Survey Results

Legend

Question text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Histogram</th>
<th>Left pole</th>
<th>Right pole</th>
<th>n=No. of responses</th>
<th>av.=Mean</th>
<th>dev.=Std. Dev.</th>
<th>ab.=Abstention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The instructor clearly defined and explained the course objectives and expectations.

   5 - Strongly Agree: 77.8% 22.2% 0% 0% 0%
   1 - Strongly Disagree: 0% 0% 0% 0% 25%

   n=9
   av.=4.78
   dev.=0.44

2. The instructor communicated information effectively.

   5 - Strongly Agree: 66.7% 33.3% 0% 0% 0%
   1 - Strongly Disagree: 0% 0% 0% 0% 25%

   n=9
   av.=4.67
   dev.=0.5

3. The instructor was prepared to teach for each instructional period.

   5 - Strongly Agree: 100% 0% 0% 0% 0%
   1 - Strongly Disagree: 0% 0% 0% 0% 25%

   n=9
   av.=5
   dev.=0

4. The instructor encouraged me to take an active role in my own learning.

   5 - Strongly Agree: 77.8% 11.1% 11.1% 0% 0%
   1 - Strongly Disagree: 0% 0% 0% 0% 25%

   n=9
   av.=4.67
   dev.=0.71

5. The instructor was available outside of class either electronically or in person.

   5 - Strongly Agree: 100% 0% 0% 0% 0%
   1 - Strongly Disagree: 0% 0% 0% 0% 25%

   n=9
   av.=5
   dev.=0

6. My overall rating of the course is:

   5 - Excellent: 55.6% 44.4% 0% 0% 0%
   1 - Poor: 0% 0% 0% 0% 25%

   n=9
   av.=4.56
   dev.=0.53

7. My overall rating of the teaching of this course is:

   5 - Excellent: 66.7% 33.3% 0% 0% 0%
   1 - Poor: 0% 0% 0% 0% 25%

   n=9
   av.=4.67
   dev.=0.5
1. The instructor clearly defined and explained the course objectives and goals:

- **5 - Strongly Agree**: 78%
- **1 - Strongly Disagree**: 22%

Average (av.) = 4.78
Standard Deviation (dev.) = 0.44
Number of responses (n) = 9

2. The instructor communicated information effectively:

- **5 - Strongly Agree**: 87%
- **1 - Strongly Disagree**: 13%

Average (av.) = 4.67
Standard Deviation (dev.) = 0.5
Number of responses (n) = 9

3. The instructor was prepared to teach for each instructional period:

- **5 - Strongly Agree**: 100%

Average (av.) = 5
Standard Deviation (dev.) = 0
Number of responses (n) = 9

4. The instructor encouraged me to take an active role in my own learning:

- **5 - Strongly Agree**: 78%
- **1 - Strongly Disagree**: 22%

Average (av.) = 4.67
Standard Deviation (dev.) = 0.71
Number of responses (n) = 9

5. The instructor was available outside of class either electronically or in person:

- **5 - Strongly Agree**: 100%

Average (av.) = 5
Standard Deviation (dev.) = 0
Number of responses (n) = 9

6. My overall rating of the course is:

- **5 - Excellent**: 67%
- **1 - Poor**: 33%

Average (av.) = 4.67
Standard Deviation (dev.) = 0.5
Number of responses (n) = 9

7. My overall rating of the teaching of this course is:

- **5 - Excellent**: 67%
- **1 - Poor**: 33%

Average (av.) = 4.67
Standard Deviation (dev.) = 0.5
Number of responses (n) = 9
x: 7. My overall rating of the teaching of this course is:

5: 5 - Excellent
4: 4 - Above Average
3: 3 - Average
2: 2 - Below Average
1: 1 - Poor

y: 6. My overall rating of the course is:

5: 5 - Excellent
4: 4 - Above Average
3: 3 - Average
2: 2 - Below Average
1: 1 - Poor

x: 7. My overall rating of the teaching of this course is:

5: 5 - Excellent
4: 4 - Above Average
3: 3 - Average
2: 2 - Below Average
1: 1 - Poor

y: 1. The instructor clearly defined and explained the course objectives and

5: 5 - Strongly Agree
4: 4 - Agree
3: 3 - Neutral
2: 2 - Disagree
1: 1 - Strongly Disagree

x: 7. My overall rating of the teaching of this course is:

5: 5 - Excellent
4: 4 - Above Average
3: 3 - Average
2: 2 - Below Average
1: 1 - Poor

y: 2. The instructor communicated information effectively.

5: 5 - Strongly Agree
4: 4 - Agree
3: 3 - Neutral
2: 2 - Disagree
1: 1 - Strongly Disagree
x: 7. My overall rating of the teaching of this course is:
5: 5 - Excellent
4: 4 - Above Average
3: 3 - Average
2: 2 - Below Average
1: 1 - Poor
y: 3. The instructor was prepared to teach for each instructional period.
5: 5 - Strongly Agree
4: 4 - Agree
3: 3 - Neutral
2: 2 - Disagree
1: 1 - Strongly Disagree

x: 7. My overall rating of the teaching of this course is:
5: 5 - Excellent
4: 4 - Above Average
3: 3 - Average
2: 2 - Below Average
1: 1 - Poor
y: 4. The instructor encouraged me to take an active role in my own learning.
5: 5 - Strongly Agree
4: 4 - Agree
3: 3 - Neutral
2: 2 - Disagree
1: 1 - Strongly Disagree

x: 7. My overall rating of the teaching of this course is:
5: 5 - Excellent
4: 4 - Above Average
3: 3 - Average
2: 2 - Below Average
1: 1 - Poor
y: 5. The instructor was available outside of class either electronically or in person.
5: 5 - Strongly Agree
4: 4 - Agree
3: 3 - Neutral
2: 2 - Disagree
1: 1 - Strongly Disagree
## Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subunit: College of Liberal and Fine Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of the instructor: Matthias Hofferberth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the course: 22997 POL 5043 001 International Politics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values used in the profile line: Mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Md</th>
<th>Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The instructor clearly defined and explained the course objectives and expectations.</td>
<td>5 - Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1 - Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>n=9</td>
<td>av.=4.78</td>
<td>md=5.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The instructor communicated information effectively.</td>
<td>5 - Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1 - Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>n=9</td>
<td>av.=4.67</td>
<td>md=5.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The instructor was prepared to teach for each instructional period.</td>
<td>5 - Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1 - Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>n=9</td>
<td>av.=5.00</td>
<td>md=5.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The instructor encouraged me to take an active role in my own learning.</td>
<td>5 - Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1 - Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>n=9</td>
<td>av.=4.67</td>
<td>md=5.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The instructor was available outside of class either electronically or in person.</td>
<td>5 - Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1 - Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>n=9</td>
<td>av.=5.00</td>
<td>md=5.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My overall rating of the course is:</td>
<td>5 - Excellent</td>
<td>1 - Poor</td>
<td>n=9</td>
<td>av.=4.56</td>
<td>md=5.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My overall rating of the teaching of this course is:</td>
<td>5 - Excellent</td>
<td>1 - Poor</td>
<td>n=9</td>
<td>av.=4.67</td>
<td>md=5.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments Report

Your written comments are an important part of your course and instructor evaluation. Please provide feedback in the box below on aspects of the course and/or the instructor that were most effective or need improvement. Student comments will be provided to your instructor only after course grades have been submitted. The instructor may, but is not obligated to, share these comments with others or include them in any evaluation process.

- Dr. Hofferberth is always prepared to deliver high quality lectures that are jam packed with information for 3 solid hours.
  - Dr. Hofferberth always challenges his students to do better (this is a good thing).
  - Dr. Hofferberth connects well with his students and encourages them to engage with the material.
- Excellent course and professor. Expanded my knowledge base on IR which allowed me to evaluate how I currently approach my research.
- Mixed results on SC. Informative course
- My only negative feedback for the course is the Statecraft simulation. Although it was fun in the beginning, it began to drag on and felt unnecessary after the reflection paper was turned in. We should have started it earlier in the semester and then ended it when the reflection paper was due.
- Thank you for everything Dr. Hofferberth! Its been great especially our conversations.
- The course readings were good. They were thoughtfully prepared and nicely lead students through major concepts in IR. However, I felt the discussion section was lacking. The professor would have benefited from really letting the students take the reins for their assigned weeks of reading. That way they could focus on what they felt was important and draw on their own experiences. The professor could still provide input and some direction for the discussion, but to a lesser extent. For example, maybe students could prepare a presentation for their reading weeks?
- The professor explicitly outlines the expectations of the class and encourages personal interpretation of whatever we are currently studying/reading. The instruction was excellent; it was the fellow students that provided the most headache throughout the course. 9/10
- The professor was always prepared to teach and made efforts at encouraging class discussion. This course served as an excellent introduction to more advanced IR topics which challenged our biases and pre-conceived notions. Inversely, the professor deemed it fit to still assign the class with time wasting assignments that the entire department seems to enjoy. Most of us are working professionals with families and other commitments outside of the classroom. It is already a struggle to keep up with the complex readings that were assigned and the difficulties of this course were exacerbated by additional assignments.
  - The largest time waster was the Statecraft simulation. While the game itself was a wonderful idea, the weekly memos detracted from time that we hardly had. Furthermore, assigning us pairs put more strain on us than was necessary. The vast majority of us had difficulties communicating with our partners which made the experience more bitter than beneficial.
  - Overall, the course was good, but the professor (and the department) need to eliminate the extra assignments. We are not entry level students or undergraduates. Graduate school should be seminar driven, not assignment driven.