

Instructor: Benjamin Schrader Semester: Summer II 2012
Campus: University of Hawaii at Manoa Department: Political Science
Course: POLS 335 Crn(Section): 90692 (701)

1. Class Lov	ral (piak and)								
	Mean	N-Size	Std Dev		Freshman	Scohomere	Junior	Senior	Grad	Other
Campus	3.58	1937	1.19	Freq(%)	111 (6%)	183 (9%)	459 (24%)	829 (43%)	254 (13%)	83 (4%)
College	9.56	1106	1.16	Freq(%)	84 (8%)	194 (19%)	296 (20%)	500 (45%)	67 (6%)	25 (2%)
Division	3.37	673	1.14	Freq(%)	55 (8%)	58 (9%)	176 (26%)	320 (43%)	41 (6%)	14 (2%)
Department	8.00	50	0.04	Freq(%)	1 (2%)	6 (10%)	28 (40%)	25 (43%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Your class	34	5	0.55	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0.00%	3 (90%)	2 (43%)	0.00%3	0.(0%)

2. Course						
	Mosn	N-Cizo	SH Dev		Electiva	Required
Campus	1.6	1937	0.65	Freq(%)	656 (34%)	1217 (63%)
College	1.56	1105	0.65	Freq(%)	425 (38%)	650 (58%)
Division	1.40	679	0.60	Freq(%)	\$01 (46%)	260 (62%)
Department	1.69	58	0.47	Freq(%)	18 (31%)	40 (69%)
Your class	1.0	5	0.45	Freq(%)	1 (20%)	4 (30%)

3. The instru	3. The instructor demonstrated knowledge of course content.													
	Mean	N-Size	Sid Dev		Strongly Disagree	Lisagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree					
Campus	4.6	1937	0.74	Freq(%)	9 (0%)	21 (1%)	97 (5%)	439 (25%)	1383 (70%)					
College	4.82	1105	0.74	Fmg(%)	4 (0%)	19 (194)	49 (4%)	945 (20%)	794 (79%)					
Division	4.55	673	0.82	Freq(%)	3 (0%)	11 (2%)	31 (5%)	168 (25%)	454 (67%)					
Department	4.30	68	0.36	Frag(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (1494)	50 (96%)					
Your class	4.8	5	0.45	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	4 (80%)					

4. The instru	ctor fulfilled t	ne goals of th	e course.						
	Mean	N-Sizo	Sid Dev		Strongly Disagree	Dieagroo	Noutral	Agros	Strongly Agree
Campus	4.52	1937	0.8	Freq(%)	13 (1%)	28 (1%)	111 (6%)	821 (27%)	1253 (68%)
College	4.53	1105	0.81	Frag(%)	5 (0%)	19 (2%)	58 (5%)	287 (26%)	728 (86%)
Division	4.49	679	0.86	Fmg(%)	3 (6%)	11 (2%)	43 (6%)	179 (27%)	430 (84%)
Department	4.71	58	0.5	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	15 (26%)	42 (72%)
Your class	4.0	5	0.46	Frag(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	4 (90%)

5. The instru	The instructor communicated effectively.													
	Mean	N-Size	Sid Dev		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree					
Compta	4.35	1907	1.01	Frag(%)	04 (297)	02 (4%)	174 (0%)	456 (24%)	1177 (01%)					
College	4.33	1105	1.03	Freq(%)	21 (2%)	44 (4%)	97 (9%)	271 (25%)	661 (60%)					
Division	4.31	673	1.08	Freq(%)	15 (2%)	29 (4%)	80 (698)	184 (24%)	398 (59%)					
Department	4.57	68	07	Fmg(%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	4 (7%)	14 (24%)	39 (87%)					
Your class	4.6	5	0.89	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)					

6. I learned t	I learned to apply principles from this course to new situations.													
	Mean	N-Size	Sid Dev		Strongly Disagree	Fisagree	Noutral	Agree	Strongly Agree					
Campus	4.36	718	0.94	Freq(%)	4 (1%)	21 (3%)	69 (10%)	205 (29%)	411 (57%)					
College	4.34	605	0.90	Frag(%)	4 (195)	21 (0%)	00 (10%)	106 (20%)	007 (60%)					
Division	4.33	673	0.96	Freq(%)	4 (195)	21 (3%)	68 (10%)	193 (29%)	379 (56%)					
Department	4.43	58	1.11	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (14%)	7 (12%)	41 (71%)					
Your class	4.0	6	0.80	Eroo(%)	0 (090)	0 (0%)	1 (2000)	0 (090)	4 (90%)					

7. I deepene	d my interest	in the subjec	matter of the	s course.					
	Mean	N-Gizo	Cid Dev		Otrongly Disagree		Neutral	Agroo	Ctrongly Agree
Campus	429	886	1.03	Freq(%)	16 (2%)	21 (2%)	112 (13%)	220 (25%)	506 (57%)
College	4.29	772	1.06	Freq(%)	15 (2%)	19 (2%)	103 (13%)	166 (21%)	440 (67%)
Division	4.25	673	1.07	Freq(%)	15 (2%)	17 (3%)	93 (14%)	161 (24%)	378 (56%)
Department	4.60	SA.	0.8	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	5 (994)	R (14%)	43 (74%)
Your class	4.4	5	1.34	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)

B. I was stm	8. I was stimulated to discuss related topics outside of class.													
	Исал	N-Cizo	Cid Dev		Otrongly Disagrop	Disagroo	Neutral	Agree	Ctrongly Agroo					
Campus	418	684	1.04	Freq(%)	10 (194)	40 (6%)	98 (14%)	185 (27%)	347 (51%)					
College	4.19	679	1.04	Freq(%)	10 (190)	40 (0%)	96 (1490)	162 (27%)	241 (61%)					
Division	4.18	673	1.04	Freq(%)	10 (194)	40 (6%)	95 (14%)	183 (27%)	341 (51%)					
Department	4.66	CO	0.79	Freq(%)	0 (090)	2 (2%)	4 (7%)	12 (21%)	40 (69%)					
Your class	4.2	5	1.3	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)					

9. I reconsid	. I reconsidered many of my former attitudes.													
	Исан	N-Sizo	Ski Dev		Strongly Disagree		Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree					
Campus	389	673	1.11	Freq(%)	14 (2%)	33 (5%)	180 (27%)	184 (27%)	253 (38%)					
College	0.00	673	1.11	Freq@G	14 (2%)	03 (5%)	100 (27%)	164 (27%)	250 (00%)					
Division	389	673	1.11	Freq(%)	14 (2%)	33 (5%)	180 (27%)	184 (27%)	253 (38%)					
Department	206	69	0.92	Freq(%)	0 (090)	3 (0%)	10 (20%)	19 (21%)	21 (50%)					
Your class	4.2	5	1.3	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)					

10. I felt that	this course o	hallengad me	intellectually						
	Mean	N-Size	Std Dev		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neural	Agree	Strongly Agree
Campus	434	385	0.9	Freq@6	3 (194)	10 (3%)	24 (6%)	145 (33%)	199 (52%)
College	400	341	0.0	Freq@0	0 (194)	10 (0%)	24 (7%)	128 (03%)	170 (51%)
Division	427	205	0.94	Freq(%)	3 (194)	7 (3%)	11 (5%)	85 (41%)	97 (47%)
Department	4.47	50	0.71	Freq@G	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	4 (7%)	(3040) 02	30 (57%)
Your class	4.2	5	1.1	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	3 (60%)

11. Which aspects of the course were most valuable?

Theores

Watching the incvice.

Learning theoretical approaches coupled with application strategies through multimedia platforms was extremely effective in understanding the material

This is my first philosophy course so it was helpful to have Ben's further analysis of the reading material. Itruly enjoyed his teaching style and feel like i learned a lot. Freally enjoyed learning how to write more scholarly papers as well. It was hard to do but I know that I need to learn the correct way to die and the proper formation writing papers.

The in class discussions were very enlightening.

12. Which aspects of the course were least valuable?

None.

Too much discussion and too many readings.

N/A

13. The instr	13. The instructor makes good use of examples and illustrations.													
	Mean	N-Gizo	Ctd Dev		Otrongly Disagree	Disagroo	Neutral	Agree	Ctrongly Agree					
Campus	427	749	1.0	Freq(%)	7 (194)	27 (4%)	80 (11%)	226 (30%)	399 (53%)					
College	4.97	720	1.01	Freq(%)	7 (194)	27 (4%)	77 (1190)	221 (20%)	207 (63%)					
Division	424	673	1.02	Freq(%)	7 (194)	27 (4%)	76 (11%)	206 (31%)	348 (52%)					
Department	4.4	59.	0.95	Freq(%)	0 (094)	1 (2%)	8 (10%)	15 (28%)	35 (60%)					
Your class	4.6	5	0.89	Freq@6i	0 (099)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)					

14. The instr	14. The instructor seems to enjoy teaching.													
	Moan	N-Sizo	Std Dov		Strongly Disagrap	Dicagroo	Noutral	Agree	Strongly Agree					
Campus	4.44	195	0.60	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	1 (194)	29 (12%)	61 (28%)	106 (69%)					
College	4.4	167	0.66	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	19 (11%)	49 (29%.)	96 (57%)					
Division	4,37	155	0.88	Freq(%)	0.00%	1 (1%)	19 (12%)	47 (30%)	86 (55%)					
Department	4.66	58	0.78	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (016)	1 (2%)	13 (22%)	48 (74%)					
Your class	4.8	5	0.45	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (016)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	4 (80%)					

15. The instr	15. The instructor was able to explain concepts clearly and effectively.												
	Moan	N-Size	Std Dev		Strongly Disagree		Noutial	Agree	Strongly Agree				
Саприя	4.21	000	1.1	Freq(%)	24 (0%)	07 (4%)	96 (1110)	251 (28%)	470 (60%)				
College	4.19	722	1.1	Freq(%)	18 (2%)	22 (4%)	93 (11%)	216 (20%)	200 (61%)				
Division	4.17	879	1 12	Freq(%)	18 (2%)	30 (4%)	78 (11%)	196 (29%)	344 (51%)				
Department	4,53	58	0.73	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	5 (9%)	14 (24%)	38 (66%)				
Your class	4.8	5	0.45	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	4 (80%)				

16. The instr	16. The instructor stimulated me to think about the subject matter.												
	Mean	N-Size	Std Dev		Strongly Disagree	Disagroe	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree				
Campus	4.36	433	1.01	Freq(%)	10 (2%)	11 (3%)	36 (8%)	112 (26%)	260 (60%)				
College	4.30	85	00	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	2 (210)	0 (0%)	27 (02%)	47 (66%)				
Division	4.90	95	00	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)	27 (22%)	47 (66%)				
Department	4.55	58	0.68	Freq(%)	0 (086)	0.(0%)	8 (10%)	14 (24%)	38 (86%)				
Your class	4.6	5	0.89	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)				

17. The instr	17. The instructor broadened my uncerstanding and crasp of the subject.												
Mean N-Size Std Dev Strongly Disagree Neutral Agree Disagree													
Campus	4.56	222	09	Freq(%)	3 (1%)	4 (2%)	13 (9%)	38 (17%)	162 (73%)				
College	4.31	185	0.84	Freq(%)	3 (2%)	1 (116)	7 (4%)	30 (18%)	123 (75%)				
Division	4.50	100	0.00	Freq(%)	2 (2%)	1 (196)	6 (0%)	26 (22%)	70 (00%)				
Dopartment	4.07	68	06	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (7%)	11 (19%)	42 (74%)				
Your class	4.6	5	0.89	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0.0160	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	4 (30%)				

18. The instr	18. The instructor treated students fairly.													
	Mean	N-Size	Std Dev		Strongly Disagree	Disagme	Neutsal	Agree	Strongly Agree					
Campus	4,52	902	0.68	Freq(%)	11 (13)	12 (1%)	44 (5%)	219 (24%)	607 (67%)					
College	4.55	708	0.85	Freq(%)	5 (1%)	8 (116)	33 (5%)	171 (24%)	483 (68%)					
Division	4.55	873	0.84	Freq(%)	5 (1%)	7 (1%)	32 (5%)	195 (25%)	457 (88%)					
Dopartment	4.70	50	0.50	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	9 (10%)	40 (00%)					
Vourclass	4.4		154	Freq(%)	0 (084)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (30%)					

10. The instr	10. The instructor's feedback about my writing helped me become a better writer.												
	Mean N-Size Std Dev Strongly Disagree Noutral Agree Strong Disagree Agree												
Campus	3.91	780	1 13	Freq(%)	14 (2%)	37 (5%)	208 (27%)	194 (24%)	306 (40%)				
College	3.91	719	1.13	Freq(%)	13 (2%)	34 (5%)	198 (29%)	176 (24%)	236 (40%)				
Division	3.39	673	1.15	Freq(%)	13 (2%)	33 (5%)	187 (29%)	154 (24%)	264 (39%)				
Department	4.21	58	0.61	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (016)	14 (24%)	18 (31%)	26 (45%)				
Vourclass	4.4	6	0.60	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (014)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	\$ (30%)				

20. The instru	20. The instructor was thoughtful and precise in response to questions.												
	Mean	N-Sizo	Std Dov		Strongly Disagree	Dicagrao	Noutral	Agree	Strongly Agree				
Campue	4.41	76	1.11	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	1 (194)	4 (8%)	19 (25%)	40 (04%)				
College	4.89	58	0.29	Freq(%)	0 (084)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	15 (26%)	41 (71%)				
Division	4,52	5B	0.79	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	15 (26%)	41 (71%)				
Department	4.62	58	0.79	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	15 (26%)	41 (71%)				
Your class	4.8	5	0.45	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (016)	0 (0%)	1 (26%)	4 (80%)				

21. The amo	21. The amount of work required is appropriate for the credit received.												
	Mesan	N-Size	Std Dev		Strongly Disagree		Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree				
Campue	1.20	300	0.06	Freq(%)	11 (1%)	19 (2%)	66 (7%)	254 (22%)	462 (\$7%)				
College	1.90	790	0.06	Frag(%)	11 (1%)	19 (2%)	66 (7%)	252 (22%)	444 (\$0%)				
Division	1.91	679	0.00	Frag(%)	11 (2%)	13 (2%)	40 (7%)	216 (22%)	974 (\$6%)				
Department	4.66	60	0.76	Freg(%)	0 (6%)	2 (2%)	9 (6%)	14 (24%)	20 (67%)				
Your class	4.6	5	0.00	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (8%)	4 (80%)				

22. How can the instructor improve the teaching of this course?

Do lectures. Not just discussion.

The only struggle I encountered was the intensity of the schedule as a product of the summer format, given a full semester this would not have been a problem

N/A

23. Global ap	23. Global appraisal: Considering everything how would rate this INSTRUCTOR?												
Mean N-Size Std Dev Very Four Poor Average Good													
Сеприя	4.38	574	1.04	Frag(%)	8 (1%)	11 (2%)	54 (916)	131 (23%)	380 (63%)				
College	4.43	349	1.01	Frag(%)	0 (0%)	3 (1%)	32 (916)	86 (23%)	238 (64%)				
Division	4.20	240	1.10	Frag(%)	0 (0%)	3 (1%)	00 (1210)	60 (25%)	141 (50%)				
Department	4.50	50	0.00	Frag(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (7%)	14 (24%)	00 (67%)				
Your slass	4.6	8	0.00	Frae(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1.100%	0 (0%)	4 (80%)				

24. Assignm	24. Assignments make students think.												
	Mean	N-Size	Sid Bev		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Noutral	Agree	Simngly Agree				
Сеприя	4.46	720	0.00	Frag(%)	0 (0%)	0 (1%)	84 (5%)	240 (34%)	400 (50%)				
College	4.46	725	0.00	Frag(%)	0 (0%)	0 (1%)	04 (5%)	249 (34%)	402 (50%)				
Division	4.46	670	0.00	Frag(%)	2 (0%)	0 (1%)	20 (440)	284 (39%)	001 (50%)				
Department	4.50	50	0.00	Frag(%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	2 (0%)	20 (34%)	05 (60%)				
Your place	4.4	5	1.04	Frag(%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)				

25. Exams a	5. Exams are reasonable in length and difficulty												
Mean N-Size Skil Dev Strongly Disagree Noutral Agree Disagree													
Сеприя	4.00	705	1.10	Frag(%)	9 (1%)	26 (4%)	125 (10%)	194 (28%)	000 (47%)				
College	4.00	705	1.10	Frag(%)	9 (1%)	26 (4%)	125 (10%)	194 (28%)	000 (47%)				
Division	4.00	870	1.17	Frag(%)	7 (1%)	23 (0%)	117 (17%)	185 (27%)	020 (40%)				
Department	4.20	50	1.12	Frag(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (17%)	10 (22%)	00 (57%)				
Your class	4.6	5	0.00	Frag(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)				

26. Global ac	26. Global appraisal: Considering everything how would you rate this COURSE?												
Mean N-Size Skillbev Very Foor Poor Average Good Exc													
Campus	4.33	479	1.17	Free(%)	5 (1%)	10 (2%)	34 (7%)	115 (24%)	297 (62%)				
College	4,44	312	1.09	Freg(%)	0 (0%)	3 (1%)	17 (5%)	72 (23%)	208 (67%)				
Division	4,26	180	1.32	Frag(%)	0 (0%)	3 (2%)	11 (6%)	43 (24%)	111 (62%)				
Department	4.4	58	1.12	Free(%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	6 (10%)	10 (17%)	39 (67%)				
Your class	4.4	5	1.34	Frag(%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0.0%	0 (0%)	4 (80%)				

27. My overall evaluation of this course is...

Very good

Below average.

Thorough in scope and broadened my perspectives

Challenging and stimulating.

AWESOME.

28. Other comments:

Benjamin is a nice instructor and a likeable person.



Instructor: Benjamin Schrader

Campus: University of Hawaii at Manoa

Course: POLS 110

Samaeter: Fall 2012

Department: Political Science Crn(Section): 79169 (005)

1. Class Lavel (pick one)												
	Mean	N-Gize	Old Day		Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Genior	Gred	Other		
Campus	3.2	30069	1.36	Freq(%)	3959 (13%)	4417 (15%)	7 (24%)	9140 (30%)	4351 (15%)	612 (2%)		
Corege	2.88	15750	1.81	Freq(%)	2820 (19%)	3016 (19%)	3700 (24%)	4563 (29%)	1175 (2%)	178 (1%)		
Division	2.97	6229	1.33	Freq(%)	1140 (18%)	909 (15%)	1555 (25%)	1877 (30%)	817 (10%)	52 (1%)		
Department	3.23	504	1.3	Freq(%)	09 (12%)	50 (10%)	150 (27%)	139 (34%)	37 (15%)	3 (196)		
Your class	1.77	99	1.07	Eron(%)	13 (59%)	9.014863	4.018863	2 (086)	0.40%3	0.4080		

2. Course						
	Mean	N-Sizo	Std Dov		Electivo	Required
Campus	1.05	30089	0.50	Freq(%)	7917 (20%)	20358 (09%)
College	1.62	5750	0.55	Frep(%)	4559 (31%)	(0343 (05%)
Division	1.55	6229	0.57	Freq(%)	2294 (37%)	3687 (59%)
Department	1.43	564	3.0	Freq(%)	257 (46%)	276 (49%)
Your dass	1.45	22	0.51	Freq(%)	12 (55%)	10 (45%)

3. The instru	The instructor cemonstrated knowledge of course content.													
	Moan	N-Size	Sid Dev		Strongly Disagree	Disagroe	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree					
Campus	4.62	30069	0.74	Free(%)	163 (116)	225 (116)	(390 (5%)	6645 (22%)	21501 (71%)					
College	4.57	15750	0.77	Freq(%)	94 (1%)	127 (1%)	835 (6%)	3733 (24%)	10303 (69%)					
Division	4.68	8320	0.70	Frag(%)	36 (190)	58 (1%)	232 (6%)	1485 (24%)	4319 (60%)					
Department	4.78	364	0.6	Freq(%)	4 (120)	3 (1%)	9 (2%)	77 (14%)	470 (83%)					
Your class	4.5	22	0.91	Frag(%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (32%)	14 (64%)					

4. The instruc	. The instructor fulfilled the goals of the course.													
	Moan	N Sizo	8 d Dev		Strongly Disagree	Disagroo	Noutral	Agree	Strongly Agree					
Campus	4.47	30089	0.84	Frag(%)	279 (1%)	458 (2%)	2117 (7%)	8290 (28%)	18778 (62%)					
College	4,43	15760	0.87	Frag(%)	141 (190)	242 (2%)	1251 (8%)	4541 (20%)	9469 (60%)					
Division	4.43	5229	0.88	Freq(%)	52 (1%)	109 (2%)	429 (7%)	1843 (30%)	3736 (60%)					
Department	4.59	564	0.82	Frag(%)	6 (1%)	4 (1%)	22 (4%)	125 (22%)	402 (71%)					
Your class	4.27	22	0.94	Free(%4)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	10 (49%)	10 (45%)					

6. The instru	5. The instructor communicated effectively.													
	Mean	N-Size	Sid Dev		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree					
Campus	4.3	30080	1.01	Frog(%)	587 (29C)	1202 (4%)	\$133 (10%)	7700 (26%)	17176 (67%)					
Culege	4.27	15750	1.63	Freq(%)	318 (236)	845 (4%)	1803 (11%)	4192 (26%)	8700 (55%)					
Division	4.25	5229	1.07	Frag(%)	141 (2%)	281 (5%)	E74 (11%)	1623 (26%)	3446 (55%)					
Department	4.52	564	0.85	Frag(%)	8 (1%)	10 (2%)	37 (7%)	124 (22%)	383 (68%)					
Your class	4.41	22	0.90	Freq(%)	1 (5%)	0 (016)	1 (5%)	7 (02%)	10 (09%)					

6. I felt that t	8. I felt that this course challenged me intellectually.													
	Mean	N-Size	Stattley		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree					
Campus	4.3	4341	1.01	Freq(%)	70 (2%)	142 (316)	435 (10%)	1244 (29%)	2401 (55%)					
College	4.29	3666	1.01	Frag(%)	66 (2%)	120 (3%)	369 (10%)	1061 (29%)	2014 (55%)					
Division	4.27	2003	1.02	Frog(94)	27 (2%)	70 (3%)	330 (11%)	593 (28%)	1141 (66%)					
Department	4.53	564	0.02	Freq(%)	7 (1%)	9 (216)	00 (5%)	103 (24%)	076 (07%)					
Your class	4.09	22	0.97	Freq(%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	3 (14%)	10 (45%)	8 (38%)					

7. The instru	7. The instructor seems to enjoy teaching.													
	Mean	N-Size	Sid Dev		Strongly Disagree	Cisagroe	Neutral	Agroc	Strongly Agree					
Campus	4.49	2653	0.9	Flog(%)	27 (1%)	34 (1%)	179 (7%)	632 (24%)	1762 (66%)					
Calege	4.48	2433	0.91	Fang(%)	26 (1%)	33 (1%)	156 (7%)	583 (24%)	1596 (68%)					
Division	4,5	1438	0.91	Free(%)	20 (1%)	21 (1%)	92 (6%)	338 (22%)	1013 (68%)					
Department	4.56	554	0.77	Hteq(%)	4 (1%)	2 (0%)	14 (2%)	114 (20%)	424 (75%)					
Your class	4.36	22	0.96	Fleg(%)	1 (516)	0 (016)	1 (5%)	8 (30%)	12 (55%)					

B. The instru	The instructor was able to explain concepts clearly and effectively.													
	Mean	N-Size	5rd Dev		Strongly Disagree	Cisagree	Neutral	Agrae	Strongly Agrae					
Campus	4.33	7937	0.99	F100(16)	108 (1%)	254 (3%)	709 (9%)	2218 (28%)	4549 (57%)					
Cutege	4.28	4020	1.00	Fierq(%)	58 (1%)	150 (3%)	390 (10%)	1203 (30%)	2174 (54%)					
Division	4.21	2934	1.09	Fieg(%)	53 (216)	119 (416)	324 (11%)	602 (29%)	1573 (53%)					
Department	4.44	584	0.91	Freq(%)	9 (2%)	12 (2%)	44 (8%)	139 (25%)	357 (63%)					
Your class	3.95	22	1.05	Face(%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	8 (27%)	7 (32%)	8 (38%)					

9. The instru	The instructor stimulated me to think about the subject matter.													
	Moan	N-Size	Bid Dov		Strongly Disagree	Cicagroo	Noutral	Agroc	Strongly Agree					
Campus	4,3	6636	1.0	Freq(%)	122 (2%)	210 (3%)	641 (10%)	1871 (20%)	3631 (66%)					
College	4.44	1090	0.94	Freq(%)	14 (1%)	23 (2%)	76 (7%)	277 (26%)	679 (63%)					
Division	4,5	907	0.37	Free(%)	9 (1%)	15 (2%)	59 (7%)	223 (25%)	594 (65%)					
Department	4.5	554	0.87	Hteq(%)	7 (1%)	12 (2%)	36 (6%)	129 (23%)	377 (67%)					
Your class	4.0	22	1.11	Freq(%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	4 (18%)	7 (32%)	9 (41%)					

10. The instr	The instructor broadened my understanding and grasp of the subject.													
	Mean	N-Size	5rd Dev		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agrae	Strongly Agrae					
Campus	4,46	3554	0.59	Ht0q(%)	37 (1%)	56 (2%)	240 (7%)	951 (27%)	2239 (63%)					
College	4,47	2047	0.87	Freq(%)	21 (116)	39 (216)	142 (7%)	533 (25%)	1293 (63%)					
Division	4,43	1138	0.9	Fieq(16)	14 (116)	25 (216)	34 (7%)	312 (27%)	093 (0116)					
Department	4.53	584	0.32	Freq(%)	6 (1%)	10 (2%)	32 (6%)	137 (24%)	377 (67%)					
Your class	4.09	22	1.06	Free(%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	2 (9%)	9 (41%)	9 (41%)					

11. The instr	11. The instructor was thoughtful and precise in response to questions.													
	Moon	N-Size	Bid Dov		Strongly Disagree	Cicagroo	Noutral	Agroc	Strongly Agree					
Campus	4.56	1743	0.32	Flog(%)	11 (1%)	27 (2%)	30 (5%)	407 (23%)	1204 (60%)					
College	4.53	575	0.35	Freq(%)	5 (1%)	9 (2%)	29 (5%)	141 (25%)	388 (67%)					
Division	4,53	575	0.35	Free(%)	5 (1%)	9 (2%)	29 (5%)	141 (25%)	386 (67%)					
Department	4.52	554	0.36	Freq(%)	5 (1%)	9 (2%)	29 (5%)	139 (25%)	377 (67%)					
Your class	4.23	22	0.92	Fleq(%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	11 (50%)	9 (41%)					

12. What did you find most valuable and helpful about the instructor?

He's very kind and understanding, without losing the respect of his entire class. He took a great amount of interest in his his teaching, which was visible to the class. He was also the easiest speak with of all my teachers.

He's very knowledgable in what he teaches and always forces us to look in between the lines and get to the bottom of the text. Hike that he actually forces to think analytically about the text. He was also very passionate about what he teaches, and didn't get his own personal beliefs mixed into his lectures that much.

Den was able to explain difficult topics which came up regularly in this course.

He was willing to work with the class, even if the class wasnt taking the subject matter extremely seriously.

Always available for advice on the class, specific with what he asks of you, cool guy, furny

N/A

His friendliness and understanding of topics.

Very good at finding the political aspects of things. Thoughtful and helpful.

Hike that I felt pretty comfortable in the class. I wasn't too nervous to speak up and participate in class discussions. It was a class in which I could ongogo myself in further understanding the material.

The reading made me feel more intelligent, but it was hard so i'm happy he didn't give us quizzes.

he requires participation from all the students.

I rather liked the entine forum post assignments we had. It required us to read other peoples views and to think about them and come up with a response. I left this helped us to breaden our views of that particular subject matter and how it relates to the overall topic of the course. I also enjoyed our elections debate we had. I felt it was a good way to learn about a rather in-depth topic. I think it would have helped and made it easier to learn the other topics we covered through various debates on the issues discussed. I think having us present certain materials also helped us understand the topics. It probably would have been more effective if everyone had a part in it, such as the rest of the class writing something about what we learned or a game played that required us to really pay attention to the presenters.

Denjamin Schrader makes the class easy enough for every single one of his students to cass.

He had his own notes on the readings and that made understanding his assignments a lot casior. Also included a little bit of personal experience as examples so that students were understanding the material better.

The topics that he taught in class were very interesting to learn about.

Ben was very approachable throughout the course. He was very well-informed about the subject, and provided supplementary details about the things that he assigned us to read. He truly has a passion for Political Science. He was also able to explain more difficult concepts in plain language, without "dumbing it down" too much.

13. What did you find least valuable and helpful about the instructor?

This question hasn't come to mind throughout the entirety of the course, and I find it difficult to find an answer. The only difficulties I encountered were through laulima, which could be revised and improved (especially with what UH Manoa has to offer).

At times it was really everwhelming and harsh with the amount of analysis that we had to do, but in the long run it seemed to be worth it. Sometimes he kind of breezes by the lectures too.

He needs to be able to control class discussions, sometimes others can feel threatened by what other students are saying and what their opinions are

Some times it was difficult to take notes for the lectures.

Nothing

N/A

I didn't feel too challenged to become involved in the political world.

Nothing

Nothing

He's into class discussions.

Absolutely nothing

The readings were a bit haid to understand, but I like how we discussed them in class to clear any confusion or misunderstandings.

Not a comment on Den himself, but being in an actual Poli Sci class made me realize that I won't be taking any more Poli Sci classes in the future. The readings were often tedious (interesting, but tedious) and more philosophical than I expected.

r/a

14. Global ap	Clobal appraisal: Considering everything how would rate this INSTRUCTOR?													
	Mean	N-Gize	Ord Day		Very Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Excelent					
Camput	4.42	9378	1.02	Freq(%)	89 (1%)	184 (2%)	874 (7%)	2192 (23%)	6039 (64%)					
College	4.41	5359	1.0	Freq(%)	52 (1%)	114 (2%)	396 (7%)	1305 (24%)	3593 (63%)					
Division	4.34	2975	1.03	Freq(%)	33 (1%)	69 (2%)	266 (9%)	795 (27%)	1755 (59%)					
Department	4,54	534	0.92	Freq(%)	5 (1%)	2 (0%)	31 (5%)	121 (21%)	395 (70%)					
Your class	4.55	22	0.67	Freq(%)	D (C%)	0 (0%)	2 (9%)	6 (27%)	14 (64%)					

15. Global at	5. Global appraisal: Considering everything how would you rate this COURSE?													
	Mean	N-Size	Sid Dev		Very Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Excelent					
Campus	4.33	8670	1.07	Freq(%)	75 (1%)	166 (2%)	587 (8%)	2449 (28%)	5061 (58%)					
College	4.29	4701	1.08	Freq(%)	39 (1%)	89 (2%)	406 (9%)	1407 (30%)	2619 (56%)					
Division	4.17	2097	1.15	Fieq(%)	24 (1%)	48 (2%)	214 (10%)	688 (33%)	1021 (49%)					
Department	4.38	504	0.95	Freq(%)	5 (1%)	7 (1%)	48 (9%)	170 (30%)	325 (58%)					
Your class	3.05	22	0.72	Freq(%)	D (09k)	0 (090)	6 (27%)	11 (50%)	6 (23%)					

16. Other commerts:

Foucault is prarty heavy reading for an introductory course.

Overall the class was fun and engaging. I rather enjoyed our forum style classroom and discussion.

I'm very pleased with how Ben handled disruptive students during class. Ben tried to allow everyone the chance to participate during class, and wouldn't allow one person to speak for too long.

I also really liked that he offered tries of books and authors that related to topics which we expressed interest in.



Instructor: Benjamin Schrader Campus: University of Hawaii at Manoa

Course: POLS 190

Semester: Spring 2013
Department: Political Science
Crn(Section): 85917 (001)

1. Class Level (pick one)													
	Mean	N-Size	Std Dev		Freshman	Sephamore	Junior	Senior	Grad	Other			
Campus	3.3	96586	155	Freq(%)	2930 (11%)	3707 (14%)	6414 (24%)	7986 (30%)	4617 (17%)	614 (2%)			
College	2.38	12637	13	Freq(%)	1975 (16%)	2374 (19%)	2039 (24%)	3864 (36%)	1153 (59.)	142 (1%)			
Division	3.05	6366	1.29	Freq(%)	790 (15%)	881 (18%)	1345 (26%)	1703 (32%)	542 (10%)	48 (1%)			
Department	3.28	541	1.91	Freq(%)	45 (9%)	71 (13%)	155 (29%)	183 (34%)	76 (14%)	2 (086)			
Your class	2.08	15	1.04	Freq(%)	5 (39%)	3 (23%)	4 (31%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	0.000			

2. Course	2. Course												
	Mean	N-Size	Std Dev		Elective	Regained							
Campus	1.82	26693	0.57	Freu(%)	7884 (29%)	17753 (67%)							
Cullege	1.57	12637	0.58	Freu(%)	4534 (38%)	7849 (61%)							
Division	1.5	5359	0.68	Freq(%)	2191 (41%)	2933 (55%)							
Department	1.45	541	0.58	Freu(%)	250 (48%)	268 (49%)							
Your class	1.38	13	0.61	Freu(%)	8 (62%)	5 (38%)							

3. The instru	3. The instructor demonstrated knowledge of course content.													
	Изап	N-S 25	Std Dev		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Noutral	Agree	Strongly Agrees					
Campus	4.62	26997	0.75	Frag(%)	176 (1%)	244 (1%)	1031 (4%)	5888 (21%)	19265 (72%)					
Callego	4.01	12007	0.70	Fieg(%)	77 (1%)	107 (199)	506 (4%)	2027 (22%)	0007 (71%)					
Division	4.50	5050	0.70	Fieg(%)	88 (1%)	51 (190)	245 (5%)	1250 (28%)	3783 (70%)					
Department	4.70	541	0.50	Fieg(%)	1 (0%)	7 (199)	11 (2%)	100 (18%)	402 (70%)					
Your class	4.62	13	0.51	Fieg(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (38%)	0 (62%)					

4. The instruc	The instructor fulfilled the goals of the course.													
	Mean	N-S 20	Std Dev		Strongly Disagree		Noutral	Agree	Strongly Agree					
Compus	4.40	26597	0.85	Fieg(%)	242 (1%)	400 (2%)	1712 (0%)	6015 (26%)	17000 (64%)					
Callego	4.40	12007	0.87	Fieg(%)	100 (1%)	223 (2%)	036 (7%)	0490 (28%)	7800 (02%)					
Division	4.42	5050	0.91	Fieg(%)	44 (1%)	110 (2%)	409 (0%)	1500 (28%)	3207 (60%)					
Department	4.5	641	0.83	Flog(%)	0 (1%)	10 (2%)	41 (010)	120 (24%)	254 (65%)					
Your class	4.29	12	0.77	Fierg(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)	4 (21%)	7 (64%)					

5. The instru	5. The instructor communicated effectively.													
	Mean	N-Size	Std Dev		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agies					
Campus	4.24	20507	1.01	Fieig(%)	596 (2%)	1020 (4%)	2410 (0%)	6182 (24%)	15942 (60%)					
Callego	4.22	12027	1.00	Fieig(%)	242 (2%)	400 (4%)	1212 (10%)	2196 (25%)	7084 (68%)					
Division	4.25	6363	1.07	Fieig(%)	122 (2%)	240 (4%)	500 (1110)	1346 (25%)	2010 (66%)					
Department	4.4	641	0.96	Fieig(%)	12 (2%)	20 (4%)	40 (7%)	100 (24%)	220 (62%)					
Your class	4.22	13	0.72	Fieig(%)	6 (3%)	0 (0%)	2 (15%)	6 (46%)	5 (59%)					

6. Hearned a	8. I learned a lot in this course.													
	Mean	N-Size	Std Dev		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree					
Campus	4.95	7204	10	Fagg(%)	145 (2%)	289 (4%)	823 (11%)	2123 (28%)	3783 (53%)					
College	4.95	2343	1.09	Fang(%)	51 (2%)	79 (3%)	244 (10%)	728 (31%.)	1221 (52%)					
Division	4.23	1171	1.04	Fang(%)	30 (3%)	47 (4%)	197 (11%)	346 (29%.)	A14 (59%)					
Department	4.46	23	0.58	Fing(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	19 (44%.)	14 (50%)					
Your class	4.15	13	0.38	Facg(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	11 (85%)	2 (15%)					

7. I develope	d greater awa	are ness of so	cietal probler	ns.					
	Mean	N-Sizo	Sti Day		Strongly Disagree		Neutral	Agree	Shongly Agree
Campus	439	1434	0.93	Freq(%)	15 (1%)	31 (2%)	100 (7%)	437 (30%)	835 (58%)
College	4.39	1297	0.92	Freq(%)	13 (1%)	26 (2%)	87 (7%)	408 (31%)	748 (58%)
Division	4.41	1214	0.91	Freq(%)	12 (1%)	23 (2%)	81 (7%)	376 (31%)	709 (58%)
Department	4.38	13	0.77	Figu(%)	0 (0%)	0 (016)	2 (15%)	4 (31%)	7 (54%)
Your dess	4.38	13	0.77	Figu(%)	0 (0%)	0 (016)	2 (15%)	4 (31%)	7 (54%)

8. I felt that ti	8. Lieft that this course challenged maintellectually.													
	Mean	N-Sizo	Std Dov		Strongly Disagree	Disagme	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agios					
Campus	4.90	2167	1.0	Freq(%)	66 (2%)	100 (2%)	217 (09.)	908 (25%)	2102 (40%)					
College	4.38	2772	0.99	Freq(%)	50 (2%)	98 (2%)	941 (9%)	698 (25%)	1696 (61%)					
Division	4.94	1569	1.03	Freq(%)	32 (2%)	45 (3%)	149 (9%)	394 (24%)	941 (60%)					
Department	4.47	541	0.89	Freq(%)	6 (1%)	12 (2%)	43 (8%)	127 (28%)	350 (65%)					
Your dass	4.42	12	0.67	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	5 (42%)	6 (50%)					

0. Which aspects of the course were most valuable?

Talking about current events and how those things that happen have to do with the thome for the given week.

The insight we were to learn.

Diving into various political theories and applying to current times. Learning new ideas and discussing about them. Blogs helped create input and interaction amongst fellow classmate inputs.

The difficulty of the content and the readings

The course allowed me to be more aware of the media and how it has a probound influence on every aspect of the current culture. Also it opened my eyes to the different views that others have and be more tolerant of the different opinions of others.

The weekly presentations/discussions about the readings.

I feet that I can look at more sides of the spectrum when it comes to political ideas. Being able to make the connection with media and politics was helpful to increase my likings of the topic.

The open discussion helped me understand the concepts better

Class discussion when it actually turned out to be productive and not just up waiting to be asked stuff.

well i guess its everything that we learned in this class is valuable, I came to understand that media is controlling the game of politics. If we could look at politics today, there is a turning point where in order to get into the world of politics we "need" media to get us there so I think its really important that we all learned more the gray side of the story.

It opened my eyes to many things that I overlooked in society. It was a great introit political science and it also ties into the major I am aspiring for, so hopefully I will earny the things I learn in my mind.

Movies

The readings the blogs and the discussions in class. They helped melleam the most and helped melto understand the overything in a different perspective.

10. Which aspects of the course were least valuable?

Some of the readings were really hard to understand, and I feet like I didn't learn anything from thom.

Readings were at times confusing and very long.

group discussions on some days because people did not want to participate

No Anguar

The blogs- only because not all of the students did them, so I kept reading the same people's blogs & commenting on them.

The professor was biased about cenain material being used. He doesn't seem very open to other ideas when it doesn't the course was supposed to be reading his mind on what he wants to see in the media to relate it to politics because he has told several students that they chouldn't use certain types of sources to correct their ideas. He was also very unclear when it came to the work we needed to do. The explanations that he gave never left me with a full understanding of what I was trying to cocomish as well as hew the grading would be. Assignments and other wik on this have been more useful in learning the pourse goals if there were guidelines or a rubric to follow so that we know how to exceed, meet, or fail.

Pleadings were rather tong and white blogs were convenient way of wrapping up the week it became a bit hard to follow week after week.

Class discussion when we would have to wait ten minutes for someone's speech about the injustice of Zuckerberg's existence to finally end

some of the movies i found disturbing and doesn't gives me an head up on what to talk about in the blog and session on the other hand everything is going well with Den. he did a great job on this topic.

I wouldn't say there was anything that wasn't valuable, but I thought we ought to have more discussions.

a few of the movies were a bit boring or hard to follow, also the student led discussions were kinda vague, some of the presenters were good, but the ones that don't know what they were doing were pretty bad.

11. The instr	11. The instructor seems to enjoy teaching.													
	Mean	N-Size	Std Day		Strongly Disagrap	Disagroo	Noutral	Agree	Strongly Ay co					
Campus	4.47	2598	0.89	Freq(%)	35 (1%)	39 (2%)	188 (7%)	541 (25%)	1676 (65%)					
College	4.45	2204	0.91	Freq(%)	35 (2%)	37 (2%)	158 (7%)	563 (26%)	1395 (63%)					
Dvision	4.53	1309	0.87	Freq(%)	19 (1%)	22 (2%)	76 (9%)	280 (21%)	904 (69%)					
Department	4.59	541	0.82	Freq(%)	7 (194)	10 (2%)	26 (5%)	102 (19%)	394 (73%)					
Your class	4.0	13	0.71	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (23%)	7 (54%)	3 (23%)					

12. The instr	2. The instructor was able to explain concepts alourly and effectively.													
	Mean	N-Size	Ski Dav		Shorgly Disagree	Disagrou	Nout al	Agree	Shorgly Agree					
Campus	435	E124	1.01	Freq(%)	126 (2%)	246 (3%)	708 (9%)	2146 (26%)	4795 (59%)					
College	428	4251	1.04	Freq(%)	71 (2%)	122 (3%)	415 (10%)	1236 (29%)	23359 (55%)					
Dyson	428	2539	1.08	Freq(%)	48 (2%)	77 (3%)	238 (9%)	991 (27%)	1438 (57%)					
Department	435	541	1.01	Freq(%)	15 (2%)	20 (4%)	43 (8%)	136 (25%)	325 (60%)					
Your class	431	13	0.75	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (15%)	5 (38%)	6 (48%)					

13. The instr	13. The instructor stimulated me to think about the subject matter,													
	Mean	N-Size	Std Dov		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree					
Campus	4.99	6994	1.03	Freq(%)	123 (2%)	971 (416)	800 (11%)	1396 (27%)	3809 (59%)					
College	4.29	9190	1.03	Freq(%)	33 (2%)	76 (3%)	232 (11%)	810 (28%)	1211 (59%)					
Division	4.44	1048	0.97	Freq(%)	12 (194)	99 (2%)	78 (7%)	254 (24%)	672 (64%)					
Department	4.5	541	0.84	Freq(%)	8 (194)	13 (216)	38 (7%)	126 (23%)	356 (46%)					
Vourclass	4.64	12	0.62	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (40%)	7 (\$4%)					

14. The instr	14. The instructor broadened my understanding and grasp of the subject.													
	Mean	N-Size	Std Dev		Strongly Disagree	Usagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree					
Самрье	4.90	4777	6.97	Freq(%)	64 (191)	112 (2%)	287 (2%)	1246 (26%)	2011 (61%)					
College	4.90	5736	6.97	Freq(%)	26 (191)	67 (2%)	254 (0%)	761 (27%)	1600 (60%)					
Division	4.45	978	0.00	Freq(%)	14 (194)	28 (2%)	47 (7%)	227 (22%)	635 (68%)					
Dopartment	4.45	541	0.9	Freq(%)	4 (194)	15 (0%)	40 (0%)	100 (25%)	042 (60%)					
Your class	423	18	0.0	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)	0 (00%)	4 (01%)					

15. The instru	15. The instructor was thoughtful and precise in response to questions.												
	Mean	N-Size	Std Dev		Strongly Disagme	Lisagree	Neutra	Agree	Strongly Agree				
Campus	451	1979	0.94	Freg(%)	30 (2%)	48 (2%)	126 (6%)	277 (19%)	1381 (70%)				
College	4.43	543	0.97	Fleg(%)	12 (2%)	15 (3%)	42 (8%)	115 (21%)	356 (65%)				
Division	4.43	543	0.97	Freq(%)	12 (216)	15 (3%)	42 (8%)	115 (21%)	356 (68%)				
Department	4.40	541	0.07	Fing(%)	12 (2%)	15 (0%)	42 (0%)	115 (21%)	054 (05%)				
Vourclass	4.0	12	1.00	Flog(%)	1 (0%)	6 (0%)	1 (0%)	7 (64%)	4 (21%)				

10. The instr	10. The instructor sets high standards for students.													
	Mean	N-Cas	Cid Cov		Otrangly Disagree	Disagroo	Noutra	Agroo	Strongly Agree					
Сатриа	4.42	7002	0.9	Freq(%)	64 (114)	09 (116)	675 (0%)	2123 (20%)	4617 (60%)					
College	4.46	1423	0.89	Flog(%)	10 (195)	12 (1%)	110 (0%)	990 (27%)	602 (02%)					
Division	4.36	193	0.94	Flog(%)	3 (2%)	1 (1%)	21 (11%)	54 (28%)	109 (57%)					
Department	4.54	23	0.69	Free(%)	0 (0%)	0.0%)	3 (11%)	7 (25%)	18 (64%)					
Your class	423	13	0.73	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (15%)	5 (48%)	5 (33%)					

17. What did you find most valuable and helpful about the instructor?

Was willing to meet with the students if they needed extra help.

Fair grader

Connected well and bought class participation and engagement.

He was very understanding and willing to explain things.

Hen was knowledgable of the course material and seemed to enjoy to have group discussions. What I enjoyed was how opened minded he was to the many different opinions people have in the course.

He always starified things for all of us, even when we didn't say we were

Like all other professors for the most part, his knowledge of material HE likes.

Challenged us to think for ourselves no answers were spoon fed

Seemed to genuinely want to help you if you were having trouble with material.

The topic is new to me and illked it, illnever understand some of the weekly lesson and issue that we talked about in class and Reniwas there to eleborate more on the situation. He gives a sense of what is going on in society and globally.

He was enflusiastic about the topics we covered each week and he knows his stuff.

Approachable:

I think the communication with the class and being able to ask any question was most helpful. I always knew what was going on and thats always a good thing.

18. What did you find least valuable and helpful about the instructor?

Assignments were confusing. No robrid for presentations/essays/assignments. Seemed unorganized at some times.

nothing.

n/e

I think Bern was a little too terrient with students throughout the course, like adding the chance to submit late work to encourage students to do the weekly assignments.

Very opinionated.

He did seem to deminate conversations at times but it was mostly because no one would read leading to lack of conversation topics

Not really anything.

he really wanted to help and give out lecture cutside class. But I just found myself in a bad position to ask question. He is a good teacher and funny too, he can make the class laugh and there's nothing wrong with that because we were building bonds between students and the class.

Nothing really.

nothing? idk how to answer this....

19. Global a	19. Global appraisal: Considering everything how would rate this INSTRUCTOR?													
	Mean	N-Size	Std Dev		Very Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent					
Campus	4.4	8763	1.07	Freq(%)	98 (116)	173 (2%)	626 (7%)	1989 (23%)	5656 (85%)					
College	400	4041	1.05	Freq(%)	58 (194)	100 (2%)	061 (0%)	1124 (24%)	2000 (03%)					
Division	4.20	2023	1.1	Flog(%)	41 (2%)	08 (9%)	242 (244)	702 (27%)	1600 (63%)					
Department	4.49	541	1.02	Flog(%)	19 (9%)	\$ (1%)	31 (8%)	134 (25%)	547 (64%)					
Yourclass	4.38	13	0.65	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (9%)	6 (46%)	6 (45%)					

20. Global ar	Global appraisal: Considering everything how would you rate this COURSE?													
	Moon	N-Size	Std Dev		Very Pear	Peer	Average	Good	Excellent					
Campus	4.28	9305	1.1	Freq(%)	98 (1%)	241 (3%)	852 (9%)	2525 (28%)	5235 (66%)					
College	4.23	5176	1.12	Freq(%)	57 (1%)	134 (3%)	510 (10%)	1556 (30%)	2767 (53%)					
Division	4.22	1912	1.12	Fig.(%)	24 (1%)	42 (2%)	208 (11%)	577 (30%)	1008 (53%)					
Department	4.0	541	0.09	Freq(%)	12 (2%)	10 (2%)	43 (0%)	180 (04%)	287 (50%)					
Vour class	1.20	13	0.44	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (77%)	2 (22%)					

21. Other comments:

I wish the biogs weren't due on a Saturday night!

Oreate guidelines or a sort of template lowards how assignments should be molded into. Although there a want for creativity and ppen-thinking. It feels too open and we become confused in how things should -- or want -- to be done.

Very good and interesting course. I appreciate Ben's willingness to stare his opinion and to show up a broad spootrum of topics. I also really enjoyed the micternal it was much more fundhan taking a multiple choice test or submitting a paper.

No other comment



Instructor: Benjamin Schrader Campus: University of Hawaii at Manoa

Course: POLS 335

Semester: Summer II 2013 Department: Political Science Crn(Section): 90616 (701)

1. Class Le	. Class Level (pick one)													
	Mean	N-Sizo	Sid Dov		Freehman	Bophamere	Junior	Senior	Grad	Other				
Campus	2.6	1872	1.22	Freq(%)	126 (7%)	240 (12%)	470 (20%)	Des (36%)	200 (10%)	66 (446)				
College	3.24	1006	1.21	Freq(%)	96 (10%)	173 (17%)	254 (25%)	389 (38%)	60 (6%)	38 (4%)				
Division	3.20	462	111	Freq(%)	45 (10%)	55 (12%)	193 (97%)	209 (45%)	22 (9%)	8 (2%)				
Department	3.56	41	0.74	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	3 (7%)	14 (38%)	22 (56%)	0.0993	1 (214)				
Your dass	3.5	4	0.58	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)				

2. Course						
	Moon	N-Gizo	Ctd Dev		Elective	Required
Campus	1.07	1372	6.50	Freq(%)	400 (22%)	1017 (70%)
College	1.64	1000	0.63	Freq(%)	212 (21%)	600 (07%)
Division	1.60	162	0.66	Freq(%)	177 (20%)	572 (60%)
Department	1.02	41	0.64	Freq(%)	10 (32%)	27 (00%)
Your dass	20	4	0.0	Frag(%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)

3. The instruc	The instructor demonstrated knowledge of course content.													
	Mean	N-Sizu	3id Day		Strangly Disagree	Disayee	Neutel	Agree	Strongly Agrae					
Campus	4.5	1872	0.75	Freq(%)	19 (1%)	21 (1%)	90 (5%)	398 (21%)	1339 (72%)					
College	4.58	1006	0.77	Freq(%)	11 (139)	16 (2%)	53 (5%)	215 (21%)	710 (71%)					
Division	4.63	462	0.72	Freq(%)	4 (138)	5 (1%)	18 (4%)	100 (22%)	334 (72%)					
Department	4.73	41	0.47	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	7 (17%)	33 (80%)					
Your dess	5.0	4	0.0	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)					

4. The instruc	4. The instructor fulfilled the goals of the course.												
	Mean	N-Size	Sid Fev		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Nourral	Agree	Strongly Agree				
Compus	4.5	1372	0.00	Freq(%)	24 (130)	00 (2%)	117 (0%)	460 (25%)	1220 (0014)				
College	4.48	1000	0.83	Freq(%)	14 (1%)	21 (2%)	60 (7%)	256 (25%)	640 (64%)				
Division	4.66	163	0.2	Freq(%)	\$ (1%)	G (1%)	22 (6%)	114 (20%)	\$12 (00%)				
Department	4.40	41	0.81	Freq(%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	12 (22%)	26 (01%)				
Voludess	475	4	0.5	Freq(%)	0 (086)	0 (0%)	0.03%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)				

5. The instruc	The instructor communicated effectively.													
	Mean	N-Sizu	3id Day		Strangly Disagree	Disagro	Noutel	Agree	Strongly Agrae					
Campus	4.35	1872	1.04	Freq(%)	43 (2%)	89 (5%)	125 (7%)	444 (24%)	1156 (62%)					
College	4.29	1006	1.1	Freq(%)	27 (3%)	€5 (6%)	71 (7%)	244 (24%)	891 (5916)					
Division	4.41	462	0.97	Freq(%)	10 (2%)	16 (3%)	31 (7%)	113 (24%)	290 (63%)					
Department	4.37	41	0.99	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (12%)	11 (27%)	24 (59%)					
Your dess	4.25	4	0.93	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)					

6. I felt that ti	Lifelt that this course challenged me intellectually													
	Mean	N-Size	Sid Fev		Strongly Disagros	Disagree	Nourral	Agree	Strongly Agrae					
Campus	4.05	254	0.04	Freq(%)	2 (1%)	8 (0%)	26 (10%)	84 (30%)	106 (5014)					
College	4.4	245	0.70	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	G (2%)	24 (10%)	89 (39%)	133 (54%)					
Division	4.38	167	0.72	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	5 (2%)	16 (10%)	\$7 (24%)	80 (63%)					
Department	4.54	41	0.74	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	3 (7%)	10 (24%)	97 (98%)					
Your dass	50	4	0.0	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0.00%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)					

7. The instruc	7. The instructor seems to enjoy teaching.												
	Moon	N-Gizo	Old Dev		Otrongly Disagrae	Disagrae	Nourral	Agree	Otrorgly Agree				
Campre	4.61	119	0.92	Freq(%)	0 (016)	2 (2%)	9 (8%)	24 (20%)	82 (89%)				
College	4.54	110	0.80	Freq(%)	0 (014)	2 (214)	0 (0%)	24 (21%)	80 (00%)				
Division	4.62	100	0.87	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)	19 (19%)	70 (70%)				
Department	4.54	41	1.03	Frag(%)	0.(046)	1 (2%)	3 (7%)	5 (12%)	31 (76%)				
Your class	4.5	4	1.0	Free(%)	0.(016)	0 /0%	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)				

8. The instru	8. The instructor was able to explain concepts clearly and effectively.													
	Изап	N-Sizo	Std Dev		Strongly Disagree	Dicagroe	Nourral	Agroo	Strongly Agree					
Cample	4.94	202	1.01	Freq(%)	4 (190)	7 (294)	20 (7%)	91 (31%)	100 (67%)					
College	44	915	0.91	Frag(%)	2 (116)	6 (386)	13 (9%)	48 (32%)	124 (58%)					
Division	4,34	184	0.96	Free(%)	2 (1%)	6 (3%)	13 (7%)	59 (32%)	102 (55%)					
Department	4.27	41	1.04	Free(%)	0.0%	2 (5%)	1 (2%)	13 (32%)	24 (59%)					
Your class	4.5	4	0.58	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (60%)	2 (50%)					

9. The instru	9. The instructor stimulated me to think about the subject matter.													
	Mean	N-Size	Std Dev		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree					
Campus	4.46	378	0.99	Frag(%)	7 (2%)	11 (386)	19 (994)	97 (20%)	245 (84%)					
College	4.51	61	0.92	Frag(%)	0.0%	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	15 (25%)	41 (67%)					
Division .	4.52	48	0.77	Freq(%)	0 (016)	2 (4%)	2 (4%)	13 (27%)	31 (65%)					
Department	4.51	41	0.78	Frag(%)	0 (016)	2 (5%)	1 (2%)	12 (29%)	26 (83%)					
Your class	4.75	4	0.5	Freq(%)	0 (016)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)					

10. The instr	10. The instructor broadened my uncerstanding and grasp of the subject.													
	Mean	N-Sizo	Std Dev		Strongly Disagrae	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly //gree					
Campus	4.46	167	0.98	Freq(%)	1 (1%)	10 (6%)	3 (2%)	41 (25%)	110 (66%)					
College	4.46	120	0.93	Freq(%)	1 (1%)	6 (5%)	3 (3%)	32 (27%)	77 (64%)					
Division	4.39	89	0.92	Freq(%)	0 (016)	5 (6%)	2 (2%)	30 (34%)	51 (57%)					
Department	4.04	41	1.04	Frag(%)	0 (014)	2 (5%)	1 (2%)	14 (04%)	20 (00%)					
Vourclass	4.76	4	0.6	Frag(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (0%)	1 (25%)	\$ (76%)					

11. The instr	11. The instructor was thoughtful and precise in response to questions.													
	Moon	N-Cizo	Ctd Dev		Otrongly Disagree	Disagrae	Nourral	Agree	Otrorgly Agree					
Campus	4.33	49	0.97	Freq(%)	0 (016)	0 (0%)	7 (14%)	14 (29%)	27 (55%)					
College	4.41	41	0.97	Frag(%)	0 (044)	0 (0%)	4 (10%)	11 (27%)	26 (01%)					
Division	4.41	41	0.97	Freq(%)	0 (044)	0 (0%)	4 (10%)	11 (27%)	26 (0194)					
Department	4.41	41	0.97	Frag(%)	0.00%	0 (084)	4 (10%)	11 (27%)	26 (31%)					
Your class	4.5	4	0.58	Froo(%)	0.(0%)	0 (0%)	0.096)	2 (60%)	2 (50%)					

12. What did you find most valuable and helpful about the instructor?

Very intellectual

He was very accepting to different ideas and respected them but required us to support with facts. Along with that, he really had a passion for the subject and explain each idea very thoroughly. His feedback on our papers were very helpful and I really think in these past 6 weeks I have become a strong writing grammetically and in explaining ideas better.

The class content he chose to teach us was very intellectually stimulating and opened my mind to many different things.

Staying after class if students need help on a certain topic. Very helpful, aspecially corrooting asseys.

13. What did you find least valuable and helpful about the instructor?

Intimidating

He made us do a lot of reading, I felt it was too much at times

Nothing

14. Global ap	14. Global appraisal: Considering everything how would rate this INSTRUCTOR?													
	Mean	N.Size	SH Dov		Very Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent					
Campus	4.96	354	1.08	Freq(%)	6 (2%)	7 (2%)	33 (8%)	93 (23%)	220 (82%)					
College	4.45	258	0.95	Freq(%)	9 (130)	6 (2%)	13 (7%)	80 (23%)	167 (85%)					
Division	4.46	178	0.98	Freq(%)	1 (1%)	6 (3%)	12 (7%)	46 (26%)	112 (83%)					
Department	4.46	41	1.0	Freq(%)	0 (080)	1 (2%)	2 (6%)	10 (24%)	27 (36%)					
Your class	4.75	4	0.5	Freq(%)	0.0%	0 (3%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)					

15. Global ap	5. Global appraisal: Considering everything how would you rate this COURSE?													
	Mean	N-Sizo	Stil Dov		Very Pear	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent					
Саприя	4.32	327	1.13	Freq(%)	5 (2%)	2 (1%)	25 (8%)	91 (28%)	193 (59%)					
College	4.83	238	1.13	Freq(%)	4 (2%)	1 (0%)	17 (7%)	95 (28%)	141 (80%)					
Division	4.26	143	1.12	Freq(%)	2 (198)	1 (1%)	9 (6%)	47 (33%)	79 (55%)					
Department	4.12	41	1.29	Freq(%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	2 (6%)	15 (37%)	20 (49%)					
Your class	4.8	4	0.58	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	2 (00%)					

16. Other comments:

Thank you for making me a better writer and expanding my knowledge of political theory.



Instructor: Benjamin Schrader Semester: Fall 2013

Campus: University of Hawaii at Manoa Department: Political Science Course: POLS341 Cmi(Section): 1249 (211)

I. Class Let	I. Class Level (pick one)													
	Mean	N-Size	Std Dev		Rechman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Grad	Other				
Campus	3.25	90711	1.33	Freq(%)	3655 (12%)	4425 (14%)	7545 (25%)	9348 (30%)	4762 (16%)	589 (2%)				
College	204	15827	1.28	Froq(%)	2618 (17%)	2048 (10%)	4027 (25%)	4653 (2010)	1237 (8%)	183 (1%)				
Division	299	0522	1.29	Freq(%)	1126 (17%)	831 (14%)	1731 (27%)	2045 (3116)	586 (9%)	49 (1%)				
Department	3.38	587	1.17	Freq0%)	40 (7%)	65 (11%)	177 (30%)	211 (98%)	78 (13%)	8 (1%)				
Your class	3.5		0.68	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (50%)	4 (50%)	0 (0%)	0.02%)				

2 Course						
	Mean	N-Size	Std Dev		Elective	Required
Compus	1.65	30711	0.55	Freq(%)	8440 (28%)	21005 (60%)
College	1.02	15327	0.55	Freq(16)	5059 (32%)	10275 (05%)
Civision	1.56	6522	0.56	Frec(%)	2455 (38%)	3845 (59%)
Cepartment	1.5	587	0.57	Frec(%)	250 (43%)	316 (54%)
Your class	1.63	8	0.52	Frec(%)	3 (38%)	5 (63%)

3. The instru	The instructor demonstrated knowledge of course content														
	Mean	N-Size	Std Dev		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree						
Campus	4.62	30720	0.75	HIRG(%)	229 (1%)	308(1%)	1255 (4%)	6055 (22%)	22137 (72%)						
College	4.59	15896	0.79	Freq(%)	155 (1%)	184 (1%)	693 (4%)	3587 (23%)	11133 (70%)						
Division	4.B1	8522	0.77	Freq(%)	49 (1%)	51 (1%)	229 (4N)	1468 (23%)	4877 (72%)						
Department	4.7	587	0.67	Freq(%)	4 (1%)	4 (1%)	15 (3%)	107 (18%)	455 (78%)						
Your class	4.75	9	0.45	Fietg(%)	0 (0%)	0(0%)	0 (0%)	2 (25%)	6 (75%)						

4. The instru	4. The instructor fulfilled the goals of the course.													
	Vesn	N-Size	Std Dev		Strongly Designee	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree					
Campus	4.47	30720	0.83	Freq(%)	308 (1%)	590 (2%)	1991 (0%)	8233 (27%)	19378 (03%)					
College	4.43	15838	0.9	Freq %)	231 (11%)	349 (2%)	1107 (7%)	4417 (28%)	9030 (01%)					
Civision	4.48	6522	0.85	Fleq(%)	62 (1%)	99 (2%)	379 (6%)	1828 (28%)	4101 (63%)					
Department	4.51	567	0.9	Heq(%)	4 (1%)	15(3%)	32 (6%)	131 (22%)	398 (69%)					
Your class	4.75	8	0.48	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (25%)	6 (75%)					

5. The instru														
	Moan	N-Size	Etd Dev		Etrongly Designee	Disagree	Noutral	Agree	Strongly Agree					
Campus	4.29	30720	1.05	Freq(%)	744 (2%)	1983 (4%)	3006 (10%)	7571 (26%)	17824 (59%)					
Cdlege	4.24	15936	1.09	Freq(%)	467 (3%)	770 (6%)	1824 (10N)	3976 (25%)	8889 (56%)					
Division	4.31	8522	1.04	Freq(%)	128 (2%)	250 (4%)	827 (10%)	1658 (25%)	3813 (58%)					
Department	4.4	587	1.07	Freq(%)	8 (1%)	28 (4%)	41 (7%)	110 (19%)	302 (67%)					
Your class	4.58	e	0.35	Fleq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	7 (88%)					

Why did you choose to take this course? (it turtilled a focus description (WI, E, DC, HAP, etc.), POLS major/minor requirement, major/minor requirement for another department, time and day(s) of the week it was offered, instructor, subject matter, etc.)

It was a part of my major requirement. I was also interested in the subject the media and politics based on similar topics covered in my WS courses.

I'm a Pole Major and needed it to graduate. I also took a media in politice class before and thought it was very interesting

subject matter

Hovo Political Science. I have been studying the subject einer my cophrace year and find it challenging. It has also broadened my knowledge regarding the operation of government, the media, as well as diplomatic relations.

POLS major requirement to take a 300+ level. I picked it because it sounded interesting, and it was

Elective Poli Sci for my major - and media is always an interesting topic in school work and research.

It fulfilled one of my focus designations and was offered online. The weekly set up of the class was very helpful as well.

POLS major

7. I folt that t	7. I falt that this course challenged me intellectually.													
	Mean	N-Size	Std Dav		Strongly Disagree		Neutral	Agree	Strongty Acres					
Campue	4.31	4202	1.01	Frag(%)	82 (2%)	145 (3%)	423 (10%)	1116 (27%)	2401 (57%)					
College	4.34	3347	0.98	Freq(%)	05 (2%)	113 (3%)	316 (9%)	897 (27%)	1938 (58%)					
Division	4.3	1982	0.99	Frag(%)	37 (2%)	60 (3%)	182 (10%)	541 (29%)	1028 (55%)					
Department	4.30	587	0.98	Freq(%)	9 (2%)	19 (3%)	36 (7%)	178 (30%)	330 (57%)					
Your class	4.25	8	0.89	Frag(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (25%)	2 (25%)	4 (50%)					

8. The instru	The instructor agents to enjoy teaching.													
	Voon	N-Sizo	8ld Dev		Strongly Disagree	Disegree	Noutral	Agroo	Strongly Acree					
Campus	4.35	2852	1.03	Freq(%)	85 (3%)	80 (3%)	260 (9%)	663 (23%)	1747 (81%)					
College	4.34	2640	1.04	Freq(%)	63 (3%)	76 (3%)	246 (9%)	627 (24%)	1593 (50%)					
Division	4.52	1744	0.85	Freq(%)	14 (1%)	27 (2%)	116 (7%)	397 (23%)	1177 (87%)					
Department	4.01	597	0.81	Freq#61	3 (1%)	7.01%	25 (4%)	114 (19%)	432 (74%)					
Your class	4.75	9	0.46	Frag(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (25%)	8 (75%)					

9 The Instru	9 The instructor was able to explain concepts clearly and effectively												
	Vean	N-Size	3td Dev		Strongly Disagree		Neutral	Agioo	Strongly Agree				
Campus	4.31	8302	1.05	Freq(%)	170 (2%)	330 (4%)	096 (8%)	2167 (20%)	4839 (58%)				
College	4.19	4499	1.12	Frag(%)	125 (3%)	212 (8%)	433 (10%)	1308 (29%)	2958 (52%)				
Division	4.19	2529	1.11	Freq(%)	50 (2%)	117 (5%)	256 (10%)	754 (30%)	1301 (51%)				
Department	4.305	567	1.05	Frag(%)	11 (2%)	26 (4%)	45 (8%)	144 (25%)	3954 (80%)				
Your class	4.5	В	0.53	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (50%)	4 (50%)				

 The instructor stimulated me to think about the aubject matter. 												
	Vean	N-Size	Sid Dev		Strongly Disagros		Neutral	Agrees	Strongly Agree			
Campus	4.26	7993	1.03	Freq(%)	161 (2%)	323 (4%)	879 (11%)	2246 (26%)	4319 (54%)			
College	4.23	2507	1.08	Fraq(%)	72 (3%)	96 (4%)	266 (11%)	690 (29%)	1358 (5/%)			
Division	4.49	1027	0.9	Freq(%)	10 (2%)	10 (2%)	60 (6%)	253 (25%)	674 (30%)			
Department	4.47	587	0.93	Frag(%)	12 (2%)	9 (2%)	41 (7%)	192 (22%)	389 (88%)			
Your class	4.75	5	0.46	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0.00%	0 (0%)	2 (25%)	5 (75%)			

11. The inet	11. The instructor broadened my understanding and group of the subject.											
	Veen	N-Size	Std Day		Strongly Disagree		Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree			
Campus	4.36	5550	1.0	Frag(%)	97 (2%)	146 (3%)	438 (8%)	1626 (27%)	35497 (59%)			
College	4.28	3350	1.05	Freq(%)	63 (2%)	105 (3%)	312 (9%)	953 (29%)	1868 (56%)			
Division	4.42	1285	0.93	Freq(%)	15 (1%)	29 (2%)	81 (6%)	362 (28%)	785 (51%)			
Department	4.44	587	0.98	Freq(%)	9 (2%)	12 (2%)	36 (0%)	148 (25%)	373 (3416)			
Tour class	4.605		0.52	Frages)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (399%)	5 (63%)			

12. The instruc	12. The instructor was thoughtful and procise in response to questions.											
	Mean	N-Size	3td Dev		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree			
Campus	4.47	1887	0.97	Freq(%)	26 (1%)	60 (3%)	110 (8%)	387 (21%)	1275 (69%)			
College	4.36	639	1.05	Freq(%)	10 (2%)	25 (4%)	49 (8%)	145 (23%)	399 (62%)			
Dwscn	4.42	612	1.0	Hreat%)	8 (1%)	21 (3%)	395 (15%)	142 (23%)	395 (CD%)			
Department	4.42	587	1.01	Freq(%)	8 (1%)	20 (3%)	38 (8%)	133 (23%)	380 (65%)			
Your class	4.63	8	0.52	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (38%)	5 (63%)			

13. What did you find most valuable and helpful about the instructor?

His communication to the students was always prompt and he gave feedback on our work. every week.

interesting material provided, very prompt with responses.

le is knowledgeable about the subject he teaches which enables him to provide direct and insightful feedback to our responses regarding the assignment.

I think his way of teaching was very effective. I felt that reading and watching the film in the first three days was manageable and I could write my thoughts out in a blog by wednesday. I think responding to two blogs by friday was great as well so that we could discuss with classmates. I really appreciated Professor Schrader responding to each individual blog post as I found his responses both encouraging and though provoking.

Its breakdown of the week's reading assignments and his notes within the readings helped to keep me focused and on track.

He read each blog and interacted with students. He also addressed any questions that may have come up in a blog and always prepped us for each week's focus topic.

14 What did you find least valuable and helpful about the instructor?

4.75

Nothing

más

NVA

not applicable

Your class

nis

Many times his commonts would consist of nothing more than, "great analysis!" There were times I found myself wanting a bit more stimulation in response from a professor.

0.45

16. Global appraisal: Considering everything how would you rate this INSTRUCTOR? N-Size Excellent Mean 3td Dev Very Poor Average 56 (1%) 22/17 (22%) Jamous 4,45 10065 Hreat% 186 (2%) 680 (7% 5509 (55%) College 4.45 5884 0.95 Freq(%) 38 (1%) 113 (2%) 408 (7%) 1993 (25%) 3843 (64%) 2106 (61%) Division 4.41 3440 30.0 Freq(%) 18 (1%) 67 (294) 266 (354 932 (27%) Department 4.47 587 0.93 Freq(%) 6 (1%) 14 (2%) 43 (7% 127 (22%) 391 (07%)

0 (0%)

0 (0%)

0 (0%

2 (20%)

6 (75%)

Freq(%)

16 Global appositsal: Considering everything how would you rate this COURSE? Mean N-Size Std Dev Very Poor Poor Average Good Excellent 2947 (29%) 5343 (57%) Campus 10261 Freq(%4) 112 (1%) 253 (294) 660 (3%) 4.21 5971 1.12 Freq(%) 83 (1%) 174 (3%) 603 (10%) 1871 (31%) 3080 (52%) College Iween 4.19 2275 1.09 Hreg(%) 19 (1%) 56 (2%) 247 (11%) 771 (34%) 1117 (49%) 163 (29%) Department 4.3 587 1.01 Freq(%) 4 (1%) 17 (3N) 65 (11%) 328 (56K) Your cleas 4.88 8 0.35 Freq(%) 0 (0%) 0 (0%) 0 (0%) 1 (12%) 7 (88%)

17. The cou	17. The course challenged me to think critically and historically about power and the political.												
	Messri	N-Size	Std Dev		Strongly Disagree		Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A			
Campus	4.44	817	0.94	Freq 9.)	5 (190)	11 (2%)	44 (7%)	161 (26%)	387 (63%)	5 (1%)			
College	4.44	513	0.94	Freq(%)	5 (1%)	11 (210)	43 (7%)	159 (26%)	385 (63%)	5 (1%)			
Division	4.44	812	0.94	Frag(%)	5 (190)	11 (2%)	43 (7%)	159 (26%)	385 (69%)	5 (1%)			
Department	4.44	587	C.M	Freq®)	5 (1%)	11 (2%)	42 (7%)	152 (26%)	389 (63%)	4 (1%)			
Your clean	5.0	8	0.0	Freq 9.)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)			

18. The cou	18. The course improved my ability to easit and defend evidence based arguments.											
	Мвап	N-Size	Std Dev		Storgy Desgree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A		
Campus	4.15	027	1.2	Freq(%)	5 (1%)	27 (4%)	66 (1118)	182 (29%)	324 (52%)	15 (2%)		
College	4.15	620	1.2	Freq(%)	5 (194)	26 (4%)	66 (11%)	180 (29%)	320 (52%)	15 (2K)		
Division	4.15	619	1.2	Freq(%)	5 (194)	26 (4%)	66 (11%)	180 (20%)	310 (52%)	15 (2%)		
Department	4.16	587	1.19	Freq(%)	5 (1%)	25 (4%)	62 (1116)	172 (29%)	302 (51%)	13 (2%)		
Your class	4.43	8	0.79	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	2 (25%)	4 (50%)	1 (13%)		

 The course gave me apportunities to practice communicating effectively in public settings, with attention to and appreciation of diverse cultural contexts.

	Maan	N-Size	Std Dev		Storgly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Campus	4.2	6249	1.15	Frag(%)	6 (1%)	21 (35%)	75 (12%)	169 (27%)	3595 (54%)	11 (2%)
College	4.2	623	1.15	Freq(%)	6 (194)	21 (3%)	75 (12%)	167 (27%)	335 (54%)	11 (2%)
Division	4.19	012	1.10	Freq(%)	0 (198)	21 (3%)	75 (12%)	166 (27%)	325 (63%)	11 (2%)
Department	4.19	587	1.14	Frag(%)	5 (1%)	21 (4%)	75 (13%)	166 (26%)	314 (53%)	9 (2%)
Your class	4.33	8	0.82	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	2 (25%)	3 (38%)	2 (25%)

70 The crurse increased my shifty to cogenity explain the inerconnectedness of local and global dynamics of power within the context of the political and cultural specificities of Hawa's nei.

WOUTHLAND OF I				ALC: UNKNOWN A TOWN						
	Mean	N-929	Std Dev		Strongly		Neutral	Agree	Strongly	N/A
Campus	4.01	628	1.31	Frag(%)	8 (193)	31 (5%)	74 (12%)	187 (30%)	294 (47%)	29 (4%)
College	4.01	628	1.31	Freq(%)	8 (194)	31 (5%)	74 (1290)	187 (30%)	204 (47%)	23 (4%)
Division	4.0	617	1.32	Freq(%)	8 (1%)	31 (5%)	74 (12%)	185 (30%)	287 (47%)	23 (4%)
Department	4.0	587	1.31	Freq(%)	7 (1%)	31 (5%)	73 (12%)	173 (29%)	274 (47%)	21 (4%)
Your class	4.13	В	0.64	Freq(%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1316)	5 (63%)	2 (25%)	0 (0%)

21. Other comments:

Great organization of the class and very good job at staying on schedule with the syllabus

Excellent coursel

This was a really great course. I was interested in all the subject matter and it was laid out in a way that I felt I was learning and thinking critically. I found that the material was very relatable to the world and my day to day life. Professor Schrader was very procent and is great at gotting you to think critically and look at the hig picture. Thank you! I would take it again just for fun!

I love the way the class is structured in that we are required to interact with other classmates and think critically. It also allows you to gain other perspectives or use other classmates' ideas to clarify something you did not understand initially.

FTST404 Race Formation in the United States, Section 001 being as PDE files) are intended totally Instructor: Bantamin Schrader, Instructor for viewing by the course trademics. Students and other members of the CSU College and Department: Uberal Arts, Ethnic Studies community od not have access to these Term: Spring 2014 forms. You may however previde eccess Course Reference Number: 17317 to the survey forms to selected Enrollment: 15 incluiduals. You can remove access to the forms at any time. Detailed Summary of Submitted Forms Options E Share forms Survey Forms Submitted: 10 🌠 Nanago Ameso In Fermo L. How well were the course Above Selow Not No Mean: 4 20 (1-5 scale) objectives communicated excellent average average average iron applicable kesponse to staylents? . 2. How well was the grading Stelven Mean: 3.50 (1-5 seale) Acres Work. Day. on communicated to Response Average Applicable students? How well did clare Relow Mean: 3.90 (1.5 scale) sessions increase your Excellent Average Average Average Reserve understanding of the subject? 0 0 0 . . 4. How well did reading Below Mean: 4.50 (1-5 acate) and gamests increase Excellent: Average Average Average Pone Applicable Respons your understanding of the multipoet? 7 0 0 0 . . 5. How well did other courses Abeve Mean: 3.70 (1-5 scale) Below Not: No assignments increase Deposition to Average Average Poor Applicable Певропас your understanding of the subject? c 0 5. How well did other noove BHOW 1905 PAC Mean: 9.00 (1-5 scale) learning resources used in Excellent Average Average Foor Applicable Response this course such as related wetoliko, 2 software, study guides, and media - increase your understanding of the subject? 7. How well was feedback Above Below Mot Me Magne 3.90 (1.5 ccale) provided — such as Excellent Average Average Foor Applicable Response reviews, guizzes. critiques, and homework 0 1 2 • - to help you track your pregress? R. If you accessed course **POOME** BRION 7905 DOC Mean: 9.72 (1-5 scae) information through an Excellent Average Average Average Foor Applicable Responsa online system such as a website ur KamCT - how 3 3 1 w. . Q. do you rate the case of finding information? 9. How do you rate the Nic Above Relay Not Mean: 4.20 (1.5 scale) clarity and completeness Excellent Average Average Average Foor Applicable Respon of instructions provided in the course for engaging in 3 6 1 • 0 class activities and completing course work? 10. How do you rate the 84c Below 7408 Mean: 4.40 (1-5 scale) intellectual challenge of Excellent Average fivelege Average Pour Applicable **Respuisse** this course? 6 0 0 0 Ф 0 11. How do you rate this Above Biology Mode Min Means \$ 10 (1.5 scale) course? Excellent Average Average Foor Applicable Responsa 7 7 1 0 0 0

12. How do you rate the instructor's knowledge of the subject?						Not Applicable		Mean: 4.00 (5-5 scale)
		2		0	0		0	
as. How effectively dic the instructor facilitate student learning?	Excellent	Above Average	Average 1	Relow Average 0	Poor N	Not Applicable	No Response O	Mean 5 30 (1-5 scale)
I.4. How do you rete the immunion's enthrollasm for teathing the subjects	Excellent 4	Above Average 5	Average 1	Below Awerage 0	Poor 0	Not Applicable	Na Besponse O	Mean: 4.30 (1-5 scale)
15. How well did the instructor organize the course?	Excellent 4	Above Average	Average 1	Below Average U	Poor U	NOT Applicable	Na Response U	Mean: 4.30 (1-5 scare)
16. How prepared was the instructor fer class sessions?	Exclost 6	Above Areizye	Average	Below Average	~~	Not Applicable	No Sequence O	Means 4.00 (1-5 acale)
17. How do you rate the instructor's effectiveness at managing class sessions?	Excellent 5	Ahove Average	Average 2	Relow Average 0	Poor O	Nht Applicable	No Response O	Mean 4 30 (1.5 scale)
10. How do you rete the instructor's effectiveness at racilitating online and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)?	Excelert 3	Above Average 3	Average 1	Below Average 0	Roor O	Not Applicable	Na Response 0	Mean: 4.29 (1-5 scale)
19. How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades?	Excellent 3	Alleve Averege 2	Average 0	Bolton Average C	Poor	Not Applicable 0	Ne Response 0	Means 4.30 [1 5 sede]
23. How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences?	Excellent 3	Above Average 4	Average 3	Below Average (Poor C	Not Applicable 0	No Response 0	Means 4.40 (1-5 scale)
21. How effectively did the instructor communicate?	Fyrellent 2	Alima Inverage 7	dueraça 1	Reliva Average	Davie C	And Applicable 0	Ne Becomose 0	Means 4.10 (1-5 scale)
33. How do you rate the availability of the instructor to help students outside of class?	Excellent	Above Average 3	Average z	Below Average t	Poor	Not Applicable U	No Response U	Mean: 4.30 [1-5 scale]
23. How do you rate this instructor?	Excellent	Allovo Average 2	Average	Bolton Average C	Poor	Sot Applicable 0	No Response 0	Heam 4.30 [1 5 sede]
ı								

ETST380A2 War, Militarism, and GI Resistance, Section 001 below as PDF files) are intended solely for viewing by the course instructor. Instructor: Benjamin Schrader, Instructor Students and other members of the CSU Collage and Department: Liberal Arts, Ethnic Studies community do not have access to these Term: Spring 2014 forms. You may, however, provide access Course Reference Number: 22575 to the survey forms to selected Enrollment: 22 incividuals. You can remove access to the forms at any time. Detailed Summary of Submitted Forms Options E Share Forms Survey Forms Submitted: 18 Menage Access to Forms 1. How well were the course Bellow Above New No Mean: 4.00 (1-5 scale) objectives communicated Excellent Average Average Poor Applicable Response to students? -44 0 0 O: 2. How well was the grading Above Bellow Niew No Mean: 4.11 (1-5 scale) system communicated to Excellent Average Average Average Poor Applicable Response students? 3 1 1 10 0 3. How well did class Above Below None Mean: 4.17 (1-5 scale) No sessions increase your Excellent Average Average Poor Apelicable Response Average uncerstancing of the suitject? 4 2 0 0 4. Now well did reading Below New Above Mean: 3.85 (1-5 scale) assignments increase Excellent Average Average Average Poor Applicable Response your understanding of the subject? 5. How well did other course Lhous Below Mean: 4.06 (1-5 scale) assignments increase Excellent Average Response Average Average Applicable your understanding of the subject? 2 5 o 1 2 o 6. How well did other Below Not No Mean: 4 00 (1-5 scale) Above learning resources used in Excellent Average Average Average Applicable Respons this course - such as related websites, software, study guides, and media - increase your understanding of the subject? 7. How well was feedback AFROME 5490w Plot. No Mean: 3.73 (1-5 scale) previded — such as Excellent Average Average Average Poor Applicable Response reviews, quirzes, es, and home э 2 * . 0 a - to help you track your pregress? 8. If you accessed source Above Below No Mean: 3.83 (1-5 scale) information through an Excellent Applicab Average Average криг online system — such as a website or Barret - how α co you rate the case of finding information? 9. How do you rate the A Property Bellow Most Min Mean: 3.89 (1-5 scale) darity and completeness Excellent Average Average Average Poor Applicable Respons of instructions provided in the course for engaging in 10 3 1 0 ш 1 3 dass activities and completing course work? 10. How do you rate the Hean: 3.72 (1.5 scale) intellectual challenge of Excellent Average Average Average Poor Applicable Response this course? 3 3 0 a 11. How do you rate this Above 3elow **Hot** Nio Mean: 3 89 (1-5 scale) merse? EXCERNIC Average Average Average Prov Applicable Response 3 1 2 0 a

12. How do you rate the instructor's knowledge of		Above		Below		Net	Ne	Mean: 4.50 (1-5 scole)
the subject?	Excellent 12	Average 3	Average	Average	Poor	Applicable	Response	
		,	,		,			I
13. How effectively did the		Above		Below		Net	No	Mean: 3.61 (1-5 scale)
instructor facilitate student learning?	Exections	Average	Average	Average	Pear	Applicable	Response	
	- 6	5	3	2	2	0	0	J
14. How do you rate the								1
instructor's enthusiasm for teaching the subject?	Excellent	Above	Average	Average	Poor	Not Applicable	No Besponse	Mean: 4.22 (1-5 scale)
for tracing the acojectr	11	2	4	0	1	0	0	
								,
15. How well did the instructor organize the	Evertient	Above	Average	Below	Owner	Not Applicable	No	Mean: 3.89 (1-5 scale)
courser	9	4	2	0	3	0	0	
								J
16. How prepared was the instructor for clear		Above		Below		Not	No	Mean: 4.05 (1-5 scale)
sessions?				Average		Applicable		
	11	2	2	1	2	0	0	J
17. Haw do you rate the		Appve		Berow		NGE	No	Mean: 3.67 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at managing class	Excellent		Average		Peor	Applicable		
sessons'		3	4	3	t	0	0]
18. How do you rate the								1
instructor's effectiveness	Excellent	Above	Average	Average	PROC	Applicable	No Hesponse	Mean: 3.75 (1-5 scale)
at facilitating ordina and/or in-class	,	E	4	×		2	U	
(communication, discussions, etc.)?								•
19. How de you rate the		Abone		Below		Not	No	Means 3.83 (1-5 scale)
instructor's fairness and importiality in the						Applicable	Response	
assignment of grades?	9	3	2	2	2	U	D D	
								,
23. How well did the		Above		Delow			No	,
23. How well did the instructor create as attemphere that was	Exadent	Abone Awarege	Average	Delow Average	Pour	Not Applicable	No Response	Means 3.22 (1-3 stole)
instructor create as atmosphere that was respectful of student	Excellent G		Average		Pour	Not		Means 3.22 (1-2 shole)
instructor create as atmosphere that was		Acustogu		Everage		Not Applicable	Response	Means 3.22 (1-2 stole)
instructor create as attemphene that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and		Awarege 1		Average 3		Not Applicable 0	Parapurase 0	
instructor create as atmosphere that was respectful of student aginions, ideas, and differences?	6	1 Abone	s	3 Below	э	Not Applicable	Parapurase 0	Means 3.82 (1-5 scale) Means 3.83 (1-5 scale)
instructor create as atmosphere that was respectful of student spinions, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did the	6	1 Abone	s	3 Below	э	Not Applicable 0	Parapurase 0	
instructor create as atmosphere that was respectful of student spinions, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did the instructor communicate?	G Excellent	Abore Average 4	S	Below Average	Poor	Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable U	ao Response U	Means 3.83 (1-5 scale)
instructor create as atmosphere that was respectful of student epinions, ideas, and differenceal 21. How effectively did the instructor communicate? 22. How do you rate the availability of the	Excellent B	Abore Abore Average 4	S Average 3	Below Average 1 Below	Poor 2	Nect Application o Nect Applicable	o so Response u	
instructor create as atmosphere that was respectful of student epinions, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did the instructor communicate? 22. How do you rate the	Excellent B	Abore Abore Average 4	S Average 3	Below Average 1 Below	Poor 2	Not Applicative 0 Not Applicable U	o so Response u	Means 3.83 (1-5 scale)
instructor create as atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did the instructor communicate? 22. How do you rate the availability of the instructor to help	Excellent B	Aboro Aboro Averege	Average 3	Below Average 1 Below Average	Poor 2	Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable U Not Applicable	So Response U	Means 3.83 (1-5 scale)
instructor create as atmosphere that was respectful of student spinions, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did the instructor communicate? 22. How do you rate the availability of the instructor to help	Excellent B Excellent 0	Abore Average 4 Abore Average 4 Abore	Average 3 Average 2	Below Average 1 Below Average 3	Poor 2 Poor 0	Nect Applicable U Nect Applicable U Nect Applicable O Nect	No Response U So Peaponse O So	Means 3.83 (1-5 scale)
instructor create as atmosphere that were respectful of student epinions, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did the instructor communicate? 22. How do you rate the availability of the instructor to help students arreids ad class? 23. How do you rate this	Excellent B Excellent 0	Abore Average 4 Abore Average 4 Abore buorope	Average 3 Average 2	Below Average 1 Below Average 3	Poor 2 Poor 0	Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable U Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable	No Response U No Response O No Response	Means 3.83 (1-5 scale) Means 4.11 (1.5 scale)
instructor create as atmosphere that were respectful of student spinions, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did the instructor communicate? 22. How do you rate the availability of the instructor to help students as existence? 23. How do you rate this	Excellent B Excellent 0	Abore Average 4 Abore Average 4 Abore	Average 3 Average 2	Below Average 1 Below Average 3	Poor 2 Poor 0	Nect Applicable U Nect Applicable U Nect Applicable O Nect	No Response U So Peaponse O So	Means 3.83 (1-5 scale) Means 4.11 (1.5 scale)

ETST100 Introduction to Ethnic Studies (GT-SS3), Section 001

Instructor: Berjamin Schrader, Instructor

College and Department: Liberal Arts, Ethnic Stucies

Term: Fall 2014

Course Reference Number: 67006

Enrollment: 45

Important Note: The survey forms submitted for this class include forms from both the version of the survey that was approved in 2010 and the version of the survey approved in 2013. Because the cuestions on the two forms differ, separate summaries are provided for each version.

below as PDF files) are intended solely for viewing by the murse instructor. Students and other members of the CSU sommunity do not have access to these furns. You may, however, provide access to the survey forms to selected individuals. You can remove access to the forms at any time.

Options

Shere Forme

Manage Access to Forms

Detailed Summary of Submitted Forms

Survey Forms Submitted: 36

Survey Version: Responses to the survey approved in 2016. (Responses: 23)

1. How well were the cours	e
objectives communicated	5
to students?	

Excellent	Above	Average	Eelew Average	Poor	Mot Applicable	No Beaconse
	E	11	a	2	0	0

Mean: 3,48 (1-5 scole)

 How well was the grading system communicated to students?

Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	Not Applicable	No Response
4	3	6	6	4	0	0

Mean: 2.87 (1-5 scale)

 How well did class assaions increase your understanding of the subject?

Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	Not Applicable	No Response
5	4	8	5	1	0	0

Mean: 3.30 (1-5 scale)

4. How well did reading assignments increase your understanding of the aubject?

Exicellent	Abuve Average	Average	Delew Average	POOF	Applicable	No Response
2.	4	7	7	3	0	0

Present: 2.78 (1-5 scale)

 Bow well did other course serignments increase your unserstanding of the subject?

Excellent	Average Average	Average	Below Average	Poer	Nut. Applicable	
-4	-4	13		1	2	n

Hean: 3.45 (1-5 years)

6. How well did other learning resources used in this course, such as related Web eiter, software, and study guides, increase your understanding of the

Excellent	Above	Average	Average	Poer	not Applicable	No Response
-4	-4	9	3	0	41	0

Mean: 3.47 (1-5 scare)

/ mow do you rate the intellectual challeage of this yourse?

publicat?

ı		Abeve		E-clow-		PROFE	Nie
ı	excellent	Average	werage.	Average.	PORF	Applicable	Response
	3	11	5	2	2		0

Henn: 3.40 (1-5 scale)

8. How do you rate this

Excellent	Average	Average	Average	Poer	Nut. Applicable	No Response
2	7	7	4	2		0

Heam: 3.04 (1-5 scale)

9 How do you rate the vecrall quality of the classroom?

Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below: Average	Poer	Not Applicable	No Response
2	2	139	3	1		0

Mean: 3.04 (1-5 scale)

LO. Bow do you note the quality of the furniture in

Excellent	Above Average	Averege	Relow Average	Poer	Not Applicable	
3	3	1.8		4		U

Mean 3 Rt (1 5 crole)

13. Mow do you rate the quality of the equipment (computers, projectors, and so on) in the classroom?

expellent	Abeve Average	nverage	Eclow Average	PORF	Not applicable	No Response
2	3	13	3	2		0

Mean: 3.00 (1-5 scale)

12. If a course manager	ment.		Above		Below		Not	No	Mean: 2.95 (1-5 scale)
system such as Kan used in this course,		rellent		Average		Page	Applicable		Made: 2.95 (1-5 k3(0)
you rate this course		2	3	30	2	3	3		
management system	n?	_						-	J
13. How do you rate the									1
instructor's knowled	ten of	er Tons	Above	Average	Below	Conn	Not Applicable	Ro	Means 4.01 (1-5 scale)
the subject?	-	9	a	4		2	0	3	
		-	•	-	2	-		,	J
14. How effectively did									1
instructor facilitate	RC116MOT	nellient.	Above	Averace	Average	Page	Not Applicable	Response	Mean: 3.04 (1-5 scale)
learning?		3	6	5	,	2	0	2	
		-	-			-		-	J
15. How do you rate the									l
instructor's enthusia	E SE	callient	Atove	Average	Average	Poor	Not Applicable	Response	Mean: 3.65 (1-5 scale)
teaching the subject	.,	7	6	6	3		0	9	
						_			J
16. How well did the int	tructor		Above		Below		Not	No	Mean; 3.09 (1-9 state)
organize the course	? Exc	callient		Average		Peor	Applicable		
		э с	4	9	6		0		
									J
17. How prepared was t	ne		Ahove		Below		Not	No	Mean: 3.75 (1-5 scale)
instructor for class sessions?	Exc	collient		Average		Pear	Applicable		
Sessons		6	7	8	2	0	0		
									J
10. How do you rate the			Above		Below		Not	No	Mean: 3.30 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effective at managing dass	Exc	cellent		Average		Peor	Applicable		1.37 [2.7 5.00]
sessions?		4	6	5	7	0	0	0	
19. How do you rate the									
19. How do you rate the		oellent	ADOVE Average	Average	BBDW Average	Peor	NO1 Applicable	NG Response	Mean: 3.20 (1-5 scare)
	Exc	cellient 5		Average 7		Peor L			Mean: 3.25 (1-5 scare)
instructor's fairness importiality in the	Exc		Average		Average		Applicable	Response	Mean: 3.25 (3-5 scare)
instructor's falmess importality is the assignment of grade 20. How well did the ins	Envetor		Average		Average		Applicable	Response	Mean: 3.25 (1-5 scale)
instructor's falmess importality is the assignment of grade	Arruetter	5	4 Ahove	7	6 Relbar	ı	Applicable 0	Q Un	
instructor's fairness importality is the assignment of grade 20. How well did the ins create an atmosphe mes responded of st opinions, ideas, and	tructor re that	5	4 Ahove	7	6 Relbar	ı	Applicable 0 Not	Q Un	
instructor's fairness impart ality is the assignment of grade 20. How well did the ins create an atmosphe was respectful of si-	tructor re that	S	4 Ahrve nverage	7 Average	6 Below Average	I. Peor	Applicable 0 Not Applicable	Ue Response	
instructor's fairness importality is the assignment of grade 20. How well did the ins create an atmosphe mes responded of st opinions, ideas, and	the	S cellens g	Average 4 Above 3	7 Average 2	6 Reibw average 6 Balbw	l Peor	Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 0	0 Me	
instructor's fairness importality is the assignment of grade 20. How well did the instruction create an atmosphe was respectful of straining, ideas, and differences?	the	S cellent G	Above Above Above	7 //verage 2 //verage	6 Below Average 6 Below Average	Psor	Apolicable 0 Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable	Me kesponse o	Meant 3 35 (1-5 scale)
instructor's fairness importality is the assignment of grade 20. How well did the instruction create an atmosphe was respectful of straining, ideas, and differences?	the	S cellens g	Average 4 Above 3	7 Average 2	6 Reibw average 6 Balbw	l Peor	Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 0	0 Me	Meant 3 35 (1-5 scale)
instructor's fairness importality is the assignment of grade 20. How well did the instructor an atmosphe mes respondful of strainings, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively sid- instructor communic	Atructor restart sident	S cellent G	Above nverage 3 Above nverage 2	7 //verage 2 //verage	Average 6 Rehw Average 6 Below Average 7	Psor	Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 0	Mc Response 0	Mean: 3.36 (1.5 scale)
instructor's fairness importality is the assignment of grade. 20. How well did the instructor an atmosphe was respectful of at pointing, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did instructor communicative and a second and a second	Arruster on that when the rate?	oeilens o oeilens	Above Above Above Above	7 //verage 2 //verage 8	Average 6 Balow Average 6 Balow Average 7	Paor 3	Apolicable 0 Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable	Ne Ne Ne	Meant 3 35 (1-5 scale)
instructor's fairness importality is the assignment of grade. 20. How well did the inscrease an atmosphe may respectful of stropinions, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did instructor communications are communicated as a second communicated commu	Arruster on that when the rate?	oeilens o oeilens	Above Above Above Above	7 //verage 2 //verage 8	Average 6 Balow Average 6 Balow Average 7	Paor 3	Apolicable 0 Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 0 Not	Ne Ne Ne	Mean: 3.36 (1.5 scale)
instructor's fairness importality is the assignment of grade. 20. How well did the inscreate an atmosphe was respectful of straining, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did instructor communicative and a straining and instructor communicative and a straining	Arruster on that when the rate?	oeilens ooilens d	Above Above Above Above Average 2	7 Average 8 Average	Below Average 6 Below Average 7	Paor	Apolicable 0 Apolicable 0 Apolicable 0 Apolicable	Me Response 0 Ne Response 0	Mean: 3.36 (1.5 scale)
instructor is fairness importality in the assignment of grade. 20. How well did the inscreament an abresphames respectful of sit pointiess, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did instructor communicative descriptions availability of the instructor to help stoutside of class? 23. How do you rate this custained and class?	the rate?	oeilens ooilens d	Above Above Above Above Average 2	7 Average 8 Average	Below Average 6 Below Average 7	Paor	Apolicable 0 Apolicable 0 Apolicable 0 Apolicable	Me Response 0 Ne Response 0	Mean: 3.36 (1.5 scale)
instructor's fairness importality is the assignment of grade. 20. How well did the instructor an atmosphe was respectful of straining, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively eld-instructor communicative communicative development instructor to help structor of class?	the rate?	oeilens d oeilens d	Above Above Above Above Average 7	7 //verage 2 //verage 8 //verage 5	Below Average 6 Below Average 7 Delow Average 5	Paor	Apolicable O Not Apolicable O Not Apolicable I	Mc kesponse o o Nc kesponse o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o	Means 3.35 (1.5 scale) Means 3.35 (1.5 scale)
instructor is fairness importality in the assignment of grade. 20. How well did the inscreament an abresphames respectful of sit pointiess, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did instructor communicative descriptions availability of the instructor to help stoutside of class? 23. How do you rate this custained and class?	the rate?	oeilens d oeilens d	Above Above Above Above Average 7	7 //verage 2 //verage 8 //verage 5	Below Average 6 Below Average 7 Delow Average 5	Paor	Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 0 Apolicable 1	Mc kesponse o o No kesponse o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o	Means 3.35 (1.5 scale) Means 3.35 (1.5 scale)
instructor's fairness importality in the assignment of grade 20. How well did the instructor an atmosphe was respectful of at pointing, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did instructor communicative and the experimental state of the instructor to help stoutside of class? 23. How de you rate this instructor?	Arruster resthat steel.	oellens d oellens d	Above Average 2 Above Average 7 Above Average 7	7 Average 8 Average 5	Below Average 5 Delow Average 5 Delow Average 5	Paor 3	Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 1 Not Apolicable	Mc sesponse o o No sesponse o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o	Means 3.35 (1.5 scale) Means 3.35 (1.5 scale)
instructor is fairness importality in the assignment of grade. 20. How well did the inscreament an abresphames respectful of sit pointiess, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did instructor communicative descriptions availability of the instructor to help stoutside of class? 23. How do you rate this custained and class?	Arruster resthat steril	oellens d oellens d oellens 4	Above Above Average 2 Above Average 7 Above Average 7	7 Average 8 Average 5	Below Average 5 Below Average 5 Below Average 3 Below Average 3	Paor 3	Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 1 Not Apolicable 0 Not Not Not Not Not Not Not Not	Mc kesponse o o Na Na Response o o Na Response o o Na Response o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o	Means 3.35 (1.5 scale) Means 3.35 (1.5 scale)
instructor's fairness importality is the assignment of grade. 20. How well did the instructor an atmosphe was respectful of straining, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did instructor communicative factors are instructor to help structor to help structor of class? 23. How de you rate this instructor? 24. How de you rate this instructor?	Arractor resthat milent	opilient opilient opilient d opilient d	Above Average 2 Above Average 7 Above Average 7	7 Average 8 Average 5 Average 6	Below Average 5 Below Average 5 Below Average 3 Below Average 3	Paor 3 Paor 3 Paor	Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 1 Not Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable	Me suspense o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o	Mean: 3.35 (1.5 scale) Mean: 3.35 (1.5 scale) Mean: 3.35 (1.5 scale)
instructor's fairness importality is the assignment of grade. 20. How well did the instructor an atmosphe was respectful of straining, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did instructor communicative factors are instructor to help structor to help structor of class? 23. How de you rate this instructor? 24. How de you rate this instructor?	Arractor resthat milent	oellens d oellens d oellens 4	Above Above Average 2 Above Average 7 Above Average 7	7 Average 8 Average 5	Below Average 5 Below Average 5 Below Average 3 Below Average 3	Paor 3	Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 1 Not Apolicable 0 Not Not Not Not Not Not Not Not	Mc kesponse o o Na Na Response o o Na Response o o Na Response o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o	Mean: 3.35 (1.5 scale) Mean: 3.35 (1.5 scale) Mean: 3.35 (1.5 scale)
instructor's fairness importality is the assignment of grade. 20. How well did the instructor an atmosphe was respectful of straining, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did instructor communicative factors are instructor to help structor to help structor of class? 23. How de you rate this instructor? 24. How de you rate this instructor?	the rate? Exc	opilient opilient opilient d opilient d	Above Average 2 Above Average 7 Above Average 7 Above Average 4	7 Average 8 Average 5 Average 6	Below Average 5 Below Average 5 Below Average 5 Below Average 3 Below Average 0	Paor 3 Paor 3 Paor	Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 1 Not Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 0 Apolicable 0	Mc No	Mean: 3.35 (1-5 scale) Mean: 3.35 (1-5 scale) Mean: 3.26 (1-5 scale)
instructor's fairness importality is the assignment of grade. 20. How well did the inscreate an abresphe may respectful of site to initially, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did instructor communicative of the instructor to help stoutside of class? 23. How do you rate this instructor? 24. How do you rate this instructor?	the rate? Exc	opilient d opilient d opilient d opilient	Above Above Average 2 Above Average 7 Above Average 1	7 Average 8 Average 5 Average 6	Below Average 5 Below Average 5 Below Average 3 Below Average 0 Delow Average 0	Paor 3 Paor 3 Paor 3	Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 1 Not Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable	Me suspense o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o	Mean: 3.36 (1.5 scale) Mean: 3.36 (1.5 scale) Mean: 3.36 (1.5 scale)
instructor's fairness importality in the assignment of grade 20. How well did the instructor an atmosphe was respectful of at pointing, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did instructor communicative and assignment of the instructor to help stoutside of class? 23. How de you rate this instructor? 24. How de you rate this instructor? 25. How de you rate yes attendance in this o	the rate? Exc	opilient d opilient d opilient d opilient	Above Above Average 2 Above Average 7 Above Average 1	7 Average 8 Average 5 Average 6	Below Average 5 Below Average 5 Below Average 3 Below Average 0 Delow Average 0	Paor 3 Paor 3 Paor 3	Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 1 Not Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable 0 Not Apolicable	Me suspense o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o	Mean: 3.35 (1-5 scale) Mean: 3.35 (1-5 scale) Mean: 3.26 (1-5 scale)

ine scanned survey forms (available ETST380A2 War, Militarism, and GI Resistance, Section 001 below as POF files) are intended solely for viewing by the course instructor. Instructor: Benjamin Schrader, Instructor Students and other members of the CSU College and Department: Liberal Arts, Ethnic Studies community do not have access to these Term: Spring 2015 forms. You may, however, provide access Course Reference Number: 24699 to the survey forms to selected Enrollment: 25 individuals. You can remove access to the forms at any time. Detailed Summary of Submitted Forms Options: Share Forms Survey Forms Submitted: 20 Manage Access to Forms 1. How well were the course Above Below Not Mean: 4.90 (1-5 scale) objectives communicated Excellent Average Average Poor Applicable Response to students? 18 2 О 0 0 0 ∠ How well was the grading Above Below Not Nο Mean: 4.65 (1-5 scale) system communicated to Excellent Average Average Poor Applicable Response students? 14 5 0 0 0 3. How well did class Above Below Not No Mean: 4.60 (1-5 scale) sessions increase your Excellent: Average Average Average Poor Applicable Response understanding of the subject? 15 4 0 0 1 0 0 4. How well did reading Above Relow Mean: 4.45 (1-5 scale) Not No assignments increase Excellent: Average Average Poor Applicable Response your understanding of the subject? 5. How well did other course Below Mean: 4.40 (1-5 scale) assignments increase Excellent: Average Average Poor Applicable Response your understanding of the subject? 5. How well did other About Below Minit Meas: 4.33 (1-5 scale) Nin learning resources used in Excellent Average Average Average Poor Applicable Response this course - such as related websites, O 11 4 2 O software, study guides. and media - increase your understanding of the subject? 7. How well was feedback Above Below Minit Meas: 4.35 (1-5 scale) provided - such as Excellent Average Average Average Page Applicable Response reviews, quizzes, critiques, and homework 5 0 0 12 2 1 0 - to help you track your progress? 8. If you accessed course Above Below Not No Meas: 4.45 (1-5 scale) information through an Excellent Poor Average Average Applicable Response Average online system - such as a website or RamCT - how 14 2 3 O 0 0 1 do you rate the ease of finding information? 9. How do you rate the Below Not Meas: 4.50 (1-5 scale) Above No clarity and completeness Excellent Average Average Average Poor Applicable Response of instructions provided in the course for engaging in 0 class activities and completing course work?

How do you rate this course?

13. How do you rate the

this course?

intellectual challenge of

Above Below Not No Excellen: Average Average Poor Applicable Response

Delicer

Average

0

Average

3

Alleran

Average

6

Excellen:

10

No

Response

0

Meas: 4.20 (1-5 scale)

Mode

Applicable

O

12. How so you rat		Everillant	Above	Average	Below	Door	Not Applicable	No	Mean: 4.85 (L-5 scale)
the subject?		17	3	0	O	0	D D	0	
		ar.	-			-			
13 How effectively			Above		Below		Not	No	Mean: 4.60 (1-5 scale)
student learning		Excellent		average		POOF	Applicable		
		15	4	0	0	1	D	0	
14 How do you rat instructor's en	thusiasm	Dwellert	Above	Average	Below	Coor	NOT Applicable	NO Bername	Mean: 4.95 (1-5 scale)
for teaching th	e subject?	19	1	0	0	0	D	0	
			-						
15. How well did to			Abeve		Below		Not	No	Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale)
instructor orga course?	saize the	Excellent	Average	Average	Average	Poor	Applicable	Response	
		TV.	1	1		.0	9		
16. How prepared instructor for c		Excellent	Above	Average	Relow	Poor	Not Applicable	No Response	Mean: 4.75 (1:5 crale)
sessivus?		36)	1	o		p	0	
		-							
17. How do you rat		I	Above		Below		Not	No	Mean: 4.50 (L-5 scale)
at managing of		Excellert		Average		Poor	Applicable		1.50 (1
sessions?		13	6	n	0	11	n	0	
18. How so you rat		Excellert	Above	Average	Below	Poor	Not Applicable	No Response	Mean: 4.74 (1-5 scale)
atfacilitating of and/or in-class		15	3	1	0	0	1	0	
interactions (communication						_	-		
(communicació									
discussions, et	14.)?								
		ı							
19. How do you rat instructor's fai	te the	Freedlant	Above	Anarana	Below	Dur	Not Applicable	No Parament	Mean: 4.55 (1-5 scale)
19. How do you rat instructor's fail impartiality in	te the rness and the		Average	_	Average		Applicable	Response	Mean: 4.55 (1-5 scale)
19. How do you rat instructor's fai	te the rness and the	Excellent 15		Average 1		Poor 1			Mean: 4.55 (1-5 scale)
19. How do you rat instructor's fai impartiality in assignment of	te the rness and the grades?		Average	_	Average		Applicable	Response	Mean: 4.55 (1-5 scale)
19. How do you rat instructor's fail impartiality in	te the rnase and the grades?	15	Average 3 Above	1	0 Below	1	Applicable 0 Not	0 No	Mean: 4.55 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.30 (1-5 scale)
19. How do you rat instructor's fai impartiality in assignment of 20. How well did the instructor creat atmosphere the	te the rness and the grades? he te an at was	15 Excellent	Average 3 Above Average	1 Average	0 Below Average	1 Pour	Applicable 0 Not Applicable	0 No Response	
19. How do you rat instructor's fai impartiality in assignment of 20. How well did th instructor crear	te the rness and the grades? he te an at was	15	Average 3 Above	1	0 Below	1	Applicable 0 Not	0 No	
19. How do you rat instructor's fail impartiality in assignment of 20. How well did the instructor creates atmosphere the respectful of st	te the rness and the grades? he te an at was	15 Excellent	Average 3 Above Average	1 Average	0 Below Average	1 Pour	Applicable 0 Not Applicable	0 No Response	
19. How do you ratinstructor's failinpartiality in assignment of atmosphere the respectful of stopinions, ideas differences?	te the rnase and the grades? he te an at was tudent t, and	15 Excellent	Average 3 Above Average	1 Average	0 Below Average	1 Pour	Applicable 0 Not Applicable	0 No Response	
19. How do you rat instructor's fail impartiality in assignment of 20. How well did the instructor creates atmosphere the respectful of st opinions, ideas	te the rnase and the grades? he te an at was tudent , and	15 Excellent 11	Average 3 Above Average 6 Above	1 Average 2	Average 0 Below Average 0 Below	Pour	Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0	No Response 0 No Response 0	
19. How do you ratinstructor's failingartiality in assignment of 20. How well did thinstructor creatatmosphere the respectful of stopinions, ideas differences?	te the rnase and the grades? he te an at was tudent , and	Excellent 11 Excellent	Average 3 Above Average 6 Above Average	Average 2	Average 0 Sclow Average 0 Sclow Average	Pour 1	Applicable O Not Applicable O Not Applicable	No Response 0	Mean: 4.30 (1-5 scale)
19. How do you ratinstructor's failing impartiality in assignment of 20. How well did thin structor creatatmosphere the respectful of stopinions, ideas differences?	te the rnase and the grades? he te an at was tudent , and	15 Excellent 11	Average 3 Above Average 6 Above	1 Average 2	Average 0 Below Average 0 Below	Pour	Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0	No Response 0 No Response 0	Mean: 4.30 (1-5 scale)
19. How do you ratinstructor's failing impartiality in assignment of a sasignment of state opinions, ideas a differences? 21. How effectively instructor committee a sasignment of sasi	te the rness and the grades? he te an at was tudent , and y did the municate?	Excellent 11 Excellent	Average 3 Above Average 6 Above Average	Average 2	Average 0 Sclow Average 0 Sclow Average	Pour 1	Applicable O Not Applicable O Not Applicable	No Response 0	Mean: 4.30 (1-5 scale)
19. How do you ratinstructor's failingartiality in assignment of 20. How well did thinstructor creatatmosphere the respectful of stopinions, ideas differences? 21. How effectively instructor comments.	te the rness and the grades? he te an at was tudent , and y did the municate?	Excellent 11 Excellent 13	Above Above Average 6 Above Average 3	Average 2 Average 3	Below Average 0 Below Average 0	Pour 1	Applicable O Not Applicable O Not Applicable O Not	No Response 0 No Response 0	Mean: 4.30 (1-5 scale)
19. How do you ratinatructor's failimpartiality in assignment of 20. How well did thinstructor creatatmosphere the respectful of stopinions, ideas differences? 21. How effectively instructor communications are serviced as a service of the instructor communication of the instructor to be instructor to be serviced as a service of the instructor to be serviced as a serviced as a service of the instructor to be serviced as a serviced a	te the irnase and the grades? he te an at was tudent t, and y did the municate?	Excellent 11 Excellent 13	Above Average 6 Above Average 3 Above Average	Average 2 Average 3	Below Average 0 Below Average 0	Pour 1	Applicable O Not Applicable O Not Applicable O	No Response 0 No Response 0	Mean: 4.30 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.35 (1-5 scale)
19. How do you ratinstructor's failingartiality in assignment of 20. How well did the instructor creatatmosphere the respectful of stopinions, ideas differences? 21. How effectively instructor commonstructor commons	te the irnase and the grades? he te an at was tudent t, and y did the municate?	Excellent 11 Excellent 13	Above Above Average 6 Above Average 3	Average 2 Average 3	Below Average 0 Below Average 0	Pour 1	Applicable O Not Applicable O Not Applicable O Not	No Response 0 No Response 0	Mean: 4.30 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.35 (1-5 scale)
19. How do you ratinstructor's failimpartiality in assignment of 20. How well did thinstructor creatatmosphere the respectful of stopinions, ideas differences? 21. How effectively instructor communications as a series of the students outside students outside instructor to be students outside.	te the rnase and the grades? he te an at was tudent , and y did the municate? te the the de of class?	Excellent 11 Excellent 13	Above Average 6 Above Average 3 Above Average	Average 2 Average 3	Below Average 0 Below Average 0 Below Average	Pour 1	Applicable O Not Applicable O Not Applicable O Not Applicable Applicable	No Response 0 No Response 0 No Response 0 No Response 0	Mean: 4.30 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.35 (1-5 scale)
19. How do you ratinstructor's failimpartiality in assignment of 20. How well did thinstructor creatatmosphere the respectful of stopinions, ideas differences? 21. How effectively instructor common to the students outside students outside 23. How do you ratinstructor to be students outside 23. How do you ratinstructor to be students outside 23. How do you ratinstructor to be students outside 23. How do you ratinstructor to be students outside 23.	te the rnase and the grades? he te an at was tudent , and y did the municate? te the the de of class?	Excellent 11 Excellent 13 Excellent 12	Above Above Average 3 Above Average 3 Above Average 3 Above	Average 2 Average 3 Average 3	Average 0 Below Average 0 Below Average 0 Below Average 0	Pour 1 Pour 0	Applicable O Not Applicable O Not Applicable O Not Applicable 2 Not	No Response 0 No Response 0 No Response 0 No Response 0	Mean: 4.30 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.35 (1-5 scale)
19. How do you ratinstructor's failimpartiality in assignment of assignment of the students of the students outside the students outsid	te the rnase and the grades? he te an at was tudent , and y did the municate? te the the de of class?	Excellent 11 Excellent 13 Excellent 12	Above Above Average 3 Above Average 3 Above Average 3 Above	Average 2 Average 3 Average 3	Average 0 Below Average 0 Below Average 0 Below Average 0	Pour 1 Pour 0	Applicable O Not Applicable O Not Applicable O Not Applicable 2	No Response 0 No Response 0 No Response 0 No Response 0	Mean: 4.30 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.35 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.50 (1-5 scale)
19. How do you ratinstructor's failimpartiality in assignment of 20. How well did thinstructor creatatmosphere the respectful of stopinions, ideas differences? 21. How effectively instructor communications are said assignment of the students outside 23. How do you ratinstructor to be students outside 23. How do you ratinstructor to be students outside 23. How do you ratinstructor to be students outside 23. How do you ratinstructor to be students outside 23.	te the rnase and the grades? he te an at was tudent , and y did the municate? te the the de of class?	Excellent 11 Excellent 13 Excellent 12	Above Above Average 3 Above Average 3 Above Average 3 Above	Average 2 Average 3 Average 3	Average 0 Below Average 0 Below Average 0 Below Average 0	Pour 1 Pour 0	Applicable O Not Applicable O Not Applicable O Not Applicable 2 Not	No Response 0 No Response 0 No Response 0 No Response 0	Mean: 4.30 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.35 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.50 (1-5 scale)

the scattled survey ruting (evenesie ETST100 Introduction to Ethnic Studies (GT-SS3), Section 001 below as PDF files) are intended solely Instructor: Benjamin Schrader, Instructor for viewing by the course instructor. Students and other members of the CSU College and Department: Liberal Arts, Ethnic Studies community do not have access to these Term: Spring 2015 forms. You may, however, provide access Course Reference Number: 21955 to the survey forms to selected Enrollment: 44 individuals. You can remove access to the forms at any time. Detailed Summary of Submitted Forms Options: Share Forms Survey Forms Submitted: 36 Manage Access to Forms 1. How well were the course Above Below Not Mean: 3.94 (1-5 scale) objectives communicated Excellent Average Average Poor Applicable Response to students? 14 9 0 a 2. How well was the grading Below Above Not Mean: 4.06 (1-5 scale) system communicated to Excellent Average Average Poor Applicable Response atudenta? 10 2 3. How well did class Above Below Not No Mean: 4.14 (1-5 scale) sessions increase your Excellent Average Average Poor Applicable Response understanding of the subject? 20 7 5 2 0 a 2 4. How well did reading Above Below Not No Mean: 3.64 (1-5 scale) assignments increase Excellent Average Average Poor Applicable Response your understanding of the subject? 12 3 0 a 11 6 4 5. How well did other course Above Below Not No Mean: 3.61 (1-5 scale) assignments increase Excellent Average Average Average Poor Applicable Response your understanding of the subject? 10 ß 7 3 3 5 ä 6. How well did other Solow Hears 3.67 (5-5 scale) Scenning resources used in Exactlent Average Average Average Poor Applicable Basponse Unio comune - south es related websites. SOF Walfe, STUTY QUIDES, and media - increase your understanding of the multipact? 7. Here well was toodback Hearts 3.47 (5-5 scale) Above Gollery Plot All the provided such as Excellent Average Applicable: Average Average Pear Випропис culture, unleave, sat University and Departments. 11 4 1.4 . 1.1 - so melo you track your CITOCITES CA 9. If you secsesed course Above No Salbre Not Heart 2.75 (5-6 ccolb) information through an **Excellent** Avversor Suremone Average Poor Applicable Response entine system such as a website or RemOT how My you nate the case of **ADDIVE** 9500796 PACE 100 Means 3.75 (3-5-90)(9) clarity and completeness of instructions provided in the course for engaging in 12 9 2 0 1.0 3 dess edivities and completing course work? 30. How six you note the Marro Sellen 200 teams 3.50 (8-5 scale) intellectual challenge of this course. Exactlent Arenave Name and Co. Percentage Flori Austrative SECURITY ... 10 6 15 3 3 0 0 III. How do you note this Not Heart 2.75 (\$-6 ccolb) Above Essellant Average Average Peor Applicable Basponse

									1
1.2.	How do you rete the instructor's knowledge of		Above		Below		Net	No	Mean: 4.47 (1-5 scale)
	the subject?	Excellent	Average	Average	Average	Poor	Applicable	Response	
		22	11	1	2		0	n	
									J
	How effectively did the								1
	instructor facilitate	E	Above		Relow		Net	No.	Mean: 3.89 (1-5 scale)
	student learning?	Excellent	Average	Average	Average	Poor	Applicable	Response	
		14	11	5	5	1	0	0	
									,
14.	How do you rate the		Above		Below		Net	No	Mean: 4.06 (1-5 scale)
	instructor's erthusiasm	Excellent		Average		Poor	Applicable		Mean: 4.06 (1-3 scare)
	for teaching the subject?								
		17	10	3	2	2	0	0	J
15.	How well did the		Alone		Below		Not	No	Mean: 3.69 (1-3 scale)
	instructor organize the course?	Excellent	Average	Average	Average	Poor	Applicable	Response	
		:5	9	7	3	2	0	0	
									J
16.	Now prepared was the							No.	1
	instructor for class	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	Not Applicable	No Response	Mean: 4.11 (1-5 scale)
	sessions?								
		19	8	5	2	2	0	0	
17.	How do you rate the		Above		Below		Not	No	Means 3.89 (1-5 scale)
	instructor's effectiveness at managing class	Excellent	Average	Average	Average	Poor	Applicable	Response	
	sessions?	14	11	5	2	3	0	1	
									J
	Now do you rate the								1
	instructor's effectiveness	Excellent	Above	Average	Below	Dane	Not Applicable	No Response	Mean: 4.09 (1-5 scale)
	at facilitating online		rive ange	ge	riter age		rigip in out on the	- ve apro-	
	and/or in-class	:8	5	8	2	1	1	1	
	and/or in-class								
	and/or in-class								
	and/or in-class interactions (communication,								
19.	and/or in-class interactions (communication,		5		2		1	1	Norma 4 22 (4.5 conto)
19.	and/or in-class intersettions (communication, cliscussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's fairness and	18	5 Above	8	2 Below	1	1 Not	1 No	Nean: 4.22 (1·5 scale)
19.	and/or in-class intersetions (communication, discussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the	18 Excellent	5 Above Average	8 Average	2 Below Average	1. Poor	Not Applicable	No Response	Nean: 4.22 (1-5 scale)
19.	and/or in-class intersettions (communication, cliscussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's fairness and	18	5 Above	8	2 Below	1	1 Not	1 No	Nean: 4.22 (1-5 scale)
19.	and/or in-class intersetions (communication, discussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the	18 Excellent	5 Above Average	8 Average	2 Below Average	1. Poor	Not Applicable	No Response	Nean: 4.22 (1-5 scale)
	and/or in-class intersettions (communication, discussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? How well did the	18 Excellent	5 Above Average	8 Average	2 Below Average	1. Poor	Not Applicable	No Response	Nean: 4.22 (1-5 scale) Nean: 4.08 (1-5 scale)
	and/or in-class interactions (communication, ciscussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? How well did the instructor create an	:8 Excellent 18	Above Average 11	Average 5	Below Average 1	Poor	Not Applicable 0	No Response	
	and/or in-class intersetions (communication, ciscussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was	Excellent 18 Excellent	Above Average 11 Above Average	Average 5	Below Average 1 selow Average	Poor 1	Not Applicable 0	No Response 0	
	and/or in-class interactions (communication, ciscussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? How well did the instructor create an	:8 Excellent 18	Above Average 11	Average 5	Below Average 1	Poor	Not Applicable 0	No Response 0	
	and/or in-class intersetions (communication, cliscussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student	Excellent 18 Excellent	Above Average 11 Above Average	Average 5	Below Average 1 selow Average	Poor 1	Not Applicable 0	No Response 0	
20.	and/or in-class intersetions (communication, discussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences?	Excellent 18 Excellent	Above Average 11 Above Average	Average 5	Below Average 1 selow Average	Poor 1	Not Applicable 0	No Response 0	
20.	and/or in-class intersetions (communication, cliscussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? How effectively did the	Excellent 18 Excellent	Above Average 11 Above Average	Average 5	Below Average 1 selow Average	Poor 1	Not Applicable 0	No Response 0	
20.	and/or in-class intersetions (communication, discussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences?	Excellent 18 Excellent 19	Above Average 11 Above 8	Average 5 Average 4	Below Average 1 Below Average 3	Poor 1	Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0	No Response 0 No Response 0	Nean: 4.08 (1-5 scare)
20.	and/or in-class intersetions (communication, cliscussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? How effectively did the	Excellent 18 Excellent 19	Above Average 11 Above 8	Average 5 Average 4	Below Average 1 Below Average 3	Poor 1	Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable	No Response 0 No Response 0	Nean: 4.08 (1-5 scare)
20.	and/or in-class intersetions (communication, cliscussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? How effectively did the	Excellent 18 Excellent 19 Excellent	Above Average 11 Above Average 8 Above Average	Average 5 Average 4	Below Average 1 selow Average 3 Below Average	Poor 1 Poor 2	Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable	No Response 0 No Response 0	Nean: 4.08 (1-5 scare)
20.	and/or in-class intersettions (communication, cliscussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's farmess and impartiality in the assignment of grades? How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? How effectively did the instructor communicate?	Excellent 18 Excellent 19 Excellent	Above Average 11 Above Average 8 Above Average	Average 5 Average 4	Below Average 1 selow Average 3 Below Average	Poor 1 Poor 2	Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable	No Response 0 No Response 0	Nean: 4.08 (1-5 scare)
20.	and/or in-class intersetions (communication, ciscussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's farmess and impartiality in the assignment of grades? How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? How effectively did the instructor communicate?	Excellent 18 Excellent 19 Excellent 15	Above Average 11 Above Average 8 Above Average 7	Average 5 Average 4 Average 10	Below Average 1 selow Average 3 Below Average 3	Poor 1 Poor 2 Poor 1	Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0	No Response 0 No Response 0	Nean: 4.08 (1-5 scare)
20.	and/or in-class intersettions (communication, cliscussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's farmess and impartiality in the assignment of grades? How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? How effectively did the instructor communicate?	Excellent 18 Excellent 19 Excellent 15	Above Average 11 Above Average 8 Above Average 7	Average 5 Average 4 Average 10	Below Average 1 selow Average 3 Below Average 3	Poor 1 Poor 2 Poor 1	Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0	No Response 0 No Response 0	Nean: 4.08 (1-5 scale) Nean: 3.89 (1-5 scale)
20.	and/or in-class intersetions (communication, discussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, idear, and differences? How effectively did the instructor communicate?	Excellent 18 Excellent 19 Excellent 15	Above Average 11 Above Average 8 Above Average 7	Average 5 Average 4 Average 10	Below Average 1 selow Average 3 Below Average 3	Poor 1 Poor 2 Poor 1	Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0	No Response 0 No Response 0	Nean: 4.08 (1-5 scale) Nean: 3.89 (1-5 scale)
20.	and/or in-class intersetions (communication, cliscussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? How effectively did the instructor communicate? How do you rate the availability of the instructor to help	Excellent 18 Excellent 19 Excellent 15	Above Average 11 Above Average 8 Above Average 7 Above Average	Average 4 Average 10	Below Average 1 Below Average 3 Below Average	Poor 1 Poor 1 Poor 1	Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0	No Response 0 No Response 0 No Response 0	Nean: 4.08 (1-5 scale) Nean: 3.89 (1-5 scale)
21.	and/or in-class intersetions (communication, cliscussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? How effectively did the instructor communicate? How do you rate the availability of the instructor to help students owiside of class?	Excellent 18 Excellent 19 Excellent 15	Above Average 11 Above Average 8 Above Average 7 Above Average >	Average 4 Average 10	Below Average 1 Below Average 3 Below Average U	Poor 1 Poor 1 Poor 1	Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 8	No Response 0 No Response 0	Nean: 4.08 (1-5 scale) Nean: 3.89 (1-5 scale) Nean: 4.04 (1-5 scale)
21.	and/or in-class intersetions (communication, cliscussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? How effectively did the instructor communicate? How do you rate the availability of the instructor to help	Excellent 18 Excellent 19 Excellent 15 Excellent 15	Above Average 11 Above Average 7 Above Average 5 Above	Average 5 Average 4 Average 10	Below Average 1 Below Average 3 Below Average U Below	Poor 1 Poor 1 Poor 2	Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 8	No Response 0 No Response 0 No Response 0 No Response 0	Nean: 4.08 (1-5 scale) Nean: 3.89 (1-5 scale)
21.	and/or in-class intersettions (communication, discussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? How effectively did the instructor communicate? How do you rate the availability of the instructor to help students outside of class?	Excellent 18 Excellent 19 Excellent 15 Excellent 15	Above Average 11 Above Average 7 Above Average 5 Above	Average 5 Average 4 Average 10	Below Average 1 Below Average 3 Below Average U Below	Poor 1 Poor 1 Poor 2	Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 8	No Response 0 No Response 0 No Response 0 No Response 0	Nean: 4.08 (1-5 scale) Nean: 3.89 (1-5 scale) Nean: 4.04 (1-5 scale)
21.	and/or in-class intersettions (communication, discussions, etc.)? How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? How effectively did the instructor communicate? How do you rate the availability of the instructor to help students outside of class?	Excellent 18 Excellent 19 Excellent 15 Excellent 15	Above Average 11 Above Average 7 Above Average 5 Above	Average 5 Average 4 Average 10	Below Average 1 Below Average 3 Below Average U Below	Poor 1 Poor 1 Poor 2	Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 8	No Response 0 No Response 0 No Response 0 No Response 0	Nean: 4.08 (1-5 scale) Nean: 3.89 (1-5 scale) Nean: 4.04 (1-5 scale)

The scenned survey forms (available ETST365 Global Environmental Justice Movements, Section DO1 below as PDF files) are intended solely. Enstructor: Benjamin Schrader, Instructor for viewing by the course instructor. Students and other members of the CSU College and Department: Liberal Arts, Ethnic Studies community do not have access to these Term: Fall 2015 forms. You may however, provide access Course Reference Number: 73896 to the curvey forms to selected Enrollment: Not Available individuals. You can remove access to the forms at any time. Detailed Summary of Submitted Forms Options: Share Firms Survey Forms Submitted: 10 Manage Access to Forms 1. How well were the course Above Below Not Non Mean: 4.60 (1-5 scale) objectives communicated Average Four Applicable Response to students? 2. How well was the grading Above Below Not No Mean: 3.90 (1-5 scale) system communicated to Excellent Average Average Poor Applicable Response students? 0 0 o 3. How well cid class Above Delgay Not No nam: 4.70 (1-5 ouole) sessions increase your Excellent Average Average Poor Apolicable Response understanding of the subject? 0 4. How well did reading Below Not No Above Mean: 4.60 (1-5 scale) assignments increase Excellent Average Average Poor Applicable Везропне your understanding of the subject? 2 1 D) O. . 5. How well cid other course Above Below Not Mean: 4.33 (1-5 scale). accignments increases Excellent Average Average Poor Applicable Response your understanding of the subject? 6. How well did other Above Below North No Mean: 4.11 (1-5 scale) learning resources used in Excellent Average Average Four Applicable Respons this course — such as related websites. 2 3 0 0 softwere, study guides, and media - increase your understanding of the subject? 7. How well was feedback Below Mean: 3.56 (1-5 scale) provided such as Excellent Average Average Poor Applicable Response reviews, quizzes, critiques, and homework 0 . 4 1 2 2 1 - to help you track your progress B. If you accessed townse Above Below Mean: 4.11 (1-5 scale) information through an expellent average average average POOT applicable kesponse online system - such as a website or RamCT - how 3 4 2 0 0 0 do you rate the case of finding information? 9. How do you rate the Read: 4.30111-5 scale) MOOVE BEIOW OVER PIO: clarity and completeness Excellent Average Average Average Poor Applicable Response of Instructions provided in the course for engaging in 4 0 0 5 1 0 . class activities and completing course work?

10. How do you rate the intellectual challenge of		Above		Below		Not	No
this course?	Excellent	Average	Average	Average	Poor	Applicable	Resconse
	5	5	a	0		0	

Means 4.50 (1-5 ccole)

11. How do you rate this		******		Bulletin			Ne	1
course?	Excellent	Average	Average	Average	Poor	Applicable	Response	Meen: 4.50 (1-5 scole)
	,	2	1	0	0	a	a	
								,
12. How do you rate the		Above		Below		Not	No	Mean: 5.00 (1-5 scale)
instructor's knowledge of the subject?	Excellent	Average	Average	Average	Poor	Applicable	Response	
	10	0	0	0	0	a	0	
13. How effectively did the instructor facilitate		Above		Delaw		Not	No	Pean: 9.90 (1-5 scale)
student learning?	Excellent			Average		Applicable	Response	
	6	2	2	0	0	a	o o	J
14. How do you rate the								
instructor's enthusiasm	Excellent	Above	Average	Below	Poor	Not Applicable	No Respense	Mean: 4.90 (1-5 scale)
forteaching the subject?	9	1	0	0	0	a	a	
						-		J
15. How well did the		Above		Ballow		Not	No	Mean: 4.50 (1-5 scale)
instructor organize the course?	Excellent		Average		Poor	Applicable	Response	Fean: 430 (1-5 scae)
Courser	6	3	1	0	0	a	a	
16. How prepared was the		Above		Ballow		Not	No	Nean: 4.70 (1-5 scale)
instructor for class acasions?	Excellent	Average	Average	Average	Poor	Applicable	Response	
	8	1	1	0	0	o	o	
17. How do you rate the instructor's effectiveness		Above		Below		Not	No	Mean: 4.80 (1-5 scale)
at maraging class			Average			Аррикавие	Respense	
sessions?	9	0	1	0	0	a	0	J
18. How do you sale the isstructor's effectiveness	F	Abrie		Belov		Not	No.	Mean: 4.50 (1-5 scale)
	Excellenc	Average		Average		Applicable	Response	Mean: 4.50 (3-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at fectilitating critise and/or in-class interactions	Excellenc 5		Average :		Poor 0			Mean: 4.50 (3-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating ordina and/or in-class		Average		Average		Applicable	Response	Mean: 4.50 (3-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating critics and/or in-class interactions (communication,		Average 2		o o		Apolicable 2	D	
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating colline and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 19. how do you sate the instructor's fairness and	3	Average 2 Above	:	0 Delov	0	Applicable	D Bc	Mean: 4.50 (3-5 scale) Mean: 4.50 (3-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating critise and/or in-class interactions (personalization, discussions, etc.)† 19. How do you sate the	3	Average 2 Above	:	0 Delov	0	Apolicable 2	D Bc	
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating colline and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 19. how do you sate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the accignment of grades?	S Excellent	Average 2 Above Average 2	: Average	Delov Average 0	Poor	Apolicable 2 Poc Apolicable 2	Response D No Response D	Ream 4.53 (3-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating critice and/or in class interactions (permanication, discussions, etc.)? 19. How do you sate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well did the instructor oreals an	S Excellent S	Average 2 Above 2	Average 8	O Delow Average O Relow	Poor 0	Apolicable 2 Noc Apolicable	No Feepense D	
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating colline and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 19. how do you sate the instructor's fairness and importability in the accignment of grades? 20. How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student	S Excellent S	Average 2 Above 2	Average 8	O Delow Average O Relow	Poor 0	Apolicable 2 Poc Apolicable 2	No Feepense D	Ream 4.53 (3-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating colline and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 19. how do you sate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well did the instructor oreate as atmosphere that was	Excellent S	Above Average 2 Above Average Average	Average	Delow Average 0 Retow Average	Poor o	Apolicable 2 Apolicable 2 Apolicable	Response D Re Response D	Ream 4.53 (3-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating critics and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 19. How do you sate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well did the instructor events as atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences?	Excellent S	Above Average 2 Above Average 2	Average	Delow Average 0 Relow Average 0	Poor o	Apolicable 2 Apolicable 2 Apolicable D	Response D Response D Response D	Ream: 4.53 (3-5 scale) Ream: 4.46 (3-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating critics and/or in class interactions (permanication, discussions, etc.)? 19. How do you sate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and	Excellent S Excellent e	Above Average 2 Above Average 2 Above	Average a	Delov Average 0 Reinw Average 0	Poor o	Apolicable 2 Apolicable 2 Apolicable	No Response D Response D Response D	Ream 4.53 (3-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating colline and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 19. how do you sate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the accignment of graries? 20. How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did the	Excellent S Excellent e	Above Average 2 Above Average 2 Above	Average a	Delov Average 0 Reinw Average 0	Poor o	Apolicable 2 Apolicable 2 Anno Apolicable D	No Response D Response D Response D	Ream: 4.53 (3-5 scale) Ream: 4.46 (3-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating critics and/or in-class interactions (permanication, discussions, etc.)? 19. How do you sate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences?	Excellenc Excellenc	Above Average 2 Above Average 2 Above Average 2	Average a	Delow Average 0 Relow Average 0	Poor 0	Apolicable 2 Apolicable 2 Apolicable D	Response D Re Response D Re Response D	Ream: 4.53 (3-5 scale) Ream: 4.46 (3-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating critics and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 19. How do you sate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did the instructor communicate?	Excenerc d	Above Average 2 Above Average 2 Above Average 3	Awerage 8 Awerage 2	Delow Average 0 Relow Average 0	Poor o	Apolicable 2 Apolicable 2 Apolicable D Apolicable D	Response D Re Response D Re Response D	Ream: 4.53 (3-5 scale) Ream: 4.46 (3-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating critics and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 19. How do you sate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did the instructor communicate?	Excenerc d	Above Average 2 Above Average 2 Above Average 3	Awerage 8 Awerage 2	Delow Average 0 Relow Average 0	Poor o	Apolicable 2 Apolicable 2 Apolicable D Apolicable D	Response D Re Response D Re Response D	Mean: 4.50 (3-5 scale) Mean: 4.50 (3-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating colline and/or in-class interactions (permanication, discussions, etc.)? 19. How do you sate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did the instructor communicate?	Excellent Excellent Excellent	Above Average 2 Above Average 2 Above Average 3 Above Average Average	Awerage 2 Awerage 2	Delow Average 0 Relow Average 0 Below Average	Poor o	Apolicable 2 Apolicable 2 Apolicable D Apolicable D	Response D Re Response D Re Response D	Mean: 4.50 (3-5 scale) Mean: 4.50 (3-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating critics and/or in-class interactions (permanication, discussions, etc.)? 19. How do you sate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well did the instructor events an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did the instructor communicate? 22. How do you sate the evaluation of the instructor obtains the particular of the instructor to help students outside of class?	Excellent s Excellent g Excellent g	Above Average 2 Above Average 2 Above Average 3 Above Average 4	Awerage 2 Awerage 2 Awerage 3	Delow Average 0 Below Average 0 Below Average 0	Poor o	Apolicable 2 Apolicable 2 Apolicable 0 Apolicable 1 Nec	Response D Re Response D Re Response D Re Response D	Mean: 4.50 (3-5 scale) Mean: 4.50 (3-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating critice and/or in-class interactions (permanication, discussions, etc.)? 19. How do you sate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How wall did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did the instructor communicate? 22. How do you sate the evolution of the instructor of the instructor to help students outside of class?	Excellent Excellent Excellent Excellent Excellent	Above Average 2 Above Average 2 Above Average 3 Average 4 Acove Average	Awerage 2 Awerage 2 Awerage 3	Delow Average 0 Relow Average 0 Below Average 0	Poor o	Apolicable 2 Apolicable 2 Apolicable D Apolicable 1 Apolicable 1 Apolicable 1	Response D Re Notesponse D Re Notesponse D Re Response D	Mean: 4.50 (3-5 scale) Mean: 4.50 (3-5 scale) Mean: 4.50 (3-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating critics and/or in-class interactions (permanication, discussions, etc.)? 19. How do you sate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well did the instructor events an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did the instructor communicate? 22. How do you sate the evaluation of the instructor obtains the particular of the instructor to help students outside of class?	Excellent s Excellent g Excellent g	Above Average 2 Above Average 2 Above Average 3 Above Average 4	Awerage 2 Awerage 2 Awerage 3	Delow Average 0 Below Average 0 Below Average 0	Poor o	Apolicable 2 Apolicable 2 Apolicable 0 Apolicable 1 Nec	Response D Re Response D Re Response D Re Response D	Mean: 4.50 (3-5 scale) Mean: 4.50 (3-5 scale) Mean: 4.50 (3-5 scale)

Persp War	380A4: ectives From se Survey								
		Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	Not Applicabl e	No Response	Mean
1	How well were the course objectives communicated to students?	18	2	0	0	0	0	0	4.90
2	How well was the grading system communicated to students?	16	2	2	0	0	0	0	4.70
3	How well did class sessions increase your understanding of the subject?	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	4.95
4	How well did reading assignments increase your understanding of the subject?	17	3	0	0	0	0	0	4.85
5	How well did other course assignments increase your understanding of the subject?	16	4	0	0	0	0	0	4.80
6	How well did other learning resources increase your understanding of the subject?	14	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.78

7	How well was feedback provided to help you track your progress?	13	1	3	0	0	3	0	4.59
8	If you accessed course information through an online system how do you rate the ease of finding information?	15	1	2	0	0	1	0	4.72
9	How do you rate the clarity and completeness of instructions provided in the course for engaging in class activities?	17	1	2	0	0	0	0	4.75
10	How do you rate the intellectual challenge of this course?	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	4.70
11	How do you rate this course?	16	4	0	0	0	0	0	4.80
12	How do you rate the instructor's knowledge of the subject?	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	5.00
13	How effectively did the instructor facilitate student learning?	18	1	1	0	0	0	0	4.85

14	How do you rate the instructor's enthusiasm for teaching the subject?	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	4.95
15	How well did the instructor organize the course?	17	1	1	0	0	0	0	4.84
16	How prepared was the instructor for class sessions?	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	4.95
17	How do you rate the instructor's effectiveness at managing class sessions?	17	1	2	0	0	0	0	4.75
18	How do you rate the instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online/in-class interactions?	13	3	1	0	0	2	0	4.71
19	How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades?	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	4.89

20	How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences?	18	1	1	0	0	0	0	4.85
21	How effectively did the instructor communicate?	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	4.95
22	How do you rate the availability of the instructor to help students outside of class?	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	4.95
23	How do you rate this instructor?	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	4.95
24	How do you rate the overall quality of the classroom?	10	2	7	0	0	1	0	4.16
25	How do you rate the quality of the equipment in the classroom?	8	5	4	1	0	1	0	4.11
26	How do you rate your class attendance in this course?	11	6	2	0	1	0	0	4.30

27	How do you rate your level of effort in this course?	12	6	1	1	0	0	0	4.45
		YES	NO						
28	I am majoring in the department offering this course.	3	14						
		A	В	С	D	F	S	U	No Response
29	I expect to receive the following grade in this course.	12	7	1	0	0	0	0	0

SP 16 ETST 100 Sec 004 Course Survey Report									
		Excellen t	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	Not Applicabl e	No Response	Mean
1	How well were the course objectives communicated to students?	10	7	1	0	0	0	0	4.50
2	How well was the grading system communicated to students?	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	4.65
3	How well did class sessions increase your understanding of the subject?	13	5	0	0	0	0	0	4.72
4	How well did reading assignments increase your understanding of the subject?	9	6	2	1	0	0	0	4.28
5	How well did other course assignments increase your understanding of the subject?	10	6	1	1	0	0	0	4.39
6	How well did other learning resources increase your understanding of the subject?	12	3	2	1	0	0	0	4.44

7	How well was feedback provided to help you track your progress?	9	5	4	0	0	0	0	4.28
8	If you accessed course information through an online system how do you rate the ease of finding information?	9	4	2	0	0	1	1	4.47
9	How do you rate the clarity and completeness of instructions provided in the course for engaging in class activities?	9	7	2	0	0	0	0	4.39
10	How do you rate the intellectual challenge of this course?	8	6	1	2	1	0	0	4.00
11	How do you rate this course?	12	4	2	0	0	0	0	4.56
12	How do you rate the instructor's knowledge of the subject?	13	3	1	0	0	0	0	4.71

13	How effectively did the instructor facilitate student learning?	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	4.67
14	How do you rate the instructor's enthusiasm for teaching the subject?	15	3	0	0	0	0	0	4.83
15	How well did the instructor organize the course?	11	5	1	0	0	0	1	4.59
16	How prepared was the instructor for class sessions?	11	5	1	0	0	0	0	4.59
17	How do you rate the instructor's effectiveness at managing class sessions?	13	5	0	0	0	0	0	4.72
18	How do you rate the instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online/in-class interactions?	13	3	2	0	0	0	0	4.61
19	How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades?	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	4.83

20	How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences?	14	2	1	0	0	0	0	4.76
21	How effectively did the instructor communicate?	13	5	0	0	0	0	0	4.72
22	How do you rate the availability of the instructor to help students outside of class?	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	4.61
23	How do you rate this instructor?	13	5	0	0	0	0	0	4.72
24	How do you rate the overall quality of the classroom?	12	4	2	0	0	0	0	4.56
25	How do you rate the quality of the equipment in the classroom?	12	5	1	0	0	0	0	4.61
26	How do you rate your class attendance in this course?	13	5	0	0	0	0	0	4.72
27	How do you rate your level of effort in this course?	9	6	2	1	0	0	0	4.28
		YES	NO						

28	I am majoring in the department offering this course.	5	12						
		A	В	С	D	F	S	U	No Response
29	I expect to receive the following grade in this course.	14	4	0	0	0	0	0	0

ETST380A4 Perspectives from War, Section 001

Instructor: Benjamin Schrader, Instructor

College and Department: Liberal Arts, Ethnic Studies

Term: Fall 2016

Course Reference Number: 77373

Enrollment: 22

Brief Summary of Submitted Forms

Salvey raining Sabilitated. 22									
Scale: Excellent = 5; Above Average = 4; Average = 3; Below Avera	ege –	2; Pe	oor =	1;	NA.	– Not	App	licable; NR = No	Response
	5	4	3	2	1	NA	NR.		
 How well were the course objectives communicated to students? 	16	5	0	0	D	0	1		Mean: 4.76
2. How well was the grading system communicated to students?	17	4	0	0	0	0	1		Mean: 4.81
3. How well did class sessions increase your understanding of the subject?	14	7	0	0	0	0	1		Mean: 4.67
4. How well did reading assignments increase your understanding of the subject?	17	3	1	0	0	0	1		Mean: 4.76
 How well did other course assignments increase your understanding of the subject? 	14	7	0	0	0	0	1		Mean: 4.67
6. How well did other learning resources used in this course — such as related websites, software, study guides, and media — increase your understanding of the subject?	14	4	0	0	0	3	1		Mean: 4.78
7. How well was feedback provided — such as reviews, guizzes, critiques, and homework — to help you track your progress?	12	6	3	0	0	0	1		Mean: 4.43
8. If you accessed course information through an online system — such as a website or RamCT — how do you rate the ease of finding information?	15	4	0	9	0	1	1		Mean: 4.80
9. How do you rate the darity and completeness of instructions provided in the course for engaging in class activities and completing course work?	16	4	0	1	0	0	1		Mean: 4.67
10. How do you rate the intellectual challenge of this course?	11	5	4	0	1	0	1		Mean: 4.19
11. How do you rate this course?	15	5	1	0	D	0	1		Mean: 4.57
12. How do you rate the instructor's knowledge of the subject?	17	4	0	0	o	0	1	_	Mean: 4.81
13. How effectively did the instructor fecilitate student learning?	17	3	1	0	0	0	4		Mean: 4.76
		-	-	Ĭ	Ī	•	•		1400111 4170
E9. You do you rate the instructor's enthusasm for teathing the rubject?	20		0	0	0	0			Hean: 4.95
15. Yow well did the instructor organize the course?	15	2	0	0	0	0	1		Mean: 4.90
16. Yow prepared was the instructor for class sessions?	18	3	0	0	0	0	1		Mean: 4.86
17. How do you rate the instructor's effectiveness at managing class sessions?	17	4	0	0	0	0	1		Mean: 4.81
 How do you rate the instructor's effectiveness at facilitating unified a sil/or functions interactions (communication, Jiscussians, sec.)? 	16	3	1	0	0	1	1		Mean: 4.75
19. Yow do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades?	15	2	0	0	0	0	1		Mean: 4.90
 flow well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? 	1.6	1	1	1	0	0	1	_	Mean: 4.71
21. How effectively did the instructor communicate?	17	•	0	0	0	0	1		Hean: 401
22. Now do you note the availability of the instructor to help students outside of class? 23. Now do you note this instructor?	16	5	0	0	0	0	1		Mean: 4.76
23. How do you rate this instructor? 24. How do you rate the overall quality of the classroom?	17	2	1	1	0	0	1		Mean: 4.70
25. 4ow do you rate the quality of the equipment (computers, projectors, and so on) in the classroom?	16	2	3	0	0	0	1		Mean: 4.62
26. How do you rate your class attendance in this course?	9	10	2	0	0	0			Hean: 4.33
27. for do you role you level of effort in this course?	11	9	1	0	0	0	2		Meen: 4.50
28. I am mejoring in the department offering this course.	Vas	No	NR						
NO. I would be sent to the following over the first owner.	2	18	2		_				
 I expect to seceive the following-grade is this course. 	13	3	0	0	0	0	o	NR 1	

POLS421 Contemporary Political Theories, Section 002

Instructor: Benjamin Schrader, Instructor

College and Department: Liberal Arts, Political Science

Term: Fall 2016

Course Reference Number: 73364

Enrollment: 33

Brief Summary of Submitted Forms

ı	Survey Forms Suumitteu. 22								
ı	Scale: Excelent = 5; Above Average = 4; Average = 3; Below Average	oge –	2) Po	er-	1;	NA.	- Not	: Арр	licable; NR = No Response
ı		5	4	3	2	1	NA	NR	
	 How well were the course objectives communicated to shudents? 	14	4	3	1	0	0	0	Means 4.41
ı	2. How well was the grading system communicated to students?	13	6	3	0	0	0	o	Mean: 4.45
	3. How well did class sessions increase your understanding of the subject?	15	3	1	1	1	0	а	Mean: 4.45
	4. How well did reading assignments increase your understanding of the subject?	11	4	4	3	0	0	a	Means 4.05
	5. How well did other course assignments increase your understanding of the subject?	9	4	7	0	0	1	1	Mean: 4.10
	 How well did other learning resources used in this course — such as related websites, software, study guides, and media — increase your understanding of the subject? 	10	1	4	0	0	7	а	Means 4.40
	7. How well was feedback provided — such as reviews, quirzes, critiques, and homework — to help you track your progress?	9	3	8	0	0	2	a	Means 4.05
	8. If you accessed course information through an online system — such as a website or RamCT — how do you rate the ease of finding information?	12	6	3	0	0	1	а	Mean: 4.43
	9. How do you rate the clarity and completeness of instructions provided in the course for engaging in class activities and completing course work?	12	3	5	2	0	0	0	Mean: 4.14
ı	10. How do you rate the intellectual challenge of this course?	16	4	1	0	1	0	0	Mean: 4.55
ı	11. How do you rate this course?	10	9	3	0	0	0	0	Mean: 4.32
ı	13. How do you rate the instructor's knowledge of the subject?	21	0	3	0	0	0	o	Mean: 4.91
	13. How effectively did the instructor facilitate student learning?	14	6	0	1	1	0	a	Mean: 4.41
ı									
ı	14. How do you rate the instructor's enthusiasm for teaching the cultivest?	4.				U		0	Piedri 1.90
ı	15. How well did the instructor regardre the murse?	12	5	4	0	п	0	0	Neur: 5.36
ı	16. How prepared was the instructor for class sessionar	17	2	2		0		0	Presir: 1.30
ı	17. How do you nate the instructor's effectiveness at managing visco executive?	4.						_	Picari 1.5
l	 How do you rate the instructor's effectiveness at facilitating entire and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.); 	12	5	2	0	0	2	0	Mear: 4.50
l	19. How do you sate the instructor's fairness and imperbally in the assignment of enades?	17	2	2	•	0	C	۰	Mean: 1.34
ı	20. How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences?	14	•	4	E	U	0	0	Piesr: 1.30
ı	21. How effectively did the instructor communicate?	17	4	1	0	0	0	0	Near: 6.73
l	22. How do you rate the availability of the instructor to heig students outside of class?	14	•	1		U	-		Piesr: 1.58
ı	23. How do you sate this instructor?	14	5	2		0	0	0	Near: 4.55
	24. How do you rate the overall quality of the cassroom? 25. How do you rate the quality of the equipment (computers, preference, and or and in the riscomme?	7	3	6	2	1	1	0	Please 3.32
	26. How did you rate your class attendance in this course?	1.0		4		U		•	Presir: 9.54
	27. How do you nate your level of effort in this course? 20. Less emission in the desertment offsion this course.	Tes	No.	NR.		0	6	0	Please 1.30
	20. I am majoring in the department offering this course.	18	4	0					
	29. I expect to receive the followine grade in this course.	T-9	;	C	D	F 0	5	Ü	NR U

ETST100 Introduction to Ethnic Studies (GT-SS3), Section 102

Instructor: Benjamin Schrader, Instructor

College and Department: Liberal Arts, Ethnic Studies

Term: Fall 2016

Course Reference Number: 67952

Enrollment: 19

Brief Summary of Submitted Forms

Survey Forms Submitted: 15								
Scale: Excellent = 5; Above Average = 4; Average = 1; Relow Average	10r =	2; Pr	or =	151	AA.	= No	Appl	licable; NR = Nr Response
	5	4	3	2		NA	NR	
 flow well were the course objectives communicated to students? 	9	3	4	0	0	0	0	Mean: 4.31
2. Yow well was the grading system communicated to students?	9	6	1	U	U	U	0	Mean: 4.50
 fun well did data sessions increase your understanding of the subject? 	11	4	1	0	0	0	۰	Msen: 4.63
4. Yow well did reading assignments increase your understanding of the subject?	8	3	5	0	0	0	0	Mean: 4.19
 flow well did other course assignments increase your understanding of the subject? 	8	4	3	U	U	1	0	Mean: 4.33
6. Now well did other learning resources used in this course — such as related websites, software, study guides, and media — increase your understanding of the subject?	7	6	3	0	0	0	0	Mean: 4.25
/. now well was feedback provided — such as reviews, quizzes, critiques, and homework — to help you track your progress?	•	7	2		0	0		Mean: 4.13
8. If you accessed course information through an online system — such as a website or RamCT — how do you rate the ease of finding information?	7	6	1	0	0	2	0	Mean: 4.43
9. You do not ate the planty and completeress of instructions provided in the course for encaging in class activities and completing course work?	,	5	2	0	0	0	۰	Msen; 4.44
10. Yow do you rate the intellectual challenge of this course?	7	4	3	2	0	0	0	Mean: 4.00
11. 4ow do you rate this course?	8	3	4		U	U	0	Mean: 4.13
12. How do you rate the instructor's knowledge of the subject?	13	3	0	0	0	0	•	Moan: 4.61
13. How effectively did the instructor fadilitate student learning?	11	3	2	0	0	D	o	Mean: 4.56
14. How do you rate the instructor's enthusiasm for teaching the subject?	13	2	1	0	0	0	0	Mean: 4.75
15. How well did the instructor organize the course?	11	5	0	0	0	O	o	Mean: 4.59
16. How prepared was the instructor for class sessions?	13	2	0	1	0	0	0	Mean: 4.69
17. How do you rate the instructor's effectiveness at managing class sessions?	10	3	3	0	0	0	a	Mean: 4.44
18. How do you rate the instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)?	9	5	2	0	0	0	٥	Mean: 4.44
19. How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades?	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	Mean: 4.81
20. How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences?	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	Mean: 4.88
21. How effectively did the instructor communicate?	12	2	2	0	0	0	o	Mean: 4.63
22. How do you rate the availability of the instructor to help students outside of class?	11	3	2	0	0	D	a	Mean: 4.56
23. How do you rate this instructor?	12	3	1	0	0	0	o	Mean: 4.69
24. How do you rate the overall quality of the classroom?	9	3	4	0	0	D	o	Mean: 4.31
25. How do you rate the quality of the equipment (computers, projectors, and so on) in the classroom?	9	5	2	0	0	0	а	Mean: 4.44
26. How do you rate your class attendance in this course?	7	7	2	0	0	D	o	Mean: 4.31
27. How do you rate your level of effort in this course?	5	7	4	0	0	0	0	Mean: 4.06
28. I am majoring in the department offering this course.	Yes	No	NR.					
	1	15	0					
1 expect to receive the following grade in this course.	A	В	c	D	F	s	U	NR
	15	0	1	0	0	0	a	0

ETST100 Introduction to Ethnic Studies (GT-SS3), Section 002

Instructor: Benjamin Schrader, Instructor

College and Department: Liberal Arts, Ethnic Studies

Term: Fall 2016

Course Reference Number: 73674

Enrollment: 11

Brief Summary of Submitted Forms

-	rey rolling Submitted 15								
Se	ale: Excellent = 5; Above Average = 4; Average = 3; Below Avera	age –	2; P(or –					ilicable; NR - No Response
		5	4	3	2		NA.		
1	How well were the course objectives communicated to students?	5	3	2	0	0	0	0	Mean: 4.3
2	flow well was the grading system communicated to students?	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	Hean: 4.6
3	How well did class sessions increase your understanding of the subject?	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	Mean: 4.6
4	flow well did reading assignments increase your understanding of the subject?	4	3	2	0	0	1	0	Mean: 4.2
5	How well did other course assignments increase your understanding of the subject?	3	5	1	0	0	1	0	Mean: 4.2
6	how well did other learning resources used in this course — such as related websites, software, study guides, and media — increase your understanding of the subject?	5	3	1	0	0	1	0	Mean: 4.4
7	How well was feedback provided — such as reviews, quizzes, critiques, and homework — to help you track your progress?	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	Mean: 4.1
8	If you accessed course information through an online system — such as a website or RamCT — how do you rate the ease of finding information?	5	2	1	0	0	2	0	Mean: 4.5
9	How do you rate the clarity and completeness of instructions provided in the course for engaging in class activities and completing course work?	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	Мент: 4.1
10	flow do you rate the intellectual challenge of this course?	2	4	2	2	0	0	0	Mean: 3.6
11	How do you rate this course?	6	2	2	0	0	0	0	Mean: 4.4
12	How do you rate the instructor's knowledge of the subject?	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	Mean: 4.5
13	How effectively did the instructor facilitate student learning?	4	4	1	1	0	0	0	Mean: 4.1
14	. How do you rate the instructor's enthusiasm for teaching the subject?	0	2	а	0	0	٥	0	Means 4.0
1.5	. How well did the instructor organize the course?	4	5	1	۰	0	0	0	Means 4.3
	. How prepared was the instructor for class sessions?	7	2		۰	0	0	0	Mean: 4.6
	. How do you rate the instructor's effectiveness at managing class sessions:	3		2		0	0	0	Mean: 4.1
18	. How do you rate the instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-dass interactions (communication, discussons, ex)?	4	1	3	1	0	1	0	Mean: 3.8
	. How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades?	В	1	1	0	U	U	U	Mean: 9.7
	How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences?	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	Nean: 4.2
	. How effectively did the instructor communicate?	5	2	3	0	0	2	0	Mean: 4.3 Nean: 4.3
	. How do you rate the availability of the instructor to help students outside of cass? . How do you rate this instructor?	5	4	0	1	0	0	0	Mean: 4.3
	. How do you rate the overall quality of the classroom'	4	3	1	1	1	0	0	Mean: 3.8
	How do you rate the quality of the equipment (computers, projectors, and so or) in the classroom?	5	3	1	0	1	0	0	Nean: 4.3
26	. How do you rate your class attendance in this course?	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	Nean: 6.1
	. How do you rate your level of effort in this source?	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	Mean: 4.6
20	. I am mejoring in the department offering this course.	Yes	He	NR					
		2		a		_	_		
29	. I expect to receive the following grace in this course.	^			9			9	NH.
		6	4	a	0	0	0	0	0

ETST480A4 War Theory, Section 001 Instructor: Benjamin Schrader, Instructor

college and Department: Liberal Arts, Ethnic Studies

Term: Spring 2017

Course Reference Number: 28685

Enrollment: 16

Detailed Summary of Submitted Forms

Survey Forms Submitted: 15

The scanned survey forms (available below as PDF flex) are intended solely for viewing by the course instructor. Students and other members of the CSU community do not have access to these forms. You man, however, provide access to the survey forms to selected individuals. You can remove access to the forms at any time.

Options:

∃ Share Forms

Manage Access to Forms

 How well were the course objectives communicated to students?

Excellent	Ahrwe Average	Average	Relew Average	Poor	Nor Applicable	No Response
12	2	1	u	U	U	U

Mesm: 4.73 (1-5 scale)

2. How well was the grading system communicated to students?

I		Above		Below		Not	No
ı	Excellent	Average	Average	Average	Poor	Applicable	Hesponse
I	19	2	1	0	0	0	0

Mean: 4.73 (1-5 scale)

3. How well did dass sessions increase your understanding of the subject?

Cumilant	Above	Auguston	Below	Book	Not Applicable	No Deceases
EXCEMENT	PAYETROPE	American	Average	POOR	ADDITIONE	PURSOUTING
13	1	1	0	0	0	0

Mean: 4.80 (1-5 scale)

4. How well did reading assignments iscrease your understanding of the subject?

Excellent	Above	Average	Below Average	Poor	Not Applicable	No Response
8	7	0	a	0	0	0

Mean: 4.53 (1-5 scale)

 How well did other course assignments iscrease your understanding of the subject?

	Ahrwe		Rolew		Not	No
Excellent	Average	Average	Average	Poor	Applicable	Response
12	1	2	0	0	0	0

Mean: 4.67 (1-5 scale)

6. How well did other learning resources used in this course — such as related websites, software, study guides, and media — increase your understanding of the subject?

Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	Not Applicable	No Response
13	0	2	0	0	0	0

Mean: 4.73 (1-5 scale)

 How well was feedback provided — such as reviews, quizzes, critiques, and homework — to help you track your progress?

ı	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	Not Applicable	No Response
I	12	2	0	1	0	0	0

Mean: 4.67 (1-5 scale)

8. If you accessed course information through an online system — such as a website or RamCT — how do you rate the ease of finding information?

I	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	Not Applicable	No Response
	13	1	1	0	0	0	0

Mean: 4.80 (1-5 scale)

9. How do you rate the clarity and completeness of instructions provided in the course for engaging in class activities and completing course work?

Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	Not Applicable	No Response
13	1	1	0	0	0	0

Mean: 4.80 (1-5 scale)

 How do you rate the intellectual challenge of this course?

Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	Not Applicable	No Response
11	3	1	0	0	0	0

Mean: 4.67 (1-5 scale)

11. How do you rate this course?

Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	Not Applicable	No Response
13	2	0	0	0	0	0

Mean: 4.87 (1-5 scale)

12. How do you rate the instructor's knowledge of the subject?	Excellent	Above Average 1	Average 0	Below Average 0	Poor O	Not Applicable 0	No Responses 0	Nean: 4.93 (1-5 scale)
13. How effectively did the instructor facilitate atudent learning?	Excellent	Above Average 2	Average 0	Below Average 0	Poor O	Not Applicable 0	No Responses	Nean: 4.86 (1-5 stale)
14. How do you rate the instructor's enthusiasm for teaching the subject?	Excellent	Above Average	Average 0	Below Average 0	Poor	Not Applicable 0	No Response 0	Mean: 4.80 (1-5 scale)
15. How well did the instructor organize the course?	Excellent	Above Average 0	Average 1	Below Average 0	Poor O	Not Applicable 0	Na Response O	Nean: 4.87 (1-5 scale)
18. How prepared was the instructor for class assaions?	Excellent	Above Average 2	Average 0	Below Average 0	Poor O	Not Applicable 0	No Response	Mean: 4.87 (1-5 scale)
17. How do you rate the instructor's effectiveness at managing class sessions?	Excellent	Above Average 4	Average 0	Below Average 0	Poor O	Not Applicable 0	No Responses 0	Mean: 4.73 (1-5 scale)
18. How do you rate the instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)?	Excellent 12	Above Average 3	Average 0	Below Average 0	Poor	Not Applicable 0	No Response 0	Mean: 4.80 (1-5 acale)

19. How do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades?	Excellent 13	Above Average 0	Average 2	Below Average 0	Poor 0	Not Applicable 0	No Response O	Mean: 4.73 (1-5 scale)
20. How well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences?	Excellent 10	Above Average 4	Average 1	Below Average 0	Poor 0	Not Applicable 0	No Responses 0	Mean: 4.60 (1-5 scale)
21. How effectively did the instructor communicate?	Excellent 13	Above Average	Average 1	Below Average 0	Poor 0	Not Applicable 0	No Response 0	Mean: 4-80 (1-5 scale)
22. How do you rate the availability of the instructor to help students outside of class?	Bicellent 13	Above Average 2	Average 0	Below Average O	Poor 0	Nut Applicable 0	No Response 0	Mean: 4.87 (1-5 scale)
23. How do you rate this instructor?	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor 0	Not Applicable 0	No Response	Mean: 4.79 (1-5 scale)

Course Report

You are reviewing results for the following course, instructor, and academic term:

POLS232 International Relations (CT-SS1), Section 901

Instructor: Benjamin Schrader, Instructor

College and Department: Liberal Arts, Political Science

Termi Spring 2017

Course Reference Number: 13960

Enrollment: 98

Detailed Summary of Submitted Forms

Survey Forms Submitted: 76

Share Survey Forms

The econned curvey forms (available below as POF filts) are intended adely for viewing by the course instruction. Students and other members of the CSU community do not have access to these forms. You may, however, provide access to the survey forms to selected individuals. You can remove access to the forms at any time.

Options:

■ Share Forms

Manage Arcess to Forms

 How well were the course objectives communicated to students?

	ADRVE		Below		Not	No	ŀ
Excellent	Average	Average	Average	Poor	Аррісвон	Response	ľ
32	27	13	4	0	9	0	l

Mean: 4.14 (1-5 scale)

2. How well was the grading system communicated to students?

Excellent	Alerve Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	Not Applicable	Ne Response
	20	4.5				

Meens 4.37 (1.5 scale)

 How well did class sessions increase your understanding of the subject?

Escellent	Abeve Average	Average	Balow Average	Poor	Not Applicable	No Response
32	23	15	2	4	0	0

Mean: 4.01 (1-5 scale)

 Hew well did reading assignments increase your understanding of the subject?

ı	Escellent	Abeve Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	Not Applicable	Nc Response
	29	20	17	7	4	5	1

Mean: 3.74 (1-5 scale)

 How well did other course assignments increase your understanding of the subject?

	Abuve		Secur		WILL.	No
Excellent	Average	Average	Average	HOOF	Аррісавіе	Response
32	2.8	в	7	1	0	6

Mean: 4.39 (1-5 scale)

b. How well did other learning resources used in this course — such as related websites, software, study guides, and media — increase your understanding of the subject?

Γ		Ahove		Below		Not	No	
l	Excellent	Average	Average	Averaçe	Poor	Applicable	Response	
l	33	23	6	9	5	4	6	

Mean: 4.38 (1-5 scale)

 How well was feedback provided — such as reviews, quiessa, critiquea, and homework — to help you track your progress?

Excellent	Asove Average	Average	Averaçe Averaçe	Poor	NO: Applicable	
25	16	23	7	2	3	

Mean: 3.75 (1-5 (CRE)

B. If you accessed course information through an unitine system — such as a website or sanCT — bow do you rate the case of finding information?

Excellent	Above Average	Average	Seov Averaçe	Poor	No: Applicable	No Response
31	22	9	1		13	6

Mean: 4.32 (1-5 scale)

b. How do you rate the clarity and competeness of instructions provided in the course for engaging in class activities and completing course work?

Excelent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	No: Applicable	No Response
39	18	11	7	1	0	¢

Mean: 4.14 (1-5 scale)

 How do you rate the intellectual challenge of this course?

	Above		Below			No
Excelent	Average	Average	Veale	Peer	Applicable	Response
18	25	:6	13	4	0	6

Hean: 3.53 (1-5 cc:le)

1. How do you rate this course?		Above		Bolom		Net	No	Mean: 4.07 (1-5 scale)
Course	Excellent	Average	Average	Average	Poor	Applicable	Response	
	35	23	2	6	3	0	0	
2. How do you rate the instructor's knowledge of		Above		Below	_	Not	No	Mean: 4.42 (1-5 scale)
the subject?	Excellent	Average	Average	Average	Poor	Applicable	Response	
	46	21	4	5	0	0	0	
3. How effectively did the instructor facilitate		Above		Bolow		Net	No	Mean: 4.:0 (:-5 scale)
student learning?	Panellent	Average	Average	Average	Poor	Applicable	Response	
	39	50	10	۰	1	0	0	
d Harrida anni anto the								
 How do you rate the instructor's cathesiasm for 	Franklinsk	Above		Below		No:	No	Mean: 4.43 (1-5 scale)
teaching the subject?						Applicable		
	47	.9	8	0	2	0	0	
How well did the instructor organize the	Executives	Above	Auren	Bolom	See-	Nu. Applicable	No Response	Mean: 4.21 (3-5 scale)
course?						Applicable		
	40	20	10	4	Ł	U	U	
6. How prepared was the								
Instructor for class	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below	Poor	No: Applicable	No Response	Mean: 4.41 (:-5 scale)
sessions?	46		wereye q				0	
	46	.8	9	3	0	0	0	
7. How do you rate the								ı
instructor's effectiveness	Excellent	Accepted	Average	Below	Poor	NO: Applicable	NO Response	Mean: 4.75 (1-5 scare)
at managing class	99	19			1	U	U	
SCISIO IST	44	.79	12	5		0		
5. Hew do you rate the instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online				Below e Averag				Mean: 4.38 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness	Excellent 45		Averag		e Poo			
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class in:eractions (communication,		Average		e Averag		r Applicab	le Respon	
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class interactions		Average		e Averag		r Applicab	le Respon	
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class in:eractions (communication, discussions, etc.)?		Average 17		e Averago		r Applicati 0	le Respon	56
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online ard/or in-class in:eractions (communication, discussions, stc.)? 9. Hew do you rate the instructor's fairness and	45	17 Above	:2	e Averago 2 Below	0	O Not	0 No	Mean: 4.47 (I-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 9. Hew do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartisity in the	45 Excellent	17 Above Average	:2 Averag	2 Below e Average	0 e Poo	0 Not Apolicas	0 No Respon	Mean: 4.47 (I-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online ard/or in-class in:eractions (communication, discussions, stc.)? 9. Hew do you rate the instructor's fairness and	45	17 Above	:2	e Averago 2 Below	0	O Not	0 No	Mean: 4.47 (I-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class inseractions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 9. Hew do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartisity in the assignment of grades?	45 Excellent	17 Above Average 17	:2 Averag	Below e Average	0 e Poo 0	0 Not Application 0	No le Respon	Mean; 4.47 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 9. Hew do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 9. Hew well did the instructor create an	Excellent 48	17 Above Average 17 Above Average 17	12 Average	2 Below Average 1 Below	0 e Poo 0	0 Not Apolicas	0 No	Mean: 4.47 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.43 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class inseractions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 9. Hew do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartisity in the assignment of grades?	Excellent 48	17 Above Average 17 Above Average 17	12 Average	2 Below Average 1 Below	0 e Poo 0	O Not Not Not Not	0 No	Mean: 4.47 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.43 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 9. Hew do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartainty in the assignment of grades? 9. Hew well did the instructor create an etmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and	Excellent 48	Above Above Average 17 Above Average Above Average	:2 Averag	Below Below Average Average Average	0 Poo	Not Application Ap	No N	Mean: 4.47 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.43 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 9. Hew do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 9. Hew well did the instructor create an etmosphere that was respectful of student	Excellent 48	Above Above Average 17 Above Average Above Average	:2 Averag	Below Below Average Average Average	0 Poo	Not Application Ap	No N	Mean: 4.47 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.43 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class instructions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 9. Hew do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 10. Hew well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinione, ideas, and differences?	Excellent 48	Above Above Average 17 Above Average 17 Above Above 16	:2 Averag	Below Below Below Below Average 3	0 e Poo 0	Not Applicab O Not Applicab O O O O	No N	Mean: 4.47 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.43 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 9. Hew do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartaility in the assignment of grades? 10. Hew well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences?	Excellent 48 Excellent 49	Above Above Average 17 Above Average 16 Above	Average 10	Below e Average 3	0 e Poo 0	Not Application Ap	No N	Mean: 4.47 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.43 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.36 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class in:eractions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 9. Hew do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 9. Hew well did the instructor create an etmosphere that was respectful of student opinione, ideas, and differences?	Excellent 48 Excellent 49	Above Above Average 17 Above Average 16 Above	Average 10	Below e Average 3	0 e Poo 0	Not Applicab O Not Applicab O Not Applicab O	No N	Mean: 4.47 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.43 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.36 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class instructions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 9. Hew do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 10. Hew well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinione, ideas, and differences?	Excellent 48 Excellent 49	Above Above Above Above Above Above Above Above Above	:2 Average :0 Average 7	Below e Average 3	0 0 e Poo 0 1 1	Not Applicab O Not Applicab O Not Applicab O Not Applicab	No N	Mean: 4.47 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.43 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.36 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class instructions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 9. Hew do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 10. Hew well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinione, ideas, and differences?	Excellent 48 Excellent 49	Above Above Above Above Above Above Above Above	:2 Average :0 Average 7	Below Below Below Average 3 Below Average U	0 0 e Poo 0 1 1	Not Applicab O Not Applicab O Not Applicab O	No N	Mean: 4.47 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.43 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.36 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 9. Hew do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 9. Hew well did the instructor create an etmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? 11. Hew effectively did the instructor communicator	Excellent 48 Excellent 49 Excellent 43	Above Average 16 Above Average 16 Above Average 19	:2 Average 7 Average 7	Below e Average 3	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Not Applicab O Not Applicab O Not Applicab O Not Applicab	No N	Mean: 4.47 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.43 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.36 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.15 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class inseractions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 9. Hew do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartisity in the assignment of grades? 10. Hew well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinione, ideas, and differences? 11. Hew effectively did the instructor communicater	Excellent 48 Excellent 49 Excellent 43	Above Average 16 Above Average 16 Above Average 19	:2 Average 7 Average 7	Below e Average 1 Below e Average 3 Below e Average 0 Below Below e Average 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Not Applicab Not Applicab Not Applicab Not Applicab Not Applicab	No N	Mean: 4.47 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.43 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.36 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.15 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 9. Hew do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartisity in the assignment of grades? 10. Hew well did the instructor create an etmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? 11. Hew effectively did the instructor communicater 12. Hew do you rate the evaluations to help students	Excellent 48 Excellent 49 Excellent 93	Above Average	:2 Average 7 Average 3 Average 3 Average	Below e Average U Below e Average U Below e Average U	0 0 e Poo 0 1 1 e Poo 1	Not Applicab O Not Applicab O Not Applicab O Not Applicab O Not Applicab	No N	Mean: 4.47 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.43 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.36 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.15 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 9. Hew do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartisity in the assignment of grades? 10. Hew well did the instructor create an etmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? 11. Hew effectively did the instructor communicater 12. Hew do you rate the evaluations to help students	Excellent 48 Excellent 49 Excellent 93	Above	:2 Average 7 Average 3 Average 3 Average	Below e Average 1 Below e Average 3 Below e Average 0 Below e Average 2	0 0 e Poo 0 1 1 e Poo 1	Not Applicab O Not Applicab O Not Applicab O Not Applicab O Not Applicab	No N	Mean: 4.47 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.43 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.36 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.15 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class instructions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 9. Hew do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartisity in the assignment of grades? 10. Hew well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinione, ideas, and differences? 11. Hew effectively did the instructor communicater 12. Hew do you rate the evallability of the instructor to help students outside of class?	Excellent 48 Excellent 49 Excellent 93	Above Average 16 Above Average 16 Above Average 19 Above Average 23 Above Average 23	:2 Average 7 Average 13 Average 16	Below e Average U Below e Average U Below e Average U	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Not Applicab O Not Applicab O Not Applicab O Not Applicab O Not Applicab	No N	Mean: 4.47 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.43 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.36 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.36 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class increations (communication, discussions, etc.)? 9. Hew do you rate the instructor's fairness and impartisity in the assignment of grades? 9. Hew well did the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? 11. Hew effectively did the instructor communicater 12. Hew do you rate the evallability of the instructor to help students outside of class?	Excellent 48 Excellent 49 Excellent 93	Above Average 16 Above Average 16 Above Average 19 Above Average 23 Above Average 23	:2 Average 7 Average 13 Average 16	Below e Average 3 Below e Average 3 Below e Average 0 Below e Average 2	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Not Applicab O Not Applicab	No N	Mean: 4.47 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.43 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.36 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.36 (1-5 scale)

ETST100 Introduction to Ethnic Studies (GT-SS3), Section 002

Instructor: Benjamin Schrader, Instructor

College and Department: Liberal Arts, Ethnic Studies

Term: Spring 2017

Course Reference Number: 26991

Enrollment: 30

Detailed Summary of Submitted Forms

Survey Forms Submitted: 23

The scanned survey forms (available below as PCF files) are intended solely for viewing by the course instructor. Students and other members of the CSU community do not have access to these forms. You may, hewever, provide access to the survey forms to selected individuals. You can remove seeses to the forms at any time.

Options

Share Form

Manage Access to Forms

1.	How well were the course
	objectives communicated
	tc students?

	Alteva		Below		Not	No
Excellent	Average	Average	Average	Poor	Applicable	Response
18	4	0	1	0	0	a

Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scole)

How well was the grading system communicated to students?

I		Above		Below		Not	No
I	Excellent	Average	Average	Average	Poor	Applicable	Response
l	19	3	1	0	0	0	a

Mean: 9.78 (1-5 scale)

 How well did class exections increases your understanding of the subject?

	Above	_	Below		Not	No	
Excellent	Average	Average	Average	Poor	Applicable	Response	ı
22	0	1	0	0	0	a	l

Mean: 4.91 (1-5 scale)

4. How well did reading assignments increase your understanding of the subject?

Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	Not Applicable	No Response
16	5	1	0	1	0	а

Mean: 6.52 (1-5 scale)

 How well did other course assignments increase your understanding of the subject?

Perellert	Allove Eurrage	Averago	Below Average	Psv	Not Applicable	No Bespanse
10	1		0			0

Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale)

 How well did other learning resources used in this course – such as related websites, software, study guides, and media – increase your understanding of the subject?

	Above		Dellow		Not	No
Excellent	Average	Average	Average	Paur	Applicable	Resperse
17	2	2	1	0	0	0

Means 4.35 (1-3 susk)

 How well was feedback provided – such as reviews quizzes, critiques, and homework – to help you track your propose?

	Above		Deliger		Not	No
Excellent	Average	Average	Average	Poor	Applicable	Response
17	1	4	1	0	0	0

Means 4,48 (1-3 stale)

 If you accessed course information through an online system — such as a website or RamCT — how do you rate the case of finding information?

Excellent	Alleve Average	Average	Bolow Avorage	Peer	Not Applicable	No Response
16	4	2	0	0	0	1

Means 4.61 (1 5 pools)

7. How do you rate the clarity and completeness of instructions provided in the cause for engaging in class activities and completing course work?

	Allowe		Ballow		Net	Ne
Perellert	E verage	Averago	Average	Provi	4pplirable	Весрипса
18	3	2	0	0	0	0

Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale)

13. How do you rate the intellectual challenge of this course?

	Above		Below		Not	No
Excellent	Average	Average	Average	Poor	Applicable	Response
15	2	4	1	1	0	0

Means 4.26 (1-5 scale)

11. How do you rete this		Above		Below		Not	No	Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale)
course!	Excelent	Average	Average	Average	Poor	Applicable	Response	
	19	2	1	1	0	0	0	
								J
12. How do you rate the				- Contract				1
instructor's knowledge of	Excellent	Above	Average	Below	Poor	Applicable	NO Response	Meas: 4.83 (1-5 scale)
the subject?								
	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	
13. How effectively dic the instructor facilitate		Abeve		Below		Net	Ne	Mean: 4.74 (1-5 scale)
student learning?	Excelent	Areage	Average	Average	hour	Applicable	Response	
	19	3	0	1.	0	0	0	
								•
14. How do you rate the		Above		Below		Not	No	Mean: 4.87 (1-5 scale)
instructor's enthusiasm for teaching the subject?	Excellent		Average		Poor	Applicable		1000
To teating the subjects	22	c	0	1	0	0	0	
					_			J
15. How wall did the								l
instructor organize the	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below	hoor	Not Applicable	No Response	Meas: 4.65 (1-5 scale)
courset								
	15	4	0	0	1	0	0	J
								1
16. How prepared was the instructor for class		Above		Delow		Not	No	Mean: 4.70 (1-5 state)
sessions?	Excellent	Average	Average	Average	Poor	Applicable	вевропан	
	19	3	0	0	1	0	0	
17. How do you rate the		Above		Below		Not	No	Mean: 4.83 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at managing dass	Excelent		Average		Poor	Applicable		
sessions?	20	2	1	0	0	0	0	
								J
18. How do you rate the		Above		Below		Not	No	Mean: 4.74 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness	Excellent		Average		Poor	Not Applicable		Mean: 4.74 (1-5 scale)
	Excellent		Average)		Poor			Mean: 4.74 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class interactions		Average		Average		Applicable	Response	Mean: 4.74 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/prin-class interactions (communication,		Average		Average		Applicable	Response	Mean: 4.74 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class interactions		Average		Average		Applicable	Response	Mean: 4.74 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class interactions [communication, discussions, etc.]? 19. How do you rate the		Average 3		Arerage 1		Applicable 0	Response 0	
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.]? 19. How do you rate the instructor's farmess and	19	Average 3 Above)	Arerage 1 Below	a	Applicable	0 No	Mean: 4.76 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class interactions [communication, discussions, etc.]? 19. How do you rate the	19	Average 3 Above)	Arerage 1 Below	a	Applicable 0	0 No	
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 19. How do you rate the instructor's farmess and impartiality in the	19	Average 3 Above) average	Arerage 1 Below Arerago	0 Oraș	Applicable 0 Not Applicable	Nc Besponse	
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 19. How do you rate the instructor's farmess and impartiality in the	19	Above average) average	Anerage 1 Below Anerage C	0 Oraș	Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0	No Bosponso 0	Manu: 4.70 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/or in-class interactions [communication, discussions, etc.]? 19. How do you rate the instructor's rainness and impartiality in the assignment of grades?	Fynellan 19	Above Above 3	average	Anerage 1 Below Anerago G	0 0 0 1	Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0	No Response 0	
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/prin-class interactions [communication, discussions, etc.]? 19. How do you rate the instructors rainness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well did the instructor create ar atmosphere that was	Freedow 19	Above sverage 3 Above Average	Average	Anerage 1 Below Anerage C Betow Arerage	0 0 0 1	Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable	Nc Besponse 0	Manu: 4.70 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/prin-class interactions [communication, discussions, etc.]? 19. How do you rate the instructor's farmess and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well fill the instructor create an	Fynellan 19	Above Above 3	average	Anerage 1 Below Anerago G	0 0 0 1	Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0	No Response 0	Manu: 4.70 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/prin-class interactions [communication, discussions, etc.]? 19. How de you rate the instructor's 'airness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well did the instructor create ar atmosphere that was respectful of student	Freedow 19	Above sverage 3 Above Average	Average	Anerage 1 Below Anerage C Betow Arerage	0 0 0 1	Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable	Nc Besponse 0	Manu: 4.70 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating colline and/prin-class interactions [communication, discussions, etc.]? 19. How do you rate the instructor's 'airness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well did the instructor create as atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, deas, and differences?	Freedow 19	Above sverage 3 Above Average	Average	Anerage 1 Below Anerage C Betow Arerage	0 0 0 1	Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable	Nc Besponse 0	Manu: 4.70 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/prin-class interactions [communication, discussions, etc.]? 19. How do you rate the instructor's 'airness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well did the instructor enable ar atmosphere that was respectful of atution opinions, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did the	Function: 19 Excellent: 19	Above Above Above Above Above) Average	Below Anerage G Below Anerage U Below	0 0 1 Poer 1	Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable U	Nc Bospinso 0 Nc Respinso 0	Manu: 4.70 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating colline and/prin-class interactions [communication, discussions, etc.]? 19. How do you rate the instructor's 'airness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well did the instructor create as atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, deas, and differences?	Function: 19 Excellent: 19	Above Above Above Above Above) Average	Below Anerage G Below Anerage U Below	0 0 1 Poer 1	Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable U	Nc Bospinso 0 Nc Respinso 0	Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/prin-class interactions [communication, discussions, etc.]? 19. How do you nate the natructor's farmess and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well did the instructor create ar atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did the	Function: 19 Excellent: 19	Above Above Above Above Above) Average	Below Anerage G Below Anerage U Below	0 0 1 Poer 1	Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable U	Nc Bospinso 0 Nc Respinso 0	Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/prin-class interactions [communication, discussions, etc.]? 19. How do you nate the natructor's farmess and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well did the instructor create ar atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? 21. How effectively did the	Freeller: 19 Exceller: 19 Exceller:	Above Average 3 Above Average 3 Above Average Average	Average J Average	Below Anerage U Below Arerage Arerage	0 Poor 1 Poor	Not Applicable U	Nc Berponse 0 Nc Response U	Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/prin-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.]? 19. How do you rate the instructor's 'airness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well did the instructor create ar atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and otherences? 21. How effectively did the instructor communicate? 22. How do you rate the	Freeller: 19 Exceller: 19 Exceller:	Above Average 3 Above Average 3 Above Average Average	Average J Average	Below Anerage U Below Arerage Arerage	0 Poor 1 Poor	Not Applicable U	Nc Berponse 0 Nc Response U	Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating colline and/prin-class interactions [communication, discussions, etc.]? 19. How do you rate the instructor's 'airness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well did the instructor create as stroopher of that was respectful of student opinions, deas, and differences? 21. How effectively did the instructor communicate?	Functions 19 Excellent 19 Excellent 21	Above Average 3 Above Average 1 Above Average 1	Average) Average)	Below Average U Below Average U Below Average II	Poor 1	Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0	Nc Response 0 NC Response 0 NC Response 0 NC Response 0	Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/prin-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.]? 19. How do you rate the instructor's 'airness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well did the instructor create ar atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and otherences? 21. How effectively did the instructor communicate? 22. How do you rate the	Functions 19 Excellent 19 Excellent 21	Above Average 3 Above Average 1 Above Average 1	Average) Average)	Below Average U Below Average U Below Average II	Poor 1	Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0	Nc Response 0 NC Response 0 NC Response 0 NC Response 0	Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating online and/prin-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 19. How do you rate the natructor's farmess and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well flid the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? 21. How do you rate the instructor communicate?	Function: 19 Excellent: 19 Excellent: 21 Excellent:	Above Average 1 Above Average 1	bverage) Average) Average	Below Average U Below Average I Selow Average	Poor 1 Poor 0	Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0	Nc tesponse 0 Nc tesponse 0 Nc Response 0 Nc Response 0	Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating coline and/prin-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 19. How do you rate the instructor's 'airness and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well did the instructor create as atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, deas, and differences? 21. How effectively did the instructor communicate? 22. How do you rate the availability of the instructor to help students outside of class?	Function: 19 Excellent: 19 Excellent: 21 Excellent:	Above Average 3 Above Average 1 Above Average 2	bverage) Average) Average	Below Average U Below Average U Below Average U Below Average 1	Poor 1 Poor 0	Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0	Nc Response U Nc Response U Nc Response U Nc Response O	Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.83 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating colline and/prin-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 19. How do you rate the instructor's farmess and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well flid the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, ideas, and differences? 21. How defectively did the instructor communicate? 22. How do you rate the availability of the instructor to help students.	Functions 19 Excellent 19 Excellent 21 Excellent 10	Above Average 3 Above Average 1 Above Average 2	hverage j hverage j hverage 2	Below Anerage U Below Anerage U Below Anerage G Below Anerage G Below Anerage	Poor 0	Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0	Nc Response U Nc Response U Nc Response U Nc Response U Nc Response O Nc	Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating colline and/pr in-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 19. How do you rate the instructor's farmess and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well flid the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, deas, and differences? 21. How do you rate the availability of the instructor communicate? 22. How do you rate the availability of the instructor to help students outside of class?	Freellers 19 Excellers 19 Excellers 21 Excellers 10	Above Average 3 Above Average 1 Above Average 2 Above Average 2	Average) Average) Average 2	Below Average U Below Average U Below Average U Below Average G Below Average G	Poor 1 Poor 1	Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0	NC Response U NC Response U NC Response U NC Response O	Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.83 (1-5 scale)
instructor's effectiveness at facilitating colline and/prin-class interactions (communication, discussions, etc.)? 19. How do you rate the notructor's farmess and impartiality in the assignment of grades? 20. How well first the instructor create an atmosphere that was respectful of student opinions, deas, and differences? 21. How do you rate the availability of the instructor communicate? 22. How do you rate the availability of the instructor to help students outside of class?	Functions 19 Excellent 19 Excellent 21 Excellent 10	Above Average 3 Above Average 1 Above Average 2	hverage j hverage j hverage 2	Below Anerage U Below Anerage U Below Anerage G Below Anerage G Below Anerage	Poor 0	Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0 Not Applicable 0	Nc Response U Nc Response U Nc Response U Nc Response U Nc Response O Nc	Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.70 (1-5 scale) Mean: 4.83 (1-5 scale)

Selected Comments from POLS 421: Contemporary Political Theory

- -Dr. Schrader has a lot of knowledge of political theory! I came into this class hesitant of all the difficult readings because I had little to no exposure to theory prior to this class. I learned so much, both from the lectures and the readings. This class is constructed well and I'm glad I got to take it with Dr. Schrader.
- -This is by far the greatest class I have taken at CSU... This class was taught extremely well and there was less political bias than any other class I've taken and also more emphasis on ontological framing, which can make philosophers of everyone. Awesome class.
- -This course was challenging but I really enjoyed it. Schrader is a very informative professor and he created a safe place for ALL students to learn and express their opinions.
- -The readings were complicated, but class sessions made them much more clear. The topics were very interesting and thought provoking to the point that I have conversations with my peers about the deeper implications of what I learned. Great class, I enjoyed it!

Selected Comments from ETST 480A4: War Theory

- -Best teacher I've had in my college career. Critical, informative, and always intriguing content. Not only that but the style of teaching is very good. The pedagogical problems that often occurs in a university space does not persist here. Ben should be used as a model for future teaching.
- -I absolutely love this course and every course offered by Ben. I really think he has taught me things that you can't always learn in a classroom. I think this course has challenged me to think critically about topics regarding war & polite, and Ben did a great job facilitating that.
- -Ben was always knowledgeable, productive, prepared, and a likable professor. This semester he always introduced me to new topics & challenged me to read more and never be satisfied with what I think I know.
- -Ben is a teacher unlike most, as this is the third class I've taken from him. I wish I could take more. He has the educational understanding as well as personal experience to connect class material to real life. He is creative and intellectual, and a great teacher.
- -Ben is and has been nothing but passionate about the courses he teaches at CSU. He has been incredibly gracious in working with me during some pretty difficult times. He truly wants his students to succeed as well as develop a genuine understanding of what he is teaching.

Selected Comments from ETST 400: Racial Formations

- -Was enthusiastic and very knowledgeable.
- -Ben was a great instructor. He was always willing and there to help... Overall a great class that was very informative and challenging.
- -This class was incredibly challenging for me personally, and I was forced out of my comfort zone each day. I appreciate your willingness to work with me and encouraging me to speak up in class, even though I had

nothing valuable to contribute. I'm grateful for this challenging experience as I know it will help me in the future. Thanks for facilitating a great class.

-Well planned & executed course, much better than expected.

Selected Comments from ETST 380 A2: War, Militarism, & GI Resistance

- -Ben is a fantastic teacher who does a great job of encouraging students to think for themselves and also to challenge those thoughts. The class opened my eyes to many facets of America's interactions abroad and domestically and made me change my perspectives on the way we wage war.
- -This was a course like no other here at CSU. I learned more in this class and took more away from this class than I have from a lot of other courses. Ben was knowledgeable and enthusiastic about what he was teaching! This is a class I would recommend to anyone willing to learn more about this subject.
- I highly enjoyed this course. I learned a lot of useful information and appreciated our instructor immensely.
- I liked the variety of readings, it kept things interesting.
- -I really enjoyed this class. I was hesitant to begin with because it was different than what I thought it would be but growing up in a conservative household, and still being pretty conservative, it was nice to see a

different perspective and engage in discussions that were out of my comfort zone. Overall, it was a really great class and I enjoyed Dr. Schrader.

- Loved the class. It exceeded my expectations. I really loved how we explored subjects like identity, militarism, structural violence, neoliberalism, and environmental violence.
- I appreciate Ben's passion for the subject matter... this has been my favorite class this semester and I have learned a lot. I love the discussions in class and as an extrovert who externally processes they have been very helpful... I wish there was more time in this class to learn more and cover more topics. Overall I have really appreciated this class and loved the learning process!!!
- Being an etst minor and taking many courses, I think the structure of the course was done well. The individuals that are very pro-war or military personnel seemed to be the same as the white male patriarchal individuals that are reluctant to believe or internalize the idea that they have privilege in a different etst course or carry that into life. Yes their opinion matters, but this is not a prelaw or political science course, it's etst and you stuck with that.
- One of the best courses I have taken at CSU!
- I enjoyed this course. It gave me a better understanding about the costs of war that are usually left invisible to society. I found this course to be beneficial with my studies in Ethnic Studies.

Selected Comments from ETST 380A4: Perspectives From War

-This has been the best class I've ever taken at CSU. I learned so much and felt like I left everyday feeling impacted.

- -Thank you for putting so much effort into this course and showing us how important this information is. Is was clear that you cared both for your students and the course material. You are a wonderful professor and I really appreciate you as a human.
- -I really enjoyed this class. I learned so much about the effects of war that I couldn't have analyzed in other classes. I loved having you as a professor, you are easily the coolest teacher ever. I love how you work with students and understand the difficulties they might be having.
- -I would recommend this class to anyone and everyone. One of the best classes I've ever taken.
- -Really enjoyed the class. I felt that we were given a great opportunity to learn with a professor that has first hand experience with the subject.
- -Honestly this class has changed my views on the world in which I live more than any other. Also this should be a required class for every student.
- -Professor Schrader did a fantastic job, one of the best courses I have taken; if not the most engaging. He has first hand experience of what he discusses, which adds a lot of credibility.
- -The reason I liked this professor so much is because he was prepared. Every class he knew what to do and was ready. I have never seen a professor so ready to go. Plus he is a really helpful guy.
- -Wonderful class. You have a ton of knowledge on this subject and you are passionate about teaching it. I love that you use different media formats to teach rather than just lecturing. Thank you.

Selected Comments from ETST 100: Introduction to Ethnic Studies

- -I really enjoyed having him as a teacher and I loved how passionate he was about the subject. I also thought is was smart that he was able to recognize his privilege as a white male while still teaching this class.
- -Ben is very understanding and fair. Sometimes bias, but knowledgeable and an overall great class.
- This class was really informative and eye opening.
- I think Schrader is passionate about the topic. In an intro course, I feel that he did a good job facilitating discussion.
- I was quite surprised about the content taught in this course. I had no idea my ideas, thoughts, and actions would change as a result of this class. I would recommend this class to anybody because it brings new insight into forgotten issues.
- -I truly did enjoy this class. It's refreshing to have a professor who gets the prominent issues in my life.
- I think that you did a great job teaching the course, and you know what you were talking about.
- Overall fantastic class. You have continued to keep me interested in the subject of Ethnic Studies. I wish the class size was smaller to make discussions easier/more comfortable.
- I liked the discussions in class. They let me get more perspectives and a better understanding on topics.