

n = 10

	Report: Graph Distribution
Course:	THE LEGACY OF RUSSIA (HSPSG8445_001_2013_1)
Evaluation:	A&S Course Evaluations: 2 Instructor and 1 TA Form (spring 2013)
Dates:	April 30, 2013 - May 10, 2013
No. of Respondents:	10
No. of Students:	17

# Instructor/Recitation Instructor Effectiveness - Rebecca Stanton

#### **Clear presentation of subject matter** 1:

0%(0) Poor 10%(1) Fair 20% (2) Good 50% (5) Very Good 20% (2) Excellent 0%(0) Not Applicable

#### Instructor's ability to help clarify course material 2:

		n = 10
Poor	0%(0)	
Fair	10%(1)	
Good	20% (2)	
Very Good	40% (4)	
Excellent	30% (3)	
Not Applicable	0%(0)	

### Instructor's ability to encourage student participation effectively 3:

		n = 10
Poor	0%(0)	
Fair	20%(2)	
Good	10% (1)	
Very Good	40% (4)	
Excellent	30% (3)	
Not Applicable	0%(0)	

### 4: Instructor's responsiveness to student questions, opinions and criticisms

11 - 10	n	=	10
---------	---	---	----

n = 10

n = 10

n = 10

11 – 10
0%(0)
10%(1)
0% (0)
50% (5)
40% (4)
0%(0)

# 5: **Instructor's ability to stimulate intellectual curiosity**

Poor	0%(0)
Fair	0%(0)
Good	20% (2)
Very Good	50% (5)
Excellent	30% (3)
Not Applicable	0%(0)

# 6: **Instructor's ability to raise challenging questions**

Poor0%(0)Fair0%(0)Good10% (1)Very Good0%(0)Excellent30% (3)Not Applicable0%(0)

# 7: **Overall effectiveness of the Instructor**

Poor0%(0)Fair0%(0)Good40% (4)Very Good30% (3)Excellent30% (3)Not Applicable0%(0)

Report: Comments

Course:	THE LEGACY OF RUSSIA (HSPSG8445_001_2013_1)
Evaluation:	A&S Course Evaluations: 2 Instructor and 1 TA Form (spring 2013)
Dates:	April 30, 2013 - May 10, 2013
No. of Respondents:	10
No. of Students:	17
Percent Completed: 59%	

### **Comments on Instructor Effectiveness - Rebecca Stanton**

1. Also challenged students and brought very interesting lectures and comments to class.

2. I enjoyed the content of the lecture, but often found it difficult to follow. I think this might have been partially caused by the class essentially being 2 professors presenting 2 separate lectures on one topic.

3. instructor was very knowledgable but did not present material in an organized, useful manner. it often was relevant to the theme of the week's class but the presentation was overly abstract, and not useful to my understanding of the topics. The instructor often seemed to be discussing topics on a whim but it could just be her style. The content of her lectures was very interesting and thought provoking however, the style was a bit disjointed and slightly even incoherent at times. Again, I do not know if this was lack of preparation or simply a matter of style. I feel that I could have learned more with a more structured clear presentation style. Sometimes due to this, the class seemed to be more of an afterthought. Additionally, the professor did not encourage discussion. The possibility to present her own ideas and thoughts seemed more of a priority than encouraging/sustaining meaningful discuss.

4. Professor Stanton is very knowledgeable in the field of literature. Personally, I felt like her lectures tended to be not as focused, when she made many literary allusions and seemed to be/feel rushed when she lectured and therefore her lectures weren't always as effective in their clarity. She was very responsive to students comments.

5. In principle, I really liked the dual-instructor format of the course. The two professors played their delineated roles nicely (which is not to say that they were incapable of leaving their analytical frameworks) and balanced each other both in knowledge, experience, and approach. My complaint, though, would be that because they each needed to lecture, we were often subjected to two hours of continual lecturing. Students were reluctant to participate for some reason.