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	3.92857	4	1.26881		14	7.14	7.14	14.29	28.57	42.86	22.22	33.21
	DEPARTMENT	4.18675	4	0.93992		332	0.90	4.52	17.47	29.22	47.89		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.05502	4	1.12474	-0.11	4,362	4.01	6.74	16.35	25.54	47.36		
	COLLEGE	3.96672	4	1.15797	-0.03	30,828	4.78	7.27	18.24	25.90	43.81		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	3.86667	4	1.24595		15	6.67	6.67	20.00	26.67	40.00	38.89	29.73
	DEPARTMENT	4.12651	4	0.97814		332	1.51	5.12	17.77	30.42	45.18		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.08539	4	1.11088	-0.20	4,368	3.78	6.57	15.41	25.82	48.42		
	COLLEGE	4.03265	4	1.11272	-0.15	30,811	3.73	6.65	18.02	25.84	45.76		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	3.46667	3	1.18723		15	6.67	6.67	46.67	13.33	26.67	11.11	14.17
	DEPARTMENT	4.00301	4	0.91809		332	1.51	3.31	22.89	37.95	34.34		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.93150	4	0.99473	-0.47	4,292	2.45	4.99	23.49	35.14	33.95		
	COLLEGE	3.82971	4	0.99529	-0.36	28,815	2.38	6.14	26.76	35.54	29.17		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.40000	3	0.73679		15	0.00	6.67	53.33	33.33	6.67	77.78	65.35
	DEPARTMENT	3.32132	3	0.81886		333	1.20	7.81	59.76	20.12	11.11		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.33830	3	0.86421	0.07	4,292	1.61	8.18	58.13	18.94	13.14		
	COLLEGE	3.42033	3	0.86367	-0.02	28,818	1.34	6.81	54.61	22.96	14.28		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	3.60000	5	1.50238		15	6.67	26.67	13.33	6.67	46.67	22.22	29.13
	DEPARTMENT	3.96687	4	1.02923		332	2.11	6.63	21.99	31.02	38.25		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.83754	4	1.06533	-0.22	4,284	3.08	7.73	24.51	31.72	32.96		
	COLLEGE	3.66175	4	1.05647	-0.06	28,772	3.14	9.43	31.33	30.34	25.77		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	3.53333	4	1.35576		15	13.33	0.00	40.00	13.33	33.33	11.11	18.90
	DEPARTMENT	4.15616	4	0.92795		333	1.50	3.30	17.42	33.63	44.14		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.00864	4	1.10912	-0.43	4,284	3.83	6.51	18.56	27.17	43.93		
	COLLEGE	3.85835	4	1.12657	-0.29	28,796	4.15	8.09	22.40	28.52	36.85		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	4.73333	5	0.45774		15	0.00	0.00	0.00	26.67	73.33	50.00	51.18
	DEPARTMENT	4.71084	5	0.59768		332	0.30	0.60	3.92	18.07	77.11		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.62491	5	0.72661	0.15	4,287	0.75	1.75	4.95	19.38	73.17		
	COLLEGE	4.53541	5	0.78301	0.25	28,776	0.78	2.36	6.46	23.35	67.06		

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2018

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 3593-001

Section Title: Nongovernmental Organizations

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 41

Course Level: Upper 3000 - 4000

Section Size: Medium 26-59

Question

1. What were the strong points of the course?
2. What were the weak points of the course?
3. What should the instructor do to improve their teaching?
4. What is your overall opinion of this course?

Comment

1. the project was awesome
2. a lot of hard reading
3. change some readings
4. she was intelligent and nice

1. the semester-long project was probably the best and most informative part of this class.
- 2.
3. actually go to the class that she teaches. Professor Bracic missed many days of class, with little warning.
4. poor

1. Dr. Bracic gave us ample time to work on our group projects in class.
2. Too many readings. Way too long.
3. N/A
4. I liked the discussion aspect along with having a group project.

1. She is extremely invested and involved in the subject
2. The class debates were broken up oddly. It's hard to prepare a rebuttal or conclusion without knowing what your 'team's' main argument/rebuttal is. She was working on her book (or doing research of some sort, I'm not sure), and that took away from class quite a bit, leading to cancelled classes. We didn't tend to go as in-depth as I would have expected. The assignments were fairly easy compared to other 3000 level courses I've had. It has also taken an extremely long time to get grades back.
- 3.
4. Mostly negative, although there is certainly room for improvement.

1. Movie
2. Breaking up into groups was often unproductive
3. Add structure
- 4.

1. Dr. Bracic is an excellent professor and a great mentor for students. She always extends herself to help students continued development, and has been a great personal role-model for me. As a professor, she was great at encouraging continued interest in the subject matter and assigned very interesting readings/media/projects for us to explore the topic with.
2. The only thing I would say was a bit challenging is the final. If we stuck to the word count max that she gave, it would be a 12 page paper to write in 5 days, which I think is a bit much for students during finals week. I think if it had been assigned earlier, it would have been fine for a final.
3. Dr. Bracic is great at managing the classroom schedule every day, and has a wide understanding of the course material, so it was fun to learn from her. She is also readily available for students who want to learn more.
4. This course was great, and I would definitely take another class with Dr. Bracic!

1. THIS CLASS WAS ORGANIZED
2. n/a
3. n/a
4. n/a

eValuate Report - Spring 2018

1. The class project of building an NGO allows students to learn by actually doing the work involved with creating an NGO. The course isn't just reading and learning skills, but learning how to apply skills.
 2. I think that it would be useful to explain the end goal of the NGO project at the beginning of the course. When I made my survey, I was imagining the end goal as something completely different than what it actually was.
 3. I would have liked to have been given a mid-term participation grade. That way I could gauge if i was participating enough in class or not.
 4. Overall, this course was my favorite course of the semester. Professor Bracic really cares about students and their learning. Her course is structured in a way that allows students to think for themselves and get real experience related to the course topic.
-
1. In-class debates encouraged critical thinking and gave students an opportunity to share their ideals and perspectives on a wide range of topics. The biggest strong point of this course, however, was being able to create your own NGO, because this allowed students an opportunity to get a different look at the process.
 2. You never really knew what your grade was in the class, because Canvas was never updated to reflect this. We also had very few graded assignments overall so if you messed up on one then you did not know how to recover.
 3. The instructor should not assign multiple 40 page papers to read every night and then get mad that no one reads it - it is unrealistic to assume that upperclassmen who are most likely taking a courseload full of upper-division classes will have the time to be able to read them.
 4. There were a lot of things that I did not enjoy about this class, but at this course it was about NGOs and being able to create your own was a good learning experience.
-
1. I learned how to use the COUNTIF command in excel.
 2. Very heavy reading and the readings were not good, then she would get mad if you didn't read when truly no one has the time to read that much a night. Class was basically just asking people's opinions and not saying who was right or wrong so it was a waste of time. I don't even really understand the point of this class, I learned more computer skills than anything about NGO's.
 3. Say what is correct and in correct in class discussions, be more clear.
 4. I'm glad it is over.
-
1. The group projects.
 2. The readings being 40+ pages before each class period.
 3. maybe lessen the reading load and instill more hands on examples.
 4. It was OK. I enjoyed my group, but I felt like there really isn't that much to NGO's.
-
1. The course does a great job of encouraging us to honestly analyze nongovernmental organizations, to truly understand their role in the world separate from their often idealized representations.
 2. There were a lot of readings, enough to make it almost impossible to meaningfully engage with all of them. Their length and density made it hard to follow.
 3. Nothing! You had a great balance of lecture, discussion, and activities.
 4. I greatly enjoyed the class, and would recommend it to anyone. You clearly have a huge bank of knowledge around the subject, and it was wonderful to learn from you.
-
1. The debates were always interesting, especially when we had to argue in favor of something we did not agree with.
 2. The readings were the course's weak point.
 3. Move away from the readings and do more lecture and class activities.
 4. The course was not what I expected, but there were still parts that I enjoyed. The group project was really fun, and I learned a lot from it.

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2018

Response Key

1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
7. Instructor's management of the course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
8. Amount you learned in this class	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
11. Overall, this course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
12. This course was graded fairly	1 = Never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Occasionally, 4 = Usually, 5 = Always

eValue Report - Fall 2017

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 2013-001

Section Title: Intro to Political Analysis

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 19

Course Level: Lower 0000 - 2000

Section Size: Small 16-25

Question	Level	Mean Response	Median Response	Standard Deviation	ZScore	Responses	Percent #1	Percent #2	Percent #3	Percent #4	Percent #5	Dept Rank	College Rank
1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.36364	5	0.67420		11	0.00	0.00	9.09	45.45	45.45	88.46	77.85
	DEPARTMENT	3.89109	4	0.89744		707	1.41	3.54	27.16	40.31	27.58		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.96156	4	0.96182	0.42	8,376	1.89	5.04	21.81	37.56	33.70		
	COLLEGE	3.90375	4	1.00650	0.46	37,809	2.47	5.90	23.43	35.21	33.00		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	4.18182	5	0.87386		11	0.00	0.00	27.27	27.27	45.45	51.92	45.69
	DEPARTMENT	4.16690	4	0.90506		707	0.28	4.95	17.40	32.53	44.84		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.17618	5	1.03465	0.01	8,372	2.39	5.76	14.66	26.24	50.96		
	COLLEGE	4.15287	5	1.05163	0.03	37,757	2.64	5.86	15.40	25.77	50.33		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.00000	4	0.63246		11	0.00	0.00	18.18	63.64	18.18	63.46	48.77
	DEPARTMENT	3.92756	4	1.03791		704	1.70	8.81	21.02	31.96	36.51		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.99426	4	1.12337	0.01	8,364	3.68	7.46	18.90	25.66	44.30		
	COLLEGE	3.95652	4	1.14454	0.04	37,715	4.07	7.88	19.71	25.01	43.33		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	4.63636	5	0.50452		11	0.00	0.00	0.00	36.36	63.64	96.15	86.15
	DEPARTMENT	4.02546	4	0.98397		707	2.12	4.24	21.64	32.96	39.04		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.06264	4	1.04052	0.55	8,349	2.44	5.99	18.57	28.87	44.14		
	COLLEGE	3.99321	4	1.07986	0.60	37,686	2.97	6.85	20.28	27.70	42.21		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	4.54545	5	0.52223		11	0.00	0.00	0.00	45.45	54.55	94.23	86.00
	DEPARTMENT	3.90382	4	1.09043		707	2.69	8.91	21.78	28.57	38.05		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.90322	4	1.14998	0.56	8,349	4.47	8.14	20.18	27.01	40.20		
	COLLEGE	3.84626	4	1.20248	0.58	37,654	5.58	9.02	20.63	24.74	40.03		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	4.45455	5	0.52223		11	0.00	0.00	0.00	54.55	45.45	84.62	73.85
	DEPARTMENT	4.00851	4	1.00280		705	1.99	5.67	20.85	32.48	39.01		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.00850	4	1.10941	0.40	8,352	3.62	7.10	18.12	27.16	44.01		
	COLLEGE	3.91793	4	1.16581	0.46	37,698	4.72	8.30	19.19	26.05	41.74		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.27273	5	0.78625		11	0.00	0.00	18.18	36.36	45.45	78.85	58.92
	DEPARTMENT	4.05256	4	0.97556		704	1.42	5.11	21.16	31.39	40.91		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.05951	4	1.07978	0.20	8,351	3.08	6.39	17.84	26.87	45.81		
	COLLEGE	3.99400	4	1.11704	0.25	37,659	3.67	7.16	19.18	26.07	43.92		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	4.36364	5	0.67420		11	0.00	0.00	9.09	45.45	45.45	98.04	90.86
	DEPARTMENT	3.68543	4	0.87137		693	1.15	5.48	35.21	39.97	18.18		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.75997	4	0.95190	0.63	7,695	2.05	6.04	29.73	38.19	23.98		
	COLLEGE	3.79663	4	0.98530	0.58	34,351	2.33	6.53	27.24	36.97	26.93		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.81818	4	0.75076		11	0.00	0.00	36.36	45.45	18.18	98.04	86.63
	DEPARTMENT	3.10072	3	0.88776		695	2.88	15.83	60.00	10.94	10.36		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.43295	3	0.82350	0.47	7,703	0.84	6.00	55.28	24.78	13.10		
	COLLEGE	3.42616	3	0.85129	0.46	34,391	1.16	6.45	55.09	23.22	14.08		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	3.63636	4	0.80904		11	0.00	9.09	27.27	54.55	9.09	58.82	55.84
	DEPARTMENT	3.58934	4	0.96247		694	2.02	8.65	37.18	32.71	19.45		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.57212	4	1.01281	0.06	7,689	2.55	10.55	34.89	31.16	20.85		
	COLLEGE	3.62944	4	1.05080	0.01	34,337	3.08	10.17	31.61	31.00	24.14		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.27273	4	0.46710		11	0.00	0.00	0.00	72.73	27.27	90.20	76.14
	DEPARTMENT	3.84726	4	1.01632		694	2.02	7.06	27.09	31.84	31.99		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.85662	4	1.07244	0.39	7,693	3.20	7.53	23.93	31.11	34.24		
	COLLEGE	3.82583	4	1.12450	0.40	34,352	4.14	8.56	22.92	29.33	35.05		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.55331	5	0.72825		694	0.58	1.44	6.34	25.36	66.28		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.51552	5	0.79447	0.61	7,699	0.79	2.43	7.03	23.94	65.81		
	COLLEGE	4.52800	5	0.77999	0.61	34,337	0.75	2.26	6.68	24.07	66.25		

eEvaluate Report - Fall 2017

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 2013-001

Section Title: Intro to Political Analysis

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 19

Course Level: Lower 0000 - 2000

Section Size: Small 16-25

Question

1. What were the strong points of the course?
2. What were the weak points of the course?
3. What should the instructor do to improve their teaching?
4. What is your overall opinion of this course?

Comment

1. She was incredibly understanding and always willing to work with us until we understood the course material. She was also completely understanding that r-code isn't easy to grasp and was constantly available if we were to ever ask for assistance with any aspect of the course material.
 2. A lot of us felt unprepared for the midterm, but she was willing to talk us through the exam and explain the questions we missed and so she turned it into a fruitful learning experience for all.
 3. Perhaps more homework and less in class work, but overall the diversity of assignments were great and each assignment served to increase our knowledge and understanding of the complex materials.
 4. Dr. Bracic was incredibly informative and did an excellent job of ensuring that we grasped all aspects of the course. She is a great role model and provided us many real-world examples of when we would possibly utilize the information gained in the class. Overall, this course was amazing and I can see myself using the knowledge gained within in my future pursuits.
1. I learned a lot of things that I hadn't known before.
 2. It was far too difficult, and I did not have enough practice on my own.
 3. Provide more examples and practices problems.
 4. Interesting but fairly difficult.
1. Dr. Bracic is a brilliant professor to learn from. She made herself a great resource for students throughout the semester. When I was struggling with some health issues, she was prompt to offer comfort and support. She is also very clearly skilled at teaching; even though the material was pretty difficult, Dr. B always explained the problems step by step. If anyone complains that they struggled in the class, it is probably due to the amount of effort they put in; if you showed up to every class (or most classes) and went to Dr. B's office hours, you would find the class perfectly manageable. I don't think I would have been as successful in this course if it weren't for Dr. Bracic.
 2. The book was the only part of the class I found difficult to work with. But for the most part, Dr. B. summarized the important concepts during class, so I was able to do well regardless!
 3. I honestly don't think I could ask for a better professor!
 4. The course itself was reasonably difficult, but Dr. Bracic made it a great semester.
1. Dr. Bracic is very clear about her feelings and intentions, and with a smaller class, that's really important.
 2. The weak points would be in her teaching style. Reading from a slide isn't the best way for some people to learn.
 3. I wouldn't personally change anything
 4. I loved this course and Dr. Bracic.
1. Dr. Bracic went out of her way to make herself available to students both inside and outside of the classroom.
 2. The R program used does not work well, if at all on some computers. However, Dr. Bracic encouraged collaboration so this became a non-issue.
 3. N/A
 4. Great course, learned a lot.
1. Good lectures
 2. N/A
 3. N/A
 4. Good
1. Dr. Bracic was one of the best teachers I've had and she genuinely cares about the class.
 2. None.
 3. Keep learning from the students, but overall she was great.
 4. A+

eValuate Report - Fall 2017

1. The research project

2.

3.

4. I enjoyed this class very much and learned a lot. Even though it is required for my major I'm glad that I took it.

1. Dr. Bracic is obviously very knowledgeable and very passionate about what she teaches. She is also upfront about her expectations with assignments.

2. Dr. Bracic has the tendency to occasionally make concepts more complicated than they actually are when teaching them for the first time, but she is usually able to simplify once students ask her questions.

3. I would recommend that Dr. Bracic focus on teaching the essentials of each concept and eliminating any extraneous information.

4. Overall, I enjoyed this course much more than I thought would. I learned a lot, and I would definitely take another course taught by Dr. Bracic again.

1. Professor Bracic is extremely intelligent, she knows her materials really well, and she does a good job at lecturing

2. Sometimes she would play music during class work time and it is quite distracting sometimes. The location of the classroom was rather unfortunate, the room has very bad lighting, the walls are moldy and the room is cramped, I wish Professor Bracic would have communicated with her department about getting a better room

3. Professor Bracic is extremely intelligent, however, she is sometimes not very good at answering questions, so I sometimes get more confused after she answers my question, I wish Professor Bracic would quite literally dumb her answers down for us.

4. The quality of the course is very high and I really enjoyed it

1. The feedback on homework and papers.

2. Some students seemed to have trouble following some explanations.

3. Maybe try to clarify some concepts.

4. I enjoyed learning the subject matter and was able to do so with ease.

eValuate Report - Fall 2017

Response Key

1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
7. Instructor's management of the course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
8. Amount you learned in this class	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
11. Overall, this course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
12. This course was graded fairly	1 = Never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Occasionally, 4 = Usually, 5 = Always

eValueate Report - Fall 2017

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 6603-900

Section Title: Field Seminar-Compar Politics

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 2

Course Level: Graduate 5000 and up

Section Size: X-Small 0-15

Question	Level	Mean Response	Median Response	Standard Deviation	ZScore	Responses	Percent #1	Percent #2	Percent #3	Percent #4	Percent #5	Dept Rank	College Rank
1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.58621	5	0.94556		29	3.45	3.45	0.00	17.24	75.86		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.27431	4	0.84479	0.86	802	1.12	1.87	13.34	35.79	47.88		
	COLLEGE	3.90375	4	1.00650	1.09	37,809	2.47	5.90	23.43	35.21	33.00		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	4.00000	4	0.00000		2	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	50.00	19.21
	DEPARTMENT	4.55172	5	0.94816		29	3.45	3.45	0.00	20.69	72.41		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.50995	5	0.81618	-0.62	804	1.00	2.49	7.34	22.89	66.29		
	COLLEGE	4.15287	5	1.05163	-0.15	37,757	2.64	5.86	15.40	25.77	50.33		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.00000	4	0.00000		2	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	37.50	39.74
	DEPARTMENT	4.65517	5	0.55265		29	0.00	0.00	3.45	27.59	68.97		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.21942	5	1.01741	-0.22	793	2.77	3.66	15.51	24.97	53.09		
	COLLEGE	3.95652	4	1.14454	0.04	37,715	4.07	7.88	19.71	25.01	43.33		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	4.50000	5	0.70711		2	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	56.29
	DEPARTMENT	4.51724	5	1.05630		29	3.45	6.90	0.00	13.79	75.86		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.39326	5	0.88961	0.12	801	1.25	2.87	11.49	24.09	60.30		
	COLLEGE	3.99321	4	1.07986	0.47	37,686	2.97	6.85	20.28	27.70	42.21		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.53571	5	0.99934		28	3.57	3.57	3.57	14.29	75.00		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.29412	5	0.96159	0.73	799	1.75	4.26	12.52	25.78	55.69		
	COLLEGE	3.84626	4	1.20248	0.96	37,654	5.58	9.02	20.63	24.74	40.03		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.44828	5	0.90972		29	0.00	6.90	6.90	20.69	65.52		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.28356	5	0.94438	0.76	797	1.51	4.27	12.55	27.73	53.95		
	COLLEGE	3.91793	4	1.16581	0.93	37,698	4.72	8.30	19.19	26.05	41.74		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.00000		0.00000		1	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	62.50	38.41
	DEPARTMENT	4.35714	5	1.06160		28	3.57	3.57	10.71	17.86	64.29		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.23058	5	1.00287	-0.23	798	2.01	4.89	14.66	24.94	53.51		
	COLLEGE	3.99400	4	1.11704	0.01	37,659	3.67	7.16	19.18	26.07	43.92		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	4.50000	5	0.70711		2	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	75.00	79.87
	DEPARTMENT	4.41379	5	1.05279		29	3.45	3.45	10.34	13.79	68.97		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.16015	4	0.87809	0.39	793	1.01	3.28	15.89	38.34	41.49		
	COLLEGE	3.79663	4	0.98530	0.71	34,351	2.33	6.53	27.24	36.97	26.93		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.00000	3	0.00000		2	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	37.50	19.46
	DEPARTMENT	3.58621	3	0.90701		29	0.00	6.90	48.28	24.14	20.69		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.58920	3	0.86923	-0.68	796	1.13	3.77	48.62	28.02	18.47		
	COLLEGE	3.42616	3	0.85129	-0.50	34,391	1.16	6.45	55.09	23.22	14.08		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	4.50000	5	0.70711		2	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	62.50	79.20
	DEPARTMENT	4.20690	5	1.11417		29	0.00	13.79	10.34	17.24	58.62		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.04146	4	0.94212	0.49	796	0.50	6.66	19.35	35.18	38.32		
	COLLEGE	3.62944	4	1.05080	0.83	34,337	3.08	10.17	31.61	31.00	24.14		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.50000	5	0.70711		2	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	62.50	67.11
	DEPARTMENT	4.41379	5	1.01831		29	3.45	3.45	6.90	20.69	65.52		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.22767	5	0.96003	0.28	795	1.76	4.28	13.84	29.69	50.44		
	COLLEGE	3.82583	4	1.12450	0.60	34,352	4.14	8.56	22.92	29.33	35.05		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.89655	5	0.30993		29	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.34	89.66		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.73384	5	0.61507	0.43	789	0.89	0.38	2.66	16.60	79.47		
	COLLEGE	4.52800	5	0.77999	0.61	34,337	0.75	2.26	6.68	24.07	66.25		

eEvaluate Report - Fall 2017

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 6603-900

Section Title: Field Seminar-Compar Politics

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 2

Course Level: Graduate 5000 and up

Section Size: X-Small 0-15

Question

1. What were the strong points of the course?
2. What were the weak points of the course?
3. What should the instructor do to improve their teaching?
4. What is your overall opinion of this course?

Comment

1. I really enjoyed the openness of our discussion and how Dr. Bracic allowed the two students to pursue lines of thought not immediately relevant to the week's readings.
 2. The "confetti" nature of some of the readings in that some things were just thrown in at random.
 3. N/A
 4. Overall, this was a great class. Oftentimes small classes can be a slow march and like pulling teeth to keep the conversation going and Dr. Bracic did a good job of keeping the class moving forward.
1. A strength of the course was the ability to talk about things that were not related to the readings but were relevant. For example, we talked about different games that could be used even though the readings did not cover it. Doing so expanded my knowledge beyond what we were told to read. It was unique to this course, but the ability to have a small class made me more engaged in the material than if it were a larger class and felt as if Dr. Bracic was concerned that we grasped the concepts.
 2. I think mixing up the readings with more recent stuff would have been interesting to read about. Also reading parts of books left me wanting to read more.
 - 3.
 4. I really enjoyed the course and look forward to her next class.

eValuate Report - Fall 2017

Response Key

1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
7. Instructor's management of the course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
8. Amount you learned in this class	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
11. Overall, this course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
12. This course was graded fairly	1 = Never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Occasionally, 4 = Usually, 5 = Always

eValue Report - Fall 2016

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 3600-900

Section Title: Human Rights & Contentious Pol

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 39

Course Level: Upper 3000 - 4000

Section Size: Medium 26-59

Question	Level	Mean Response	Median Response	Standard Deviation	ZScore	Responses	Percent #1	Percent #2	Percent #3	Percent #4	Percent #5	Dept Rank	College Rank
1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	INDIVIDUAL	3.05263	3	1.31122		19	15.79	15.79	31.58	21.05	15.79	9.09	2.61
	DEPARTMENT	4.19417	4	0.92191		206	1.94	2.91	14.08	35.92	45.15		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.12215	4	0.92107	-1.16	3,995	1.65	3.18	17.60	36.45	41.13		
	COLLEGE	3.89556	4	1.01956	-0.83	37,571	2.70	6.00	23.57	34.52	33.21		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	3.73684	4	1.24017		19	5.26	15.79	10.53	36.84	31.58	9.09	13.91
	DEPARTMENT	4.53140	5	0.82305		207	0.48	3.86	6.76	19.81	69.08		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.38117	5	0.93097	-0.69	3,993	1.63	3.73	10.57	23.04	61.03		
	COLLEGE	4.14816	5	1.06200	-0.39	37,492	2.80	5.97	15.39	25.30	50.54		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	3.10526	4	1.62941		19	21.05	26.32	5.26	15.79	31.58	18.18	7.39
	DEPARTMENT	3.86473	4	1.16630		207	3.86	11.11	18.84	27.05	39.13		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.13838	4	1.06032	-0.97	3,989	2.83	5.94	15.42	26.17	49.64		
	COLLEGE	3.98000	4	1.12219	-0.78	37,452	3.76	7.26	19.66	25.87	43.45		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	3.73684	4	1.14708		19	0.00	21.05	15.79	31.58	31.58	9.09	20.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.36715	5	0.88157		207	0.97	4.35	8.21	29.95	56.52		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.20250	5	0.99008	-0.47	3,995	1.78	4.88	15.62	26.76	50.96		
	COLLEGE	3.98799	4	1.08752	-0.23	37,455	3.04	7.10	20.17	27.38	42.30		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	3.16667	3	1.38267		18	22.22	0.00	33.33	27.78	16.67	9.09	8.70
	DEPARTMENT	4.24272	5	1.01179		206	3.40	2.91	12.62	28.16	52.91		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.08950	4	1.09858	-0.84	3,989	3.56	6.17	16.40	25.52	48.36		
	COLLEGE	3.84266	4	1.20924	-0.56	37,421	5.77	9.01	20.55	24.51	40.15		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	2.89474	3	1.48678		19	26.32	10.53	31.58	10.53	21.05	9.09	4.35
	DEPARTMENT	4.24757	5	1.01783		206	4.37	0.97	13.11	28.64	52.91		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.14372	4	1.04762	-1.19	3,987	2.88	5.19	15.83	26.86	49.24		
	COLLEGE	3.90761	4	1.17617	-0.86	37,449	5.08	8.15	19.30	25.88	41.59		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	2.78947	3	1.51213		19	26.32	21.05	21.05	10.53	21.05	9.09	2.61
	DEPARTMENT	4.11707	4	1.05994		205	3.41	5.85	12.68	31.71	46.34		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.18072	5	1.01901	-1.37	3,984	2.36	4.97	15.44	26.71	50.53		
	COLLEGE	3.99263	4	1.11016	-1.08	37,430	3.70	6.77	19.49	26.66	43.39		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	2.78947	3	1.22832		19	21.05	10.53	47.37	10.53	10.53	9.09	1.32
	DEPARTMENT	4.06796	4	0.98538		206	2.91	3.40	17.48	36.41	39.81		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.01696	4	0.92063	-1.33	3,951	1.24	4.28	21.26	37.99	35.23		
	COLLEGE	3.80991	4	0.99322	-1.03	33,852	2.42	6.46	26.73	36.49	27.90		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.42105	3	0.60698		19	0.00	0.00	63.16	31.58	5.26	81.82	62.72
	DEPARTMENT	3.29612	3	0.78067		206	1.94	5.34	62.62	21.36	8.74		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.35879	3	0.81462	0.08	3,955	0.99	6.80	59.47	20.83	11.91		
	COLLEGE	3.42857	3	0.84844	-0.01	33,878	1.19	6.19	55.17	23.47	13.98		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	3.42105	4	1.12130		19	5.26	15.79	26.32	36.84	15.79	9.09	17.54
	DEPARTMENT	4.04412	4	0.95361		204	0.98	4.90	22.55	31.86	39.71		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.86318	4	1.01656	-0.43	3,954	2.02	7.51	24.76	33.54	32.17		
	COLLEGE	3.63848	4	1.05219	-0.21	33,835	3.12	9.83	31.75	30.68	24.62		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	2.94737	3	1.31122		19	21.05	10.53	31.58	26.32	10.53	9.09	4.83
	DEPARTMENT	4.18447	4	0.98523		206	2.91	2.43	16.02	30.58	48.06		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.09790	4	1.03153	-1.12	3,953	2.53	5.26	17.81	28.69	45.71		
	COLLEGE	3.82811	4	1.13571	-0.78	33,859	4.35	8.70	22.33	29.00	35.61		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	3.73684	4	1.09758		19	5.26	5.26	26.32	36.84	26.32	9.09	2.63
	DEPARTMENT	4.63592	5	0.71804		206	0.97	1.46	3.88	20.39	73.30		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.66033	5	0.67709	-1.36	3,948	0.58	1.27	4.41	19.02	74.72		
	COLLEGE	4.51347	5	0.79520	-0.98	33,850	0.82	2.51	6.66	24.51	65.49		

eEvaluate Report - Fall 2016

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 3600-900

Section Title: Human Rights & Contentious Pol

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 39

Course Level: Upper 3000 - 4000

Section Size: Medium 26-59

Question

1. What were the strong points of the course?
2. What were the weak points of the course?
3. What should the instructor do to improve their teaching?
4. What is your overall opinion of this course?

Comment

1. Interaction in class discussion
 2. Does not give grades back. Is not clear on how she grades. Extremely scatterbrained
 3. Get organized.
 4. Not the best.
1. She makes everyone get into groups and discuss the material. This helps everyone understand the material better.
 - 2.
 - 3.
 4. This course was definitely interesting! I love the passion that Dr. Bracic has for the topics we talk about in class.
1. The open minded thinking.
 2. There was no structure. Hard to follow.
 3. Create structure. Stay on topic.
 4. I liked the idea and I love Dr. B in general. The course just didn't work very well in terms of sound curriculum.
1. Learning about our classmates' research
 2. The group work was too hectic
 3. Maybe set up groups based on seating arrangements early on so we aren't always having to move all over the classroom
 4. Great for initiating dialogue about human rights
1. It got me thinking about human rights around the world in a more broad view.
 2. I felt like the course was very disorganized. My fellow classmates and I never really knew when things were due and what exactly was expected of us. Lastly, she never post any grades online, I could get an A in the class or fail it I honestly have no idea what my grade is at this point.
 3. Be more organized in the structure of the course and hand back/ post grades online.
 4. Enjoyed the subject of the course. I like Dr. Bracic, I think she is a generally nice person, but it is hard to understand what exactly she wants/ looking for from us. At least that's the feeling I got.
1. Dr. Bracic absolutely amazed me this semester. Her passion for human rights ignited in me a passion for it as well. I learned a plethora of new information that I will utilize in my future work of study.
 2. No weak points.
 3. Nothing.
 4. I really enjoyed this class. I would recommend this class to anyone.
1. Her particular interest and study of the Roma was interesting. Taking classes with a professor who is actively doing research is usually interesting.
 2. It really is an introductory course more than anything. This limited the scope of the course to broader areas of study rather than achieving a more pointed look at particular representative events.
 3. She's actually quite good. I enjoyed the structure of the course, given its limitations. No comments for improvement.
 4. Interesting, although not entirely applicable to my area of study. Though that was really my fault more than anything. Still an interesting course, and certainly beneficial.
1. The class collaboration. The student presentations were interesting. I learned the most from those.
 2. The debates. Rather than open peoples minds to see alternative viewpoints, they simply angered everyone in the class and caused greater divides within the students. The lectures were unstructured and hard to glean any information from. The midterm paper instructions were unclear and the rubric was not upload until days before the deadline, after many of us had already written the paper. The paper was not graded according to the rubric and she did not effectively define expectations. The class aims to be about Human rights theory and basis of understanding, however it often degenerated into a opinion debate over specific instances (always the same ones) so my knowledge base did not grow with each class. Also the attendance sheet never made it all the way around the room.
 3. Make the course far more structured. This course needs to be lecture based, not discussion based. For Human Rights, because it is all so subjective, class discussions lead nowhere and do not contribute to learning. Also, when allowing students to meet with her, she does not give enough notice to students. Only allowing students to meet with her for 2 days to discuss a paper topic and expectations that are vague is not enough time. Rather, she should do appoint me only and still hold class that wednesday.
 4. I do not recommend this course. I do not feel that I learned much about Human Rights, but more about the futility and cynicism surrounding humanitarian efforts. The course was too unstructured and too erratic. I frequently left the class feeling exhausted and frustrated that I had just been required to spend an hour of my time sitting in a room to get nothing substantial or productive out of it.

eValuate Report - Fall 2016

<p>1. I found the topics Professor Boracic taught to be very interesting.</p> <p>2. Everyday there was something new going on in the classroom, it created a chaotic atmosphere. Between the oral presentations, random group work, and mock courts it got to be a little overwhelming.</p> <p>3. Create a less chaotic atmosphere for students so they can actually focus on the course material.</p> <p>4. I enjoyed Professor Bracic- she was very helpful when I had questions about my final paper. However, I thought the classroom setting was too hectic and rushed for me.</p>
<p>1. Days where we had to debate each other were really cool. I learned so much from those days and came away with entirely new perspectives.</p> <p>2. Better articulation of grades would be nice. With only one grade in the gradebook before having to turn in final assignments, it is stressful trying to guess what is expected of me.</p> <p>3. A powerpoint to follow along with key points would have been really helpful.</p> <p>4. Interesting class, good instruction.</p>
<p>1. I loved the topic and thought Professor Bracic did a great job of showing her extended knowledge of the subject.</p> <p>2. The lectures were not always structured well. It was easy to get lost and have no idea what the topic of the day was.</p> <p>3. I would have liked to have some power point slides or something to help keep track of the lecture. I would just recommend some more structure.</p> <p>4. I truly enjoyed this course, mostly due to Professor Bracic.</p>
<p>1. I loved her personality! She was easy going and kind. Made us feel like we matter and was ALWAYS willing to help us. We knew we could go to her with any problem or question we had.</p> <p>2. Signing up for readings and stuff on D2L was very confusing. You had to make sure other people weren't signed up for it, then people would duplicate, exc. it was confusing.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>4.</p>
<p>1. She was a very personable professor. Easy to approach and ask questions.</p> <p>2. She was very unorganized, class was very hard to keep focus in. There was no structure for the course or any assignments. Very hard to grasp any content from the class.</p> <p>3. Make the course more structured. Allow for draft submissions for essays, one essay was very vague in the question.</p> <p>4. I feel as the course did not teach me anything. I was very lost during discussion, none of the content connected all together.</p>
<p>1. I dont believe there was anything strong about this course</p> <p>2. yes. Professor Bracic didnt really teach much then based all the assignments off of what she teached. Worst teacher ive had in my 3 years here. Group activities were terribly set up and she questioned her directions as she gave them. Had the whole class looking at each other in aw.</p> <p>3. Quit. Dont expect so much when you create terribly confusing prompts</p> <p>4. Would highly recommend staying away from this professor and course. Most people in the class agree on those both. Ive made my mistake, I feel for anyone that does after me</p>
<p>1. I enjoyed doing class debates</p> <p>2. I disliked not actually learning from the course readings.</p> <p>3. have quizzes every now and then to get people to read the course material</p> <p>4. I loved Dr. Bracic she was an amazing instructor</p>
<p>1. Loads of discussions and activities during the lectures</p> <p>2. Some times it felt like it would be more useful to have a less group discussions and more of a lecture where the professor teaches. That would be easier to lear I think.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>4. Very good</p>
<p>1. The reading material is a very big part of this course and while it can be hard to keep up with at times, the readings are generally very eye opening.</p> <p>2. Knowing how you are doing in the class is difficult because there is such little feedback.</p> <p>3. Although it is a discussion based course, it would help facilitate the learning of everyone in the class if the professor controlled the input of those who are very opinionated and passionate about the material. It can be overbearing and cause others to check out or not feel comfortable in the class.</p> <p>4. It would be difficult to take an exam on this material because there were not many concrete ideas. It was a great discussion course.</p>
<p>1.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>3. More lecturing and discussion, less in-class group work.</p> <p>4.</p>

eValuate Report - Fall 2016

Response Key

1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
7. Instructor's management of the course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
8. Amount you learned in this class	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
11. Overall, this course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
12. This course was graded fairly	1 = Never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Occasionally, 4 = Usually, 5 = Always

eValue Report - Fall 2016

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 2013-001

Section Title: Intro to Political Analysis

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 16

Course Level: Lower 0000 - 2000

Section Size: Small 16-25

Question	Level	Mean Response	Median Response	Standard Deviation	ZScore	Responses	Percent #1	Percent #2	Percent #3	Percent #4	Percent #5	Dept Rank	College Rank
1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	INDIVIDUAL	3.22222	4	1.39443		9	11.11	22.22	22.22	22.22	22.22	11.11	15.67
	DEPARTMENT	3.87452	4	0.90437		518	1.35	4.05	27.61	39.77	27.22		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.94235	4	0.98395	-0.73	8,239	2.01	5.78	22.03	36.32	33.86		
	COLLEGE	3.89556	4	1.01956	-0.66	37,571	2.70	6.00	23.57	34.52	33.21		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	3.11111	3	1.36423		9	11.11	22.22	33.33	11.11	22.22	4.44	9.52
	DEPARTMENT	4.15830	4	0.94840		518	1.54	4.05	16.80	32.24	45.37		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.16689	5	1.04610	-1.01	8,227	2.60	6.05	13.99	26.77	50.59		
	COLLEGE	4.14816	5	1.06200	-0.98	37,492	2.80	5.97	15.39	25.30	50.54		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	3.55556	5	1.81046		9	22.22	11.11	11.11	0.00	55.56	28.89	27.09
	DEPARTMENT	3.82785	4	1.17934		517	5.22	9.09	20.89	27.27	37.52		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.95835	4	1.13383	-0.36	8,212	3.87	7.90	19.50	25.97	42.75		
	COLLEGE	3.98000	4	1.12219	-0.38	37,452	3.76	7.26	19.66	25.87	43.45		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	3.22222	4	1.30171		9	11.11	22.22	11.11	44.44	11.11	4.44	14.20
	DEPARTMENT	3.99038	4	0.98246		520	1.35	5.58	23.85	31.15	38.08		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.02970	4	1.06037	-0.76	8,216	2.67	6.46	19.39	28.20	43.28		
	COLLEGE	3.98799	4	1.08752	-0.70	37,455	3.04	7.10	20.17	27.38	42.30		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	3.00000	3	1.22474		9	11.11	22.22	33.33	22.22	11.11	4.44	15.23
	DEPARTMENT	3.91522	4	1.03814		519	2.31	6.94	23.70	31.02	36.03		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.86226	4	1.17439	-0.73	8,211	5.13	8.44	20.70	26.54	39.19		
	COLLEGE	3.84266	4	1.20924	-0.70	37,421	5.77	9.01	20.55	24.51	40.15		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	3.11111	3	1.05409		9	0.00	33.33	33.33	22.22	11.11	4.44	14.35
	DEPARTMENT	3.97485	4	0.99482		517	1.74	6.19	21.66	33.66	36.75		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.97471	4	1.13129	-0.76	8,223	4.17	7.20	18.65	26.94	43.04		
	COLLEGE	3.90761	4	1.17617	-0.68	37,449	5.08	8.15	19.30	25.88	41.59		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	3.44444	4	1.50923		9	11.11	22.22	11.11	22.22	33.33	6.67	19.91
	DEPARTMENT	4.05000	4	0.97631		520	1.92	3.85	22.12	31.54	40.58		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.02519	4	1.09009	-0.53	8,216	3.35	6.37	19.00	27.00	44.29		
	COLLEGE	3.99263	4	1.11016	-0.49	37,430	3.70	6.77	19.49	26.66	43.39		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	3.11111	4	1.53659		9	22.22	11.11	22.22	22.22	22.22	13.64	12.21
	DEPARTMENT	3.63221	4	0.94147		503	1.99	7.55	34.79	36.58	19.09		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.75440	4	0.97012	-0.66	7,500	2.13	6.61	29.71	36.77	24.77		
	COLLEGE	3.80991	4	0.99322	-0.70	33,852	2.42	6.46	26.73	36.49	27.90		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.22222	3	0.83333		9	0.00	11.11	66.67	11.11	11.11	75.00	28.05
	DEPARTMENT	3.03960	3	0.82039		505	3.17	15.05	63.56	11.09	7.13		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.43926	3	0.83446	-0.26	7,508	1.05	5.85	54.71	24.89	13.49		
	COLLEGE	3.42857	3	0.84844	-0.24	33,878	1.19	6.19	55.17	23.47	13.98		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	3.11111	3	0.92796		9	0.00	22.22	55.56	11.11	11.11	11.36	18.15
	DEPARTMENT	3.57738	3	0.95940		504	1.59	8.93	39.68	29.76	20.04		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.55946	4	1.03391	-0.43	7,493	2.95	10.97	34.57	30.21	21.30		
	COLLEGE	3.63848	4	1.05219	-0.50	33,835	3.12	9.83	31.75	30.68	24.62		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	2.66667	3	0.86603		9	11.11	22.22	55.56	11.11	0.00	2.27	5.78
	DEPARTMENT	3.80396	4	1.01730		505	2.18	7.52	27.72	32.87	29.70		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.81936	4	1.09801	-1.05	7,501	3.41	8.84	23.94	30.01	33.80		
	COLLEGE	3.82811	4	1.13571	-1.02	33,859	4.35	8.70	22.33	29.00	35.61		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	4.66667	5	0.70711		9	0.00	0.00	11.11	11.11	77.78	61.36	60.40
	DEPARTMENT	4.55159	5	0.74431		504	0.60	2.38	4.56	26.19	66.27		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.49607	5	0.79378	0.21	7,505	0.80	2.40	7.01	25.98	63.81		
	COLLEGE	4.51347	5	0.79520	0.19	33,850	0.82	2.51	6.66	24.51	65.49		

eEvaluate Report - Fall 2016

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 2013-001

Section Title: Intro to Political Analysis

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 16

Course Level: Lower 0000 - 2000

Section Size: Small 16-25

Question

1. What were the strong points of the course?
2. What were the weak points of the course?
3. What should the instructor do to improve their teaching?
4. What is your overall opinion of this course?

Comment

- 1.
 - 2.
 3. I would suggest for Dr. Bracic to teach on a level that the students understand. She is so passionate about what she teaches that sometimes she thinks we know what she is talking about. Other than that she is an excellent Professor.
 4. It was a very interesting course.
1. The actual lecture material.
 2. R.
 3. The video we watched for extra credit really helped me with understand R, but it came at the end of the semester. Maybe that video at the beginning or parts during each class time would help!
 4. It was okay. Luckily I've taken a stats class, so the lecture material and project were very easy for me. I know other people struggled.
1. This course was really interesting because it incorporated the election into what we were learning. We created a survey and did research which was really cool.
 2. The course seemed too difficult to be considered an introduction course. R Studio was difficult to learn. There should be a requirement to know how to operate R Studio before being admitted into the class.
 3. Dr. Bracic did a great job making sure we understood the material. She always answered our questions and helped explain the material in a way that we understood. She was always willing to meet with students to help work on our projects. Some of the lectures were boring but Dr. Bracic knew this and tried to keep our attention by making the lectures interesting.
 4. I enjoyed this course. Dr. Bracic is a great professor! I was nervous when the course first began because I thought it would be really difficult but Dr. Bracic made sure we understood the material and helped us prepare for our assignments. Overall, awesome!
1. Dr. Bracic was more than willing to answer questions and clarify complex topics in class and out of class. She made a difficult course and subject matter very understandable and something that I feel I have learned a great deal about.
 2. I did not realize walking in that it was a statistics class.
 3. Sometimes, when confused by a particular topic during lecture, she could have been a bit more gentle in her approach in explaining information that we did not understand.
 4. I thought the course was excellent, even with my initial hesitations. I learned far more than I expected.
1. Interesting topics and semester long project was interesting
 2. This was a heavily statistics based class and I was not interested in statistics. This shouldn't be a requirement for political science or public affairs majors. I also was unaware that I was going to need to provide my own laptop and software- the software for this class seldom worked and ruined my laptop.
 3. Be more aware of the actual material. The professor was fantastic but you could tell this wasn't her expertise
 4. I did enjoy the class and professor but feel that it was not necessary for me and had it not been a requirement I would not have taken it. It should be advertised that personal laptop is required and its a statistics course.
1. The ability to work with a real survey and analyze the data yourself.
 2. Firstly, the computer lab in which the class was originally supposed to be held in, was torn down; which lead to us students having to download the class software on our personal computers (adding unnecessary junk to my computer). Secondly, I do not believe that this course was valuable to my education in the political science field, most of this class was analyzing statistics from surveys by using such methods as measure of central tendency and standard deviation (etc.), which I did not need to spend a semester learning how to do.
 3. Nothing, I believe that Dr. Bracic did her best with this class and the material that she was given to teach.
 4. I do not believe that this course was valuable to my education in the field of political science. Dr. Bracic stated, on the first day, that this class would have nothing to do with learning about politics and would be all statistics and survey entry analysis. The course description is as follows- "Scientific method and the variety of approaches to a science of politics; problems of research design; methods and techniques of systematic political inquiry," this description led me to believe that I would be conducting and analyzing research. While we did do this, to an extent, I was not planning or prepared to be using computer language and a software that I will most likely never touch again (R Studio) for almost every single day in the class. Overall, I would tell most people on the political science track to stray far away from this course because I do not believe that it was valuable to my education as a political science major.
- 1.
 - 2.
 - 3.
 - 4.

eValuate Report - Fall 2016

1. Dr. Bracic is very personable and makes the poll questions fun.
 2. R Studio was difficult to deal with, but I understand we have to learn it. I feel like we should slow the R Studio/ Lab classes down to understand it better. The final paper is worth the majority of the points which is okay because I didn't feel prepared for the midterm (not due to lack of studying, but the power points are straight forward where the test is more putting the powerpoint information into play). We should go over the paper way more if it is worth so many points.
 3. Project paper focus since it is worth the majority of points.
 4. I liked the professor, but the class was not that interesting to me.
-
- 1.
 2. R studio not working was very frustrating. Having to download R onto my own computer was very inconvenient. Would have been more efficient to be in a compute lab.
 - 3.
 4. The first couple of weeks I was extremely intimidated by how hard the information we would learn would be but Dr. B made it very easy for us and would teach it until we understood

eValuate Report - Fall 2016

Response Key

1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
7. Instructor's management of the course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
8. Amount you learned in this class	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
11. Overall, this course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
12. This course was graded fairly	1 = Never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Occasionally, 4 = Usually, 5 = Always

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2016

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 3600-003

Section Title: Nongovernmental Organizations

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 30

Course Level: Upper 3000 - 4000

Section Size: Medium 26-59

Question	Level	Mean Response	Median Response	Standard Deviation	ZScore	Responses	Percent #1	Percent #2	Percent #3	Percent #4	Percent #5	Dept Rank	College Rank
1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.05882	4	0.89935		17	0.00	5.88	17.65	41.18	35.29	45.46	38.65
	DEPARTMENT	4.03483	4	0.93476		201	1.00	4.98	20.90	35.82	37.31		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.05905	4	0.97645	-0.00	4,623	2.38	4.07	18.41	35.56	39.58		
	COLLEGE	3.89934	4	1.00541	0.16	31,084	2.60	5.58	23.71	35.48	32.62		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	4.52941	5	0.79982		17	0.00	5.88	0.00	29.41	64.71	36.36	53.39
	DEPARTMENT	4.47761	5	0.84306		201	0.50	3.98	7.96	22.39	65.17		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.32713	5	0.98785	0.20	4,622	2.23	4.65	10.45	23.52	59.15		
	COLLEGE	4.15359	4	1.04380	0.36	31,044	2.55	5.80	15.23	26.54	49.86		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.47059	5	0.87447		17	0.00	5.88	5.88	23.53	64.71	81.82	68.92
	DEPARTMENT	3.66169	4	1.25896		201	6.97	12.44	22.39	23.88	34.33		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.08537	4	1.07624	0.36	4,615	2.82	6.57	17.40	25.70	47.52		
	COLLEGE	4.01613	4	1.09561	0.41	31,000	3.30	6.62	19.55	26.23	44.31		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	4.41176	5	1.06412		17	5.88	0.00	5.88	23.53	64.71	63.64	64.54
	DEPARTMENT	4.25373	5	0.93290		201	1.49	2.99	15.92	27.86	51.74		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.17295	5	1.03525	0.23	4,614	2.49	5.37	15.34	25.92	50.87		
	COLLEGE	3.98176	4	1.07043	0.40	30,977	2.85	6.77	20.78	28.54	41.06		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	4.11765	4	1.05370		17	5.88	0.00	11.76	41.18	41.18	72.73	45.42
	DEPARTMENT	3.92040	4	1.16346		201	3.98	8.46	22.39	21.89	43.28		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.03406	4	1.16085	0.07	4,609	4.69	6.99	16.64	23.61	48.08		
	COLLEGE	3.83967	4	1.19207	0.23	30,974	5.34	9.09	21.03	25.33	39.20		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	4.23529	5	0.90342		17	0.00	5.88	11.76	35.29	47.06	72.73	48.21
	DEPARTMENT	3.99502	4	1.04641		201	1.00	8.96	21.89	25.87	42.29		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.07824	4	1.12774	0.14	4,614	4.25	6.42	15.24	25.47	48.63		
	COLLEGE	3.92192	4	1.15041	0.27	30,995	4.52	7.86	19.65	26.82	41.14		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.05882	5	1.19742		17	5.88	5.88	11.76	29.41	47.06	45.46	38.65
	DEPARTMENT	4.01005	4	1.10550		199	2.01	10.55	16.58	26.13	44.72		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.11734	4	1.07779	-0.05	4,602	3.41	5.50	15.93	26.27	48.89		
	COLLEGE	4.01098	4	1.08182	0.04	30,953	3.09	6.60	19.67	27.43	43.22		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	3.94118	4	0.89935		17	0.00	5.88	23.53	41.18	29.41	45.46	39.27
	DEPARTMENT	3.92040	4	0.95060		201	1.00	6.47	23.88	36.82	31.84		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.97514	4	0.96406	-0.04	4,546	2.16	4.73	20.61	38.45	34.05		
	COLLEGE	3.81597	4	0.98404	0.13	28,973	2.40	6.03	26.84	37.05	27.68		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.29412	3	1.10480		17	5.88	11.76	47.06	17.65	17.65	27.27	42.51
	DEPARTMENT	3.47761	3	0.81899		201	1.00	3.48	56.72	24.38	14.43		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.39336	3	0.80864	-0.12	4,548	0.95	5.50	59.26	21.88	12.42		
	COLLEGE	3.42945	3	0.85321	-0.16	28,995	1.30	6.15	54.96	23.49	14.10		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	3.52941	3	1.12459		17	0.00	17.65	41.18	11.76	29.41	27.27	23.08
	DEPARTMENT	3.76500	4	1.04654		200	2.50	9.00	27.00	32.50	29.00		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.82116	4	1.03403	-0.28	4,546	2.42	7.63	26.57	32.16	31.21		
	COLLEGE	3.63657	4	1.04539	-0.10	28,949	3.09	9.51	32.37	30.74	24.30		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	3.88235	4	1.05370		17	5.88	0.00	23.53	41.18	29.41	36.36	34.41
	DEPARTMENT	3.85075	4	1.09891		201	2.49	9.95	23.88	27.36	36.32		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.01473	4	1.09921	-0.12	4,548	3.69	6.57	17.79	28.45	43.49		
	COLLEGE	3.83198	4	1.11689	0.05	28,960	4.01	8.39	22.92	29.72	34.95		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	4.82353	5	0.39295		17	0.00	0.00	0.00	17.65	82.35	72.73	70.85
	DEPARTMENT	4.51741	5	0.75561		201	0.00	2.99	6.97	25.37	64.68		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.57903	5	0.75505	0.32	4,549	0.70	2.02	6.02	21.17	70.08		
	COLLEGE	4.52020	5	0.79232	0.38	28,956	0.88	2.32	6.69	24.13	65.98		

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2016

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 3600-003

Section Title: Nongovernmental Organizations

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 30

Course Level: Upper 3000 - 4000

Section Size: Medium 26-59

Question

1. What were the strong points of the course?
2. What were the weak points of the course?
3. What should the instructor do to improve their teaching?
4. What is your overall opinion of this course?

Comment

1. Dr. Bracic is a wonderful professor and her passion for what she does shows in her class. I learned a lot about a subject I was very unfamiliar with and she taught it in an interesting way. I don't usually like group projects, but with hers, I really liked it and learned a lot.

2. Some of the reading material is very long and a lot of data so it can be very dry. It would be fine if only some of the reading was of this sort but it was most of the reading. A lot of times, we wouldn't discuss much of the reading and I know many students, including myself, usually just skimmed the reading because we didn't usually discuss it in detail during class.

- 3.
4. It was a wonderful course.

1. Dr. Bracic is extremely knowledgeable of the course material, and displays strong sincerity towards the information and issues discussed in class. I felt like I could ask her any question and be confident with the answer she provided me. Dr. Bracic was aware of the difficulties that came with assignments, and was flexible with students.

2. Lectures were dull at times. Readings were generally dull causing me to lose interest much of the time. Grades were not posted on D2L which caused me to question my academic standing many times, regardless of the physical grades handed back to us.

3. Post grades on D2L, and either provide more engaging course readings or assign less material to read. While some students may find the readings extremely interesting, the average student may disagree.

4. Although I felt disconnected from the course material and readings at times, Dr. Bracic was never dull in her instructing. Her assignments were never too difficult, and forced students to gain an understanding of Non-Governmental Organizations. Even though I am more interested with policy and legislation, I feel that the course and Dr. Bracic have provided me with a solid understanding of Non-Governmental Organizations.

1. the content was interesting, class time for group work was awesome because finding time for busy students to meet is hard so giving the class time was excellent.

2. the readings were very hefty and not always interesting. The in class debates were not useful to my learning. the way the final was distribution is bogus and unthoughtful. Giving the students no time to prepare or study or even time manage to make time for spend writing the exam isn't fair. We won't be able to do as well as we should if we given more time or even just a time table to be able manage all that we are given.

3. Spread out the readings and more in class discussion without debates.

4. Do the final differently

1. The debates were very intriguing. It was fun to debate a topic that I did not necessarily agree with inherently.

2. I didn't really like the mini group projects in class with the readings. They didn't contribute to my learning much.

3. I think that the readings should be cut down and tailored to exactly what you are going to discuss in class.

4. I would probably take it again.

1. Not many. Easy grading.

2. Always felt like class was planned 5 minutes before hand. A lot of deadtime where we didn't do anything. Project dates always changed and caused confusion.

3. have a schedule and stick to it. Make the readings not so dense or break them up.

4. Meh.

1. Being able to create a simulated organization, issuing surveys and making a website for its, was a lot of fun and had practical, real-world application.

2. No stand-out weak points.

3. Sometimes when Dr. Bracic gave us an in-class project, or discussion topic, she could be a bit unclear with her instructions, leaving us looking at each other wondering what she wanted us to do. Being clearer and more specific in her instructions might be helpful.

4. This course was a great opportunity to see how an NGO conducts research, makes surveys, frames arguments, and reaches people.

1. I really liked the semester long project. It really helped me learn and understand all the different aspects of an NGO.

2. It was sometimes hard to keep up in class discussion of readings.

3. Maybe have a powerpoint slide or two that highlights the important parts of the readings. Just to help students follow along.

4. I loved this class! I knew almost nothing about this subject before this class but Dr. Bracic has taught me so much! Dr. Bracic is awesome!

eValuate Report - Spring 2016

1. She is passionate about what she teaches, and knows what she is talking about.

2. N/A

3. N/A

4. Very good class

1. Strong points of the class was that the group project was easy because you had plenty of time to complete each assignment.

2. One weak point of the class was not getting the readings far enough in advance.

3. Having a power point or some point of reference while lecturing would be helpful because sometimes I got lost while she was teaching.

4. I really enjoyed this course and I though the group project was really fun and very informative.

1. The course covered relevant and important information to the overall curriculum on a consistent basis.

2. There were no noteworthy weak points to this course.

3. The instructor was extremely effective in teaching this course. No change is necessary.

4. I would very highly recommend this course to anybody seeking an informative and engaging upper division political science course.

1. Strong points would have been the group project. I loved getting to develop an idea and help bring it to life throughout the semester.

2. Weak points of the class would be the constant schedule changes. It was difficult to keep track of when everything was due because they changed a lot.

3. A powerpoint would have been nice to take notes off of because it was sometimes difficult to take notes just by listening.

4. This course was one of my favorite courses I took this semester. I loved that we learned how NGO's work by creating our own NGO. It gave us first hand experience.

1.

2.

3.

4. Prior to this course, I had no knowledge on the topic of NGOs. In fact, I didn't even know what a NGO was. Throughout the course, Professor Bracic did a great job explaining what an NGO was / what an NGO did / the positive and negative sides of an NGO / everything in-between. I can truly say that this is the course I learned the most in this semester!

Thank you very much!

1. Dr. Bracic is the difference maker in this course. Her breadth of knowledge created strong content engagement.

2. Group works is always a struggle!

3. The structure of the course sets up really well content synthesis. There were times when only a few people would speak on the readings, so if anything, maybe looking at that element to create more student participation.

4. Dr. Bracic is a wonderful professor and because of her, her passion, and knowledge it sets up for a very meaningful course.

1. Dr. Bracic was friendly and approachable. The creating the NGO assignment was fun and engaging, allowing for a more in-depth, hands-on experience with NGOs. Very fair grading.

2. The reading material was a lot, sometimes too much. The group aspect of the project was sometimes frustrating due to the lack of communication and attendance by my partner.

3. I appreciated the debates that allowed us to develop our own opinions about the topics. Perhaps more activities designed to encourage independent thinking.

4. I like the course, as it taught me about NGOs in a thorough fashion. Dr. Bracic is one of the nicest professors I have encountered.

eValue Report - Spring 2016

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 6603-900

Section Title: Field Seminar-Compar Politics

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 2

Course Level: Graduate 5000 and up

Section Size: X-Small 0-15

Question	Level	Mean Response	Median Response	Standard Deviation	ZScore	Responses	Percent #1	Percent #2	Percent #3	Percent #4	Percent #5	Dept Rank	College Rank
1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.50000	5	0.70711		2	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	75.00	62.35
	DEPARTMENT	4.35714	4	0.70270		70	0.00	1.43	8.57	42.86	47.14		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.32112	5	0.80687	0.22	819	0.37	2.44	12.09	34.92	50.18		
	COLLEGE	3.89934	4	1.00541	0.60	31,084	2.60	5.58	23.71	35.48	32.62		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.64286	5	0.68176		70	0.00	1.43	7.14	17.14	74.29		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.54223	5	0.78184	0.59	817	0.98	1.59	7.47	22.15	67.81		
	COLLEGE	4.15359	4	1.04380	0.81	31,044	2.55	5.80	15.23	26.54	49.86		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.50000	5	0.70711		2	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	83.33	50.00
	DEPARTMENT	3.95714	4	1.02767		70	2.86	5.71	20.00	35.71	35.71		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.29448	5	1.02147	0.20	815	2.82	3.80	13.37	21.10	58.90		
	COLLEGE	4.01613	4	1.09561	0.44	31,000	3.30	6.62	19.55	26.23	44.31		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.37681	5	0.89281		69	1.45	1.45	14.49	23.19	59.42		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.41104	5	0.85661	0.69	815	0.74	3.56	9.45	26.38	59.88		
	COLLEGE	3.98176	4	1.07043	0.95	30,974	2.85	6.77	20.78	28.54	41.06		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.24286	5	1.02767		70	1.43	7.14	12.86	22.86	55.71		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.35055	5	0.91316	0.71	813	1.11	4.18	11.07	25.83	57.81		
	COLLEGE	3.83967	4	1.19207	0.97	30,974	5.34	9.09	21.03	25.33	39.20		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.45714	5	0.82858		70	0.00	2.86	12.86	20.00	64.29		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.37515	5	0.90604	0.69	813	1.23	3.20	12.30	23.37	59.90		
	COLLEGE	3.92192	4	1.15041	0.94	30,995	4.52	7.86	19.65	26.82	41.14		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.35714	5	0.79920		70	0.00	1.43	15.71	28.57	54.29		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.32515	5	0.91857	0.73	815	1.84	2.45	12.76	27.24	55.71		
	COLLEGE	4.01098	4	1.08182	0.91	30,953	3.09	6.60	19.67	27.43	43.22		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	4.50000	5	0.70711		2	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	75.00	67.10
	DEPARTMENT	4.28571	4	0.72518		70	0.00	1.43	11.43	44.29	42.86		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.24555	4	0.81671	0.31	786	0.51	2.54	13.36	39.06	44.53		
	COLLEGE	3.81597	4	0.98404	0.70	28,973	2.40	6.03	26.84	37.05	27.68		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.00000	3	0.00000		2	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	8.33	20.65
	DEPARTMENT	3.80000	4	0.75373		70	0.00	0.00	40.00	40.00	20.00		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.62991	3	0.84596	-0.74	789	0.25	3.93	47.78	28.64	19.39		
	COLLEGE	3.42945	3	0.85321	-0.50	28,995	1.30	6.15	54.96	23.49	14.10		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.14286	4	0.76681		70	0.00	1.43	18.57	44.29	35.71		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.18679	4	0.88925	0.91	787	0.76	3.94	15.50	35.45	44.35		
	COLLEGE	3.63657	4	1.04539	1.30	28,949	3.09	9.51	32.37	30.74	24.30		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.30435	5	0.86270		69	0.00	4.35	13.04	30.43	52.17		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.33418	5	0.88296	0.75	784	0.64	3.95	12.12	27.93	55.36		
	COLLEGE	3.83198	4	1.11689	1.05	28,960	4.01	8.39	22.92	29.72	34.95		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.83824	5	0.37097		68	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.18	83.82		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.78599	5	0.53458	0.40	785	0.38	0.25	2.80	13.50	83.06		
	COLLEGE	4.52020	5	0.79232	0.61	28,956	0.88	2.32	6.69	24.13	65.98		

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2016

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 6603-900

Section Title: Field Seminar-Compar Politics

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 2

Course Level: Graduate 5000 and up

Section Size: X-Small 0-15

Question

1. What were the strong points of the course?
2. What were the weak points of the course?
3. What should the instructor do to improve their teaching?
4. What is your overall opinion of this course?

Comment

1. Conversations were always enlightening

2. None

3. Keep doing great!

4. Great!

1. Weekly readings worked very well together and complemented each other.

Course material was engaging and probed a variety of issues.

Dr. Bracic thoroughly explained the literature and various arguments.

Dr. Bracic encouraged us to think outside of the box when engaging with literature.

2.

3.

4. Dr. Bracic's seminar on comparative politics was very interesting and expanded my knowledge of the field significantly. Her broad knowledge of the field and interesting selection of literature brought forth interesting discussion each week. I would highly recommend her comparative politics seminar to anyone.

eValue Report - Fall 2015

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 2013-001

Section Title: Intro to Political Analysis

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 16

Course Level: Lower 0000 - 2000

Section Size: Small 16-25

Question	Level	Mean Response	Median Response	Standard Deviation	ZScore	Responses	Percent #1	Percent #2	Percent #3	Percent #4	Percent #5	Dept Rank	College Rank
1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.33333	5	0.70711		9	0.00	0.00	11.11	44.44	44.44	86.84	81.22
	DEPARTMENT	3.93141	4	0.89543		554	1.26	3.79	24.73	40.97	29.24		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.84718	4	0.99607	0.49	9,089	2.51	6.27	24.55	37.34	29.33		
	COLLEGE	3.85500	4	1.01799	0.47	38,316	2.93	6.13	24.14	36.11	30.69		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	4.77778	5	0.44096		9	0.00	0.00	0.00	22.22	77.78	92.11	93.88
	DEPARTMENT	4.25859	4	0.90292		553	1.08	3.98	12.66	32.55	49.73		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.03987	4	1.08974	0.68	9,080	3.22	7.05	17.02	27.97	44.75		
	COLLEGE	4.09246	4	1.07750	0.64	38,256	3.08	6.35	16.28	26.79	47.49		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.55556	5	0.72648		9	0.00	0.00	11.11	22.22	66.67	81.58	86.91
	DEPARTMENT	4.07040	4	1.02963		554	2.35	5.23	19.86	28.16	44.40		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.90024	4	1.13971	0.57	9,072	3.98	8.49	21.09	26.42	40.02		
	COLLEGE	3.96671	4	1.12565	0.52	38,211	3.91	7.23	19.94	26.13	42.79		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	4.44444	5	0.72648		9	0.00	0.00	11.11	33.33	55.56	81.58	84.21
	DEPARTMENT	4.05616	4	0.97264		552	1.81	4.53	20.11	33.33	40.22		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.91085	4	1.07969	0.49	9,052	3.00	7.66	22.14	29.65	37.55		
	COLLEGE	3.92976	4	1.09098	0.47	38,156	3.28	7.39	21.42	28.89	39.02		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	4.11111	5	0.92796		9	0.00	0.00	33.33	22.22	44.44	52.63	69.13
	DEPARTMENT	3.99457	4	1.02685		552	3.08	4.53	20.83	32.97	38.59		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.72890	4	1.20063	0.32	9,063	5.88	10.28	23.16	26.42	34.26		
	COLLEGE	3.79475	4	1.21082	0.26	38,159	6.04	9.30	21.57	25.35	37.74		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	4.25000	5	0.88641		8	0.00	0.00	25.00	25.00	50.00	55.26	69.56
	DEPARTMENT	4.06545	4	0.98221		550	2.18	4.55	18.36	34.36	40.55		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.85648	4	1.15305	0.34	9,058	4.66	8.71	20.59	28.41	37.64		
	COLLEGE	3.86993	4	1.17483	0.32	38,187	5.21	8.40	19.88	27.20	39.31		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.33333	5	0.86603		9	0.00	0.00	22.22	22.22	55.56	63.16	74.25
	DEPARTMENT	4.09074	4	0.96997		551	1.81	3.81	20.51	31.22	42.65		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.90721	4	1.10600	0.39	9,063	3.57	7.93	20.98	29.23	38.29		
	COLLEGE	3.94817	4	1.11753	0.34	38,166	3.87	7.35	19.89	27.86	41.02		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	4.00000	4	0.86603		9	0.00	0.00	33.33	33.33	33.33	81.08	74.38
	DEPARTMENT	3.68831	4	0.89155		539	1.30	5.38	36.18	37.48	19.67		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.67449	4	0.97438	0.33	8,433	2.66	7.09	31.83	37.00	21.43		
	COLLEGE	3.77711	4	0.98793	0.23	35,026	2.57	6.40	27.83	37.17	26.04		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.55556	3	0.88192		9	0.00	0.00	66.67	11.11	22.22	97.30	69.57
	DEPARTMENT	3.17375	3	0.83629		541	1.66	12.57	62.66	12.94	10.17		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.43991	3	0.81884	0.14	8,438	1.05	5.18	55.34	25.56	12.86		
	COLLEGE	3.43861	3	0.84325	0.14	35,063	1.20	5.69	55.11	24.05	13.95		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	3.77778	4	0.97183		9	0.00	11.11	22.22	44.44	22.22	67.57	72.52
	DEPARTMENT	3.62546	4	0.93896		542	1.48	6.83	40.41	30.26	21.03		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.48338	3	1.04669	0.28	8,426	3.70	12.15	35.27	29.85	19.02		
	COLLEGE	3.58634	4	1.04995	0.18	35,000	3.45	10.23	32.98	30.92	22.42		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.11111	4	0.78174		9	0.00	0.00	22.22	44.44	33.33	67.57	73.60
	DEPARTMENT	3.86347	4	0.98219		542	1.66	6.46	26.57	34.50	30.81		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.69170	4	1.12393	0.37	8,430	4.41	10.31	25.92	30.42	28.94		
	COLLEGE	3.77806	4	1.13334	0.29	35,019	4.51	8.98	23.75	29.69	33.06		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	4.55556	5	0.52705		9	0.00	0.00	0.00	44.44	55.56	51.35	54.04
	DEPARTMENT	4.56215	5	0.72996		539	0.37	1.86	6.49	23.75	67.53		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.40978	5	0.86618	0.17	8,424	1.15	3.40	8.32	27.59	59.54		
	COLLEGE	4.46956	5	0.83027	0.10	34,971	1.03	2.84	7.34	25.74	63.05		

eEvaluate Report - Fall 2015

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 2013-001

Section Title: Intro to Political Analysis

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 16

Course Level: Lower 0000 - 2000

Section Size: Small 16-25

Question

1. What were the strong points of the course?
2. What were the weak points of the course?
3. What should the instructor do to improve their teaching?
4. What is your overall opinion of this course?

Comment

1. Dr. Bracic was very responsive to the class when it appeared that the class was confused. She always took the time to clarify the topic. She was very approachable and always willing to help clear up any confusion.
 2. The R lab was a struggle.
 3. Some of the in class assignments were too long for the time we had to work on them.
 4. I think the statistics part was easier to understand than the R labs. The final paper we wrote did help to bring the two sections together, but I struggled through the entire semester to understand what we were trying to accomplish in R.
1. The professors lecture.
 2. Only the tech issues we would have but that was the OUIT Issue
 3. Nothing she's great
 4. It was excellent
1. This course was unlike any other course that I have taken while at OU. It was very interesting to learn about R. Also, now I do not trust polls as much anymore!
 2. Sometimes the computers did not work with the R program, which was a hassle. Other than that, no weak points.
 3. I love Dr. B so much! Nothing to improve on that much.
 4. I loved this course and I hope to take my third course with Dr. B in the future.
1. I really enjoyed the unique opportunity to learn about R! That was great! This is one of the only concrete, sort of numbers based political science classes I know of, and it was a refreshing change that helped me to become more well rounded.
 2. Class could be really long. I wish it would have been a MWF class, but honestly its probably more well suited for this format. Also, the computers would often act up and not function properly. I do NOT believe this was the instructors fault, but really someone should fix them (looking at you, IT).
 3. I am not sure if much could be done. Dr. Bracic is one of the most knowledgeable professors I have ever had.
 4. It was really good. Altogether, I would not change much. It was a great experience! Dr. Bracic is one of the best professors I have taken and is a model of accessibility/helpfulness. She is always an email away and is more than willing to help you if you are struggling. OU should do everything they can to keep her, because I am sure other offers will be coming up soon, and honestly I hope to have her as a resource when times get tough in my own research. Incredible professor, really good course!
1. The lectures were very helpful, and there were several extra credit opportunities. I also really liked the detailed pages that explained what to do for each paper project.
 2. It was kind of hard to understand how to use R at times.
 3. Post the grades on D2L so that we can have a better understanding of where our grade are at.
 4. I learned a lot from the course about research and data software.
1. The last 8 weeks of the course seemed to be more understandable, and the assignments seemed to be more clear.
 2. The paper assignment was confusing on exactly what was required, giving out a sample of what is needed would be extremely helpful.
 3. Lessen the assignment workload after lecture. It was nearly impossible to finish R assignments before the class ended.
 4. I thought this course was a lot harder than I originally thought it would be. The professor was very nice and always took the time to answer all questions.
1. The class was interesting and had structure.
 2. The R exercises, you were graded on how far you got in a class, sometimes I (and others) would hit a problem and wouldnt get past the first question.... A real let down in the grades.
 3. He teaching methods were effective. He she did a great job.
 4. It was an interesting course, I thought she did a great job and one thing she could improve was the grading system she had on R.

eEvaluate Report - Fall 2015

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 3600-001

Section Title: Human Rights & Contentious Pol

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 21

Course Level: Upper 3000 - 4000

Section Size: Small 16-25

Question	Level	Mean Response	Median Response	Standard Deviation	ZScore	Responses	Percent #1	Percent #2	Percent #3	Percent #4	Percent #5	Dept Rank	College Rank
1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.50000	5	0.53452		8	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	100.00	83.90
	DEPARTMENT	4.11111	4	1.02178		54	1.85	7.41	12.96	33.33	44.44		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.98513	4	0.99419	0.52	2,287	2.40	5.25	19.98	36.16	36.20		
	COLLEGE	3.85500	4	1.01799	0.63	38,316	2.93	6.13	24.14	36.11	30.69		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	4.66667	5	0.50000		9	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.33	66.67	83.33	73.66
	DEPARTMENT	4.40000	5	0.95452		55	1.82	3.64	10.91	20.00	63.64		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.25876	5	0.99100	0.41	2,284	2.10	4.60	13.09	25.74	54.47		
	COLLEGE	4.09246	4	1.07750	0.53	38,256	3.08	6.35	16.28	26.79	47.49		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.33333	5	0.70711		9	0.00	0.00	11.11	44.44	44.44	100.00	61.95
	DEPARTMENT	3.92727	4	1.19961		55	7.27	5.45	14.55	32.73	40.00		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.98422	4	1.17802	0.30	2,282	5.17	7.32	17.18	24.58	45.75		
	COLLEGE	3.96671	4	1.12565	0.33	38,211	3.91	7.23	19.94	26.13	42.79		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	4.55556	5	0.52705		9	0.00	0.00	0.00	44.44	55.56	100.00	76.10
	DEPARTMENT	4.25455	5	0.96644		55	1.82	3.64	14.55	27.27	52.73		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.10561	4	1.04177	0.43	2,282	2.45	6.31	15.86	28.97	46.41		
	COLLEGE	3.92976	4	1.09098	0.57	38,156	3.28	7.39	21.42	28.89	39.02		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	4.55556	5	0.52705		9	0.00	0.00	0.00	44.44	55.56	100.00	80.98
	DEPARTMENT	4.20000	5	1.04350		55	3.64	5.45	7.27	34.55	49.09		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.00176	4	1.14567	0.48	2,279	4.43	7.42	16.67	26.50	44.98		
	COLLEGE	3.79475	4	1.21082	0.63	38,159	6.04	9.30	21.57	25.35	37.74		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	4.55556	5	0.52705		9	0.00	0.00	0.00	44.44	55.56	100.00	76.59
	DEPARTMENT	4.05455	4	1.06141		55	1.82	9.09	14.55	30.91	43.64		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.00614	4	1.12983	0.49	2,279	4.17	7.28	16.63	27.60	44.32		
	COLLEGE	3.86993	4	1.17483	0.58	38,187	5.21	8.40	19.88	27.20	39.31		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.44444	5	0.72648		9	0.00	0.00	11.11	33.33	55.56	100.00	73.17
	DEPARTMENT	3.94545	5	1.26810		55	5.45	10.91	16.36	18.18	49.09		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.99344	4	1.15247	0.39	2,286	4.55	7.74	16.19	26.86	44.66		
	COLLEGE	3.94817	4	1.11753	0.44	38,166	3.87	7.35	19.89	27.86	41.02		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	4.12500	4	0.64087		8	0.00	0.00	12.50	62.50	25.00	83.33	59.59
	DEPARTMENT	3.96296	4	0.98982		54	1.85	5.56	22.22	35.19	35.19		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.93909	4	0.96856	0.19	2,167	2.12	4.98	22.43	37.79	32.67		
	COLLEGE	3.77711	4	0.98793	0.35	35,026	2.57	6.40	27.83	37.17	26.04		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.44444	3	0.72648		9	0.00	0.00	66.67	22.22	11.11	33.33	47.15
	DEPARTMENT	3.70909	4	0.89593		55	1.82	1.82	41.82	32.73	21.82		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.52738	3	0.84412	-0.10	2,173	0.92	4.46	51.50	27.20	15.92		
	COLLEGE	3.43861	3	0.84325	0.01	35,063	1.20	5.69	55.11	24.05	13.95		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	4.44444	5	0.52705		9	0.00	0.00	0.00	55.56	44.44	100.00	94.82
	DEPARTMENT	3.72727	4	1.12964		55	5.45	7.27	25.45	32.73	29.09		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.79954	4	1.04129	0.62	2,170	2.95	7.28	26.68	33.04	30.05		
	COLLEGE	3.58634	4	1.04995	0.82	35,000	3.45	10.23	32.98	30.92	22.42		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.55556	5	0.72648		9	0.00	0.00	11.11	22.22	66.67	100.00	85.49
	DEPARTMENT	4.00000	4	1.13855		55	1.82	10.91	20.00	20.00	47.27		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.97417	4	1.10178	0.53	2,168	3.78	6.83	18.82	29.34	41.24		
	COLLEGE	3.77806	4	1.13334	0.69	35,019	4.51	8.98	23.75	29.69	33.06		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	4.44444	5	0.52705		9	0.00	0.00	0.00	55.56	44.44	50.00	33.68
	DEPARTMENT	4.46296	5	0.79415		54	0.00	3.70	7.41	27.78	61.11		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.53875	5	0.82327	-0.11	2,168	1.29	2.81	5.26	22.00	68.63		
	COLLEGE	4.46956	5	0.83027	-0.03	34,971	1.03	2.84	7.34	25.74	63.05		

eEvaluate Report - Fall 2015

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 3600-001

Section Title: Human Rights & Contentious Pol

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 21

Course Level: Upper 3000 - 4000

Section Size: Small 16-25

Question

1. What were the strong points of the course?
2. What were the weak points of the course?
3. What should the instructor do to improve their teaching?
4. What is your overall opinion of this course?

Comment

1. I liked the class discussion environment.

2. Very challenging midterm.

3. More exact knowledge goals.

4. Very good.

1. There was a strong focus on discussion and debate that was facilitated by Dr. Bracic in a sensitive and inquisitive manner.

2. Topics were often explained clearly but sometimes the emphasis on discussion was to such a high degree that the fundamental ideas of the course were not always communicated well.

3.

4.

1. Professor Bracic's knowledge of the subject matter.

2.

3.

4. It was a great class and I learned a lot. OU is very lucky to have professor Bracic.

1. I really enjoyed the class readings and all the lectures. The topics were always very interesting.

2. N/a

3. N/a

4. I loved this course.

1. This course was very interesting and Dr. Bracic was great.

2.

3.

4. Very good course.

1. In class lecture and research assignment

2. Expectation was vague for the midterm

3. Layout specific expectations for each assignment

4. Really enjoyed this course!

1. I liked the group work. Seeing other people's perspectives on the readings and class material really broadened my knowledge of said material.

2. Some of the assigned studies we had to read were a little too academic for undergrads. The final paper didn't seem to grasp the goal of conceptualizing the course as a whole as maybe a test and a few short answers might.

3. The teaching itself was pretty good. Wouldn't change a thing.

4. As someone who hardly kept up with the news of the world, I felt kind of behind or had lack of knowledge compared to the other students. But other than that it was okay.

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2015

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 3600-003

Section Title: Nongovernmental Organizations

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 16

Course Level: Upper 3000 - 4000

Section Size: Small 16-25

Question	Level	Mean Response	Median Response	Standard Deviation	ZScore	Responses	Percent #1	Percent #2	Percent #3	Percent #4	Percent #5	Dept Rank	College Rank
1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.75000	5	0.46291		8	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	75.00	90.91	97.87
	DEPARTMENT	4.39806	5	0.79631		103	0.97	0.00	13.59	29.13	56.31		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.98512	4	0.97158	0.79	2,689	2.05	5.06	20.49	37.15	35.25		
	COLLEGE	3.85859	4	1.01982	0.87	31,320	3.00	5.81	24.62	35.45	31.11		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	4.75000	5	0.46291		8	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	75.00	90.91	86.38
	DEPARTMENT	4.56311	5	0.63663		103	0.00	0.00	7.77	28.16	64.08		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.24851	5	0.99944	0.50	2,688	2.57	3.98	13.24	26.45	53.76		
	COLLEGE	4.11268	4	1.06018	0.60	31,257	2.80	6.05	16.27	26.85	48.03		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.75000	5	0.46291		8	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	75.00	90.91	92.77
	DEPARTMENT	4.12745	5	1.17458		102	5.88	5.88	9.80	26.47	51.96		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.99851	4	1.14269	0.66	2,683	4.58	6.86	17.26	26.72	44.58		
	COLLEGE	3.96280	4	1.12379	0.70	31,213	3.86	7.08	20.66	25.72	42.68		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	4.87500	5	0.35355		8	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.50	87.50	90.91	95.74
	DEPARTMENT	4.50980	5	0.75446		102	0.00	2.94	6.86	26.47	63.73		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.07396	4	1.04412	0.77	2,677	2.95	5.01	18.34	29.10	44.60		
	COLLEGE	3.93763	4	1.08881	0.86	31,184	3.31	7.05	21.55	28.73	39.36		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	4.75000	5	0.70711		8	0.00	0.00	12.50	0.00	87.50	81.82	94.04
	DEPARTMENT	4.36893	5	0.93924		103	0.97	5.83	8.74	24.27	60.19		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.97123	4	1.12952	0.69	2,676	4.52	6.28	19.28	27.39	42.53		
	COLLEGE	3.79911	4	1.19900	0.79	31,177	5.83	8.96	22.09	25.72	37.40		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	4.62500	5	0.51755		8	0.00	0.00	0.00	37.50	62.50	63.64	85.96
	DEPARTMENT	4.38835	5	0.89916		103	0.97	2.91	13.59	21.36	61.17		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.02380	4	1.11378	0.54	2,689	4.31	5.99	17.00	28.41	44.29		
	COLLEGE	3.88636	4	1.16531	0.63	31,194	5.04	8.04	19.87	27.35	39.70		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.75000	5	0.46291		8	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	75.00	90.91	93.62
	DEPARTMENT	4.22330	5	0.98947		103	0.97	6.80	13.59	26.21	52.43		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.02128	4	1.09888	0.66	2,679	3.81	6.16	17.99	28.18	43.86		
	COLLEGE	3.96075	4	1.10787	0.71	31,156	3.72	6.99	20.14	27.81	41.34		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	4.50000	5	0.75593		8	0.00	0.00	12.50	25.00	62.50	60.00	91.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.32967	5	0.83073		91	0.00	1.10	19.78	24.18	54.95		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.89939	4	0.97111	0.62	2,286	2.01	5.64	23.67	37.75	30.93		
	COLLEGE	3.79196	4	0.98154	0.72	28,466	2.24	6.63	27.40	37.15	26.58		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.12500	3	0.99103		8	0.00	25.00	50.00	12.50	12.50	20.00	18.00
	DEPARTMENT	3.73626	4	0.86712		91	0.00	5.49	37.36	35.16	21.98		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.54061	3	0.83886	-0.50	2,290	0.57	4.76	51.00	27.38	16.29		
	COLLEGE	3.43006	3	0.84625	-0.36	28,496	1.33	5.87	54.96	24.14	13.70		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	4.25000	5	0.88641		8	0.00	0.00	25.00	25.00	50.00	90.00	86.50
	DEPARTMENT	4.07692	4	0.98014		91	0.00	8.79	17.58	30.77	42.86		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.71691	4	1.03493	0.52	2,282	2.45	9.25	29.23	32.30	26.77		
	COLLEGE	3.61038	4	1.04366	0.61	28,448	3.08	10.09	32.82	30.76	23.26		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.62500	5	0.74402		8	0.00	0.00	12.50	12.50	75.00	80.00	90.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.25275	5	0.97289		91	1.10	5.49	14.29	25.27	53.85		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.89790	4	1.10422	0.66	2,282	4.21	6.88	20.68	31.38	36.85		
	COLLEGE	3.80015	4	1.12949	0.73	28,446	4.22	8.98	23.54	29.10	34.16		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		8	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.71111	5	0.60419		90	0.00	1.11	4.44	16.67	77.78		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.51530	5	0.81671	0.59	2,288	1.22	2.49	6.03	24.04	66.22		
	COLLEGE	4.48355	5	0.81711	0.63	28,456	0.95	2.68	7.15	25.50	63.72		

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2015

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 3600-003

Section Title: Nongovernmental Organizations

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 16

Course Level: Upper 3000 - 4000

Section Size: Small 16-25

Question

1. What were the strong points of the course?
2. What were the weak points of the course?
3. What should the instructor do to improve their teaching?
4. What is your overall opinion of this course?

Comment

1. The passion that Dr. Bracic has towards NGOs.

2. N/A

3. N/A

4. I loved this course and it has made me want to pursue a career in the non-profit sector.

1. The class itself was very interesting. Particularly Dr. Bracic was so incredibly knowledgeable about the topic I enjoyed hearing her lecture.

2. While I really enjoyed the class, I felt like I wasn't held accountable for my learning. I really liked the NGO project, but I wish there had been a few more assignments with it.

3.

4. I really liked this course, but I would have liked for there to have been more hands on learning.

1. Discussions were very engaging and caused each student to think independently about the material. Small group discussions were effective.

2. The syllabus was not well defined as to the projects and groups roles and had to be clarified throughout the semester.

3. I can not give a criticism Dr. Bracic did very well this semester.

4. VERY GOOD! Dr. Bracic was very open and

1. The course frequently utilized a debate format. The class members would be assigned positions and argue the merits of their side. This formed a deeper understanding of multiple angles of issues. Dr. Bracic was very helpful, insightful, and experienced. The semester long project, was highly enjoyable and showed e first hand how an NGO operated. I highly recommend this course to anyone interested in the public nonprofit sector.

2. The readings were very in depth, yet if one were not to read them, they were still able to participate in class discussion. the readings proved to be extraneous, helpful, nut not required.

3. If the group project was to be presented, I feel each student would learn from the creativity of the other students.

4. Superb, I enjoyed the course. I consequently learned I do not wish to work in the non-profit sector, however, I learned a great deal and developed an appreciation for NGOs.

1. She listens to the students and encourages critical thinking in order to better understand the material.

2. I did not notice any that bothered me.

3.

4. I loved the course and would recommend it.

1. The project was very good and gave a lot of learning experiences that would not be found in other classes. Also the reading material was very interesting and gave a different light on issues that most political science classes would not cover.

2. It was often unclear the readings and what we were supposed to get out of them.

3. For each reading maybe make a little 3 question pre-read for points that we should be looking for.

4. Really great class. I would recommend for anyone looking for a class that is different than the mainstream political science classes.

1. Professor was knowledgeable and passionate regarding the subject.

2. No weak points

3. Nothing

4. Great course, engaging discussion, interactive group work, practical skills learned during course of class.

1. I loved the partner project and felt that it contributed to my learning.

2. The readings, although interesting were quite long.

3. I feel that Dr. Bracic is extremely passionate about teaching this subject and it showed. She stimulated my continuing interest in the subject matter and contributed to my learning.

4. I enjoyed this course and felt that the material was relevant. Also, I enjoyed having Dr. Bracic as a professor. She is willing to work with her students and give them the best classroom experience possible.

eEvaluate Report - Spring 2015

Response Key

1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
7. Instructor's management of the course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
8. Amount you learned in this class	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
11. Overall, this course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
12. This course was graded fairly	1 = Never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Occasionally, 4 = Usually, 5 = Always

eValue Report - Fall 2014

Course: P SC 2013-001

College of Arts and Sciences

Total Enrollment: 19

Section Title: Intro to Political Analysis

Course Level: Lower 0000 - 2000

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Section Size: Small 16-25

Question	Level	Mean Response	Median Response	Standard Deviation	ZScore	Responses	Percent #1	Percent #2	Percent #3	Percent #4	Percent #5	Dept Rank	College Rank
1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	INDIVIDUAL	3.57143	4	1.13389		7	0.00	28.57	0.00	57.14	14.29	32.56	31.03
	DEPARTMENT	3.77324	4	0.97389		441	2.95	5.67	26.53	40.82	24.04		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.84763	4	0.98731	-0.28	7,508	2.68	5.67	24.43	38.65	28.57		
	COLLEGE	3.86610	4	1.01437	-0.29	35,034	2.79	6.17	23.78	36.15	31.11		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	3.71429	3	1.25357		7	0.00	14.29	42.86	0.00	42.86	16.28	28.42
	DEPARTMENT	4.16136	4	0.94199		440	0.68	6.36	14.32	33.41	45.23		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.05853	4	1.08020	-0.32	7,501	3.27	6.37	16.86	28.24	45.26		
	COLLEGE	4.11093	4	1.06603	-0.37	34,985	2.96	6.00	16.11	26.83	48.09		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	3.85714	4	1.46385		7	14.29	0.00	14.29	28.57	42.86	48.84	43.32
	DEPARTMENT	3.71655	4	1.22063		441	6.80	9.30	23.81	25.62	34.47		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.89441	4	1.16929	-0.03	7,501	4.67	8.76	19.92	25.78	40.87		
	COLLEGE	3.99514	4	1.11613	-0.12	34,964	3.71	6.93	19.49	25.88	43.99		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	4.00000	4	1.00000		7	0.00	14.29	0.00	57.14	28.57	53.49	56.07
	DEPARTMENT	3.94091	4	1.05699		440	2.50	7.50	21.36	30.68	37.95		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.90072	4	1.08556	0.09	7,494	3.36	7.18	22.66	29.62	37.18		
	COLLEGE	3.93917	4	1.09131	0.06	34,934	3.26	7.36	21.16	28.67	39.56		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	3.57143	3	1.13389		7	0.00	14.29	42.86	14.29	28.57	23.26	37.79
	DEPARTMENT	3.85421	4	1.13342		439	3.87	8.20	24.60	25.28	38.04		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.74930	4	1.18621	-0.15	7,491	5.51	9.84	23.43	26.65	34.57		
	COLLEGE	3.80903	4	1.20869	-0.20	34,895	5.87	9.41	20.93	25.50	38.28		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	3.71429	4	0.75593		7	0.00	0.00	42.86	42.86	14.29	37.21	38.25
	DEPARTMENT	3.89773	4	1.09086		440	3.86	6.82	21.36	31.59	36.36		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.87285	4	1.14293	-0.14	7,487	4.54	8.25	20.46	28.86	37.88		
	COLLEGE	3.88605	4	1.17076	-0.15	34,935	5.01	8.46	19.46	27.08	40.00		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	3.57143	3	1.13389		7	0.00	14.29	42.86	14.29	28.57	23.26	29.49
	DEPARTMENT	3.95652	4	1.07747		437	4.12	3.89	23.80	28.60	39.59		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.93111	4	1.11957	-0.32	7,476	4.16	6.81	20.96	27.90	40.17		
	COLLEGE	3.97180	4	1.11781	-0.36	34,895	3.92	6.91	19.70	27.03	42.44		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	3.28571	3	1.11270		7	0.00	28.57	28.57	28.57	14.29	21.43	18.69
	DEPARTMENT	3.58741	4	0.94222		429	2.56	7.23	36.36	36.60	17.25		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.70659	4	0.96130	-0.44	7,164	2.40	6.78	30.42	38.55	21.85		
	COLLEGE	3.78172	4	0.98135	-0.51	33,310	2.41	6.44	27.66	37.54	25.95		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.42857	3	0.53452		7	0.00	0.00	57.14	42.86	0.00	71.43	53.11
	DEPARTMENT	3.22970	3	0.83284		431	2.78	7.42	63.81	16.01	9.98		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.45996	3	0.80802	-0.04	7,181	0.78	4.92	54.80	26.54	12.96		
	COLLEGE	3.43329	3	0.84365	-0.01	33,352	1.22	5.87	55.06	24.08	13.78		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	3.00000	3	1.41421		7	14.29	28.57	14.29	28.57	14.29	11.90	17.21
	DEPARTMENT	3.51748	3	1.00364		429	2.33	10.49	40.56	26.34	20.28		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.50223	3	1.03469	-0.49	7,162	3.53	11.34	35.59	30.45	19.09		
	COLLEGE	3.60620	4	1.04803	-0.58	33,278	3.20	10.14	32.74	30.68	23.24		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	3.42857	4	1.13389		7	0.00	28.57	14.29	42.86	14.29	21.43	30.49
	DEPARTMENT	3.74419	4	1.08159		430	3.72	7.91	28.37	30.23	29.77		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.73054	4	1.11317	-0.27	7,170	4.37	9.08	25.62	31.00	29.93		
	COLLEGE	3.79883	4	1.12598	-0.33	33,305	4.32	8.59	23.79	29.49	33.81		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	4.71429	5	0.75593		7	0.00	0.00	14.29	0.00	85.71	71.43	69.67
	DEPARTMENT	4.51044	5	0.77114		431	1.16	1.16	6.73	27.38	63.57		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.44047	5	0.85392	0.32	7,165	1.10	3.25	7.76	26.27	61.62		
	COLLEGE	4.49561	5	0.82175	0.27	33,278	1.05	2.67	6.93	24.36	64.99		

eEvaluate Report - Fall 2014

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 2013-001

Section Title: Intro to Political Analysis

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 19

Course Level: Lower 0000 - 2000

Section Size: Small 16-25

Question

1. What were the strong points of the course?
2. What were the weak points of the course?
3. What should the instructor do to improve their teaching?
4. What is your overall opinion of this course?

Comment

1. Learning how to use R!

2. The midterm was quite difficult, I feel the final will be the same way.

3. Shorten the exams.

4. Professor Bracic was great. She was friendly and knew her material!

1. Working with R as opposed to a program that students would have to purchase was a huge plus. Also, the lab workbook that went along with R was very easy to understand and learn from.

2. The actual textbook was very dense and didn't clearly explain the topics covered.

3.

4.

1. I felt she was very including and made all of her students feel welcome

2. I know that she had a lot of class periods where describing the material and teaching it to us was a struggle for her. I have no doubt that she is very knowledgeable in this subject, but there were a few times that I felt I was being given all the information she had, due to the fact that she could not fully portray it to us.

3. Make sure that she has a set way of teaching us the material before entering class.

4. I thought it was good, but I ended up changing my major halfway through this semester making this class no longer a necessity for my major. This was annoying because the class was at sometimes very hard and stressful, but I made it through with learning a lot of things that I will hopefully find use in later in life.

1. The information we were learning was interesting, engaging, and varied

2.

3. Grades are unclear; because they are not frequently updated online it is hard to gauge where one stands.

4. Professor Bracic is extremely helpful and caring with all of her students. She was absolutely fabulous to have for an intro course, and because of her I am trying to continue my statistical education.

1. The material covering statistics and how experiments/surveys are conducted was good information.

2. R is very confusing, and the book is not helpful.

Looking at data is not very interesting unless it can be tied to current political events or used in an actual analysis instead of just finding the data and doing nothing with it.

3. Assignments should be to find data, interpret it, and use it to make a decision or recommendation for a policy or something. Make the data applicable to real situations.

4. I did not like the class. It was not very interesting and I do not feel like I will remember or be able to use what we covered in class in a political science career, unless it is in a statistics position.

I thought "political analysis" would be analyzing policies and improving critical thinking on political issues, not statistics.

1. Dr. Bracic was really good about explaining everything we were uncertain about.... Even if it took countless times of re-explaining it. It helped that she put our work on D2L, so we weren't constantly confused about what we were doing when doing R functions. She was willing to do anything in order for us to excel and do well in the class.

2. I felt like the work we did was not a 2000 level work load. Some of the graduate students in Public Administration don't even do the analysis we're doing. I'm sure it'll help us in the long run, but I feel like sometimes it was taught at a higher level than what it was, which was a basic 2000 level course.

3. Keep being flexible and willing to adjust! Thanks for always helping us when we were confused.

4. This course definitely had nothing to do with my major, but it was an interesting change of pace. I don't know if I would take it again if I had the opportunity, but I'm thankful I took it with Dr. Bracic or if be so lost.

eValuate Report - Fall 2014

Response Key

1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
7. Instructor's management of the course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
8. Amount you learned in this class	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
11. Overall, this course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
12. This course was graded fairly	1 = Never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Occasionally, 4 = Usually, 5 = Always

eValueate Report - Fall 2014

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 3600-001

Section Title: Human Rights & Contentious Pol

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 15

Course Level: Upper 3000 - 4000

Section Size: X-Small 0-15

Question	Level	Mean Response	Median Response	Standard Deviation	ZScore	Responses	Percent #1	Percent #2	Percent #3	Percent #4	Percent #5	Dept Rank	College Rank
1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.75000	5	0.50000		4	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	75.00	100.00	88.59
	DEPARTMENT	4.35484	4	0.48637		31	0.00	0.00	0.00	64.52	35.48		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.08706	4	0.93360	0.71	804	2.11	3.11	17.54	38.43	38.81		
	COLLEGE	3.86610	4	1.01437	0.87	35,034	2.79	6.17	23.78	36.15	31.11		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.64516	5	0.66073		31	0.00	0.00	9.68	16.13	74.19		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.40200	5	0.91280	0.66	801	1.50	3.62	9.74	23.47	61.67		
	COLLEGE	4.11093	4	1.06603	0.83	34,985	2.96	6.00	16.11	26.83	48.09		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.75000	5	0.50000		4	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	75.00	80.00	77.85
	DEPARTMENT	3.67742	4	1.16582		31	3.23	16.13	19.35	32.26	29.03		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.16667	5	1.02136	0.57	804	1.74	6.09	16.42	25.25	50.50		
	COLLEGE	3.99514	4	1.11613	0.68	34,964	3.71	6.93	19.49	25.88	43.99		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	4.75000	5	0.50000		4	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	75.00	60.00	79.87
	DEPARTMENT	4.38710	4	0.66720		31	0.00	0.00	9.68	41.94	48.39		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.20326	5	0.98422	0.56	797	2.01	4.39	15.06	28.36	50.19		
	COLLEGE	3.93917	4	1.09131	0.74	34,934	3.26	7.36	21.16	28.67	39.56		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.06452	4	0.92864		31	0.00	6.45	19.35	35.48	38.71		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.09375	4	1.09383	0.83	800	3.63	5.50	17.25	25.13	48.50		
	COLLEGE	3.80903	4	1.20869	0.99	34,895	5.87	9.41	20.93	25.50	38.28		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.48387	5	0.62562		31	0.00	0.00	6.45	38.71	54.84		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.18477	5	1.02387	0.80	801	2.87	4.00	15.61	26.84	50.69		
	COLLEGE	3.88605	4	1.17076	0.95	34,935	5.01	8.46	19.46	27.08	40.00		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.30000	4	0.74971		30	0.00	3.33	6.67	46.67	43.33		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.16896	4	1.01751	0.82	799	2.50	4.51	16.15	27.28	49.56		
	COLLEGE	3.97180	4	1.11781	0.92	34,895	3.92	6.91	19.70	27.03	42.44		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	4.50000	5	0.57735		4	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	100.00	78.87
	DEPARTMENT	4.25806	4	0.68155		31	0.00	0.00	12.90	48.39	38.71		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.04787	4	0.91138	0.50	773	1.55	2.98	20.96	38.16	36.35		
	COLLEGE	3.78172	4	0.98135	0.73	33,310	2.41	6.44	27.66	37.54	25.95		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.75000	4	0.50000		4	0.00	0.00	25.00	75.00	0.00	80.00	71.13
	DEPARTMENT	3.48387	3	0.88961		31	0.00	12.90	38.71	35.48	12.90		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.55541	3	0.84213	0.23	776	0.00	5.93	49.74	27.19	17.14		
	COLLEGE	3.43329	3	0.84365	0.38	33,352	1.22	5.87	55.06	24.08	13.78		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	4.25000	4	0.50000		4	0.00	0.00	0.00	75.00	25.00	80.00	70.42
	DEPARTMENT	3.67742	4	0.94471		31	3.23	3.23	35.48	38.71	19.35		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.79974	4	1.07780	0.42	774	3.36	7.75	26.61	30.10	32.17		
	COLLEGE	3.60620	4	1.04803	0.61	33,278	3.20	10.14	32.74	30.68	23.24		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.16129	4	0.77875		31	0.00	3.23	12.90	48.39	35.48		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.05548	4	1.08824	0.87	775	4.00	4.77	18.19	27.74	45.29		
	COLLEGE	3.79883	4	1.12598	1.07	33,305	4.32	8.59	23.79	29.49	33.81		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	5.00000	5	0.00000		4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.80645	5	0.47745		31	0.00	0.00	3.23	12.90	83.87		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.57198	5	0.82553	0.52	771	1.04	3.63	4.67	18.42	72.24		
	COLLEGE	4.49561	5	0.82175	0.61	33,278	1.05	2.67	6.93	24.36	64.99		

eEvaluate Report - Fall 2014

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: P SC 3600-001

Section Title: Human Rights & Contentious Pol

Instructor: Ana Bracic

Total Enrollment: 15

Course Level: Upper 3000 - 4000

Section Size: X-Small 0-15

Question

1. What were the strong points of the course?
2. What were the weak points of the course?
3. What should the instructor do to improve their teaching?
4. What is your overall opinion of this course?

Comment

1. She encourages class discussion really well as well as creating an environment in which dark or tough topics can be discussed openly and without judgement.

2.

3.

4. I loved it. I would highly recommend any of her courses to my friends. I wish I could take more!

1. I enjoyed the research paper. I also enjoyed the group discussions.

2. The assigned readings were long.

3. Shorten the readings and add more video to help relate material.

4. Professor Bracic was amazing! She has been my favorite professor at OU. She's friendly, helpful, and knows her material.

THANK YOU!

1. Different activities in class really helped strengthen certain topics that we had discussed (i.e., debate, social norm activity, etc). I also really enjoyed how the course progressed via the different topics that were discussed.

2. Some topics I really had no background knowledge about and felt as though I was playing a bit of catch up, but Professor Bracic always explained or expanded on information in our readings.

3. Nothing! I absolutely loved how this class was structured.

4. I loved this class so much. I really enjoyed all of the discussion and all of the assignments I actually enjoyed doing. I feel like I have learned so much from Professor Bracic and I will miss this class!

1. Professor Bracic loves human rights and it is evident in her classroom discussions. Every time I went to her office hours she helped me without questioning. Great professor.

2.

3.

4. Loved it.

eValuate Report - Fall 2014

Response Key

1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
7. Instructor's management of the course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
8. Amount you learned in this class	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
11. Overall, this course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
12. This course was graded fairly	1 = Never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Occasionally, 4 = Usually, 5 = Always