

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