

PROFESSOR Jeremy Menchik

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 18

NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 20

PERCENT OF ENROLLED STUDENTS RESPONDING: 90

STATISTICS REFLECT FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES

I. SECTION A: COURSE EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
1. RELEVANCE OF ASSIGNED READINGS [(1) LOW TO (5) HIGH]	POOR	0	0	0	0	5	13	EXCELLENT	4.722	0.461
2. DIFFICULTY OF COURSE [(1) EASY TO (5) DIFFICULT]	POOR	0	0	0	4	13	1	EXCELLENT	3.833	0.514
3. WORKLOAD IN COURSE [(1) LIGHT TO (5) HEAVY]	POOR	0	0	0	4	13	1	EXCELLENT	3.833	0.514
4. OVERALL RATING OF DISCUSSION INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	10	0	0	0	2	6	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.463
5. OVERALL RATING OF LAB INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	17	0	0	0	0	1	EXCELLENT	5.000	N/A
6. USEFULNESS OF ASSIGNMENTS AND PAPERS	POOR	0	0	0	0	9	9	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.514
7. OVERALL COURSE RATING	POOR	0	0	0	0	4	14	EXCELLENT	4.778	0.428

II. SECTION B: FACULTY EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
8. EFFECTIVENESS IN EXPLAINING CONCEPTS	POOR	0	0	0	0	1	17	EXCELLENT	4.944	0.236
9. ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST IN SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	0	2	16	EXCELLENT	4.889	0.323
10. ENCOURAGEMENT OF CLASS PARTICIPATION	POOR	0	0	0	0	4	14	EXCELLENT	4.778	0.428
11. FAIRNESS IN GRADING	POOR	0	0	0	0	4	14	EXCELLENT	4.778	0.428
12. PROMPTNESS IN RETURNING ASSIGNMENTS	POOR	0	0	0	0	4	14	EXCELLENT	4.778	0.428
13. QUALITY OF FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS	POOR	0	0	0	1	5	12	EXCELLENT	4.611	0.608
14. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE OF CLASS	POOR	1	0	0	1	5	10	EXCELLENT	4.562	0.629
15. OVERALL RATING OF INSTRUCTOR	POOR	0	0	0	0	2	16	EXCELLENT	4.889	0.323
16. WERE THE GRADING CRITERIA CLEARLY STATED	POOR	0	0	0	0	3	15	EXCELLENT	4.833	0.383

PROFESSOR Jeremy Menchik

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING: 18

NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 20

PERCENT OF ENROLLED STUDENTS RESPONDING: 90

STATISTICS REFLECT PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES

I. SECTION A: COURSE EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
1. RELEVANCE OF ASSIGNED READINGS [(1) LOW TO (5) HIGH]	POOR	0	0	0	0	28	72	EXCELLENT	4.722	0.461
2. DIFFICULTY OF COURSE [(1) EASY TO (5) DIFFICULT]	POOR	0	0	0	22	72	6	EXCELLENT	3.833	0.514
3. WORKLOAD IN COURSE [(1) LIGHT TO (5) HEAVY]	POOR	0	0	0	22	72	6	EXCELLENT	3.833	0.514
4. OVERALL RATING OF DISCUSSION INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	56	0	0	0	11	33	EXCELLENT	4.750	0.463
5. OVERALL RATING OF LAB INSTRUCTOR (IF APPLICABLE)	POOR	94	0	0	0	0	6	EXCELLENT	5.000	N/A
6. USEFULNESS OF ASSIGNMENTS AND PAPERS	POOR	0	0	0	0	50	50	EXCELLENT	4.500	0.514
7. OVERALL COURSE RATING	POOR	0	0	0	0	22	78	EXCELLENT	4.778	0.428

II. SECTION B: FACULTY EVALUATION

		NR	1	2	3	4	5		MEAN	ST DEV
8. EFFECTIVENESS IN EXPLAINING CONCEPTS	POOR	0	0	0	0	6	94	EXCELLENT	4.944	0.236
9. ABILITY TO STIMULATE INTEREST IN SUBJECT	POOR	0	0	0	0	11	89	EXCELLENT	4.889	0.323
10. ENCOURAGEMENT OF CLASS PARTICIPATION	POOR	0	0	0	0	22	78	EXCELLENT	4.778	0.428
11. FAIRNESS IN GRADING	POOR	0	0	0	0	22	78	EXCELLENT	4.778	0.428
12. PROMPTNESS IN RETURNING ASSIGNMENTS	POOR	0	0	0	0	22	78	EXCELLENT	4.778	0.428
13. QUALITY OF FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS	POOR	0	0	0	6	28	67	EXCELLENT	4.611	0.608
14. AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE OF CLASS	POOR	6	0	0	6	28	56	EXCELLENT	4.562	0.629
15. OVERALL RATING OF INSTRUCTOR	POOR	0	0	0	0	11	89	EXCELLENT	4.889	0.323
16. WERE THE GRADING CRITERIA CLEARLY STATED	POOR	0	0	0	0	17	83	EXCELLENT	4.833	0.383



Department of International Relations
Course / Faculty Evaluation



Course Number: G R S
C A S 1 R 5 6 1 Section: A 1

Course Title: International Relations & Religion

Instructor: Menckel

Semester/Year: Spring 2016

Instructions

- * Use #2 Pencil, Blue or Black Ink Pen only
- * Make DARK Marks
- * Example: ① ② ③ ● ⑤

Course Evaluation

- | | Poor | | | | Excellent |
|---|------|---|---|---|-----------|
| 1. Relevance of assigned readings [(1) low to (5) high]..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 2. Difficulty of course [(1) easy to (5) difficult]..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 3. Workload in course [(1) light to (5) heavy]..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 4. Overall rating of discussion instructor (if applicable)..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 5. Overall rating of lab instructor (if applicable)..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 6. Usefulness of assignments and papers..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 7. Overall course rating..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| | • | • | • | • | • |

Faculty Evaluation

- | | Poor | | | | Excellent |
|---|------|---|---|---|-----------|
| 8. Effectiveness in explaining concepts..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 9. Ability to stimulate interest in subject..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 10. Encouragement of class participation..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 11. Fairness in grading..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 12. Promptness in returning assignments..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 13. Quality of feedback to students..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 14. Availability outside of class..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 15. Overall rating of instructor..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 16. Were the grading criteria clearly stated..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| | • | • | • | • | • |

Please turn over and complete comments section

Please comment on:

STRENGTHS of the course and of the Instructor:

The professor was extremely strong in his explanations of material. I think this was most helpful for undergraduates. There was an interesting array of readings and perspectives which facilitated discussion and broadened our knowledge of the subject.

WEAKNESSES of the course and of the Instructor:

Some readings were repetitive for graduate students. I sometimes felt unfocused due to this, and would request alternate meetings or readings in order to challenge us, particularly in the beginning of the semester.

GENERAL COMMENTS:



Department of International Relations
Course / Faculty Evaluation



Course Number:

C	A	S	IR	5	6	1
---	---	---	----	---	---	---

 Section:

A	1
---	---

Course Title: Religion & IR
Instructor: Menchik
Semester/Year: Spring 2016

Instructions

- * Use #2 Pencil, Blue or Black Ink Pen only
- * Make DARK Marks
- * Example: ① ② ③ ● ⑤

Course Evaluation

	Poor			Excellent
1. Relevance of assigned readings [(1) low to (5) high].....	①	②	③	④ ●
2. Difficulty of course [(1) easy to (5) difficult].....	①	②	③	● ⑤
3. Workload in course [(1) light to (5) heavy].....	①	②	③	● ⑤
4. Overall rating of discussion instructor (if applicable).....	①	②	③	④ ●
5. Overall rating of lab instructor (if applicable).....	①	②	③	④ ●
6. Usefulness of assignments and papers.....	①	②	③	● ⑤
7. Overall course rating.....	①	②	③	④ ●
	•	•	•	•

Faculty Evaluation

	Poor			Excellent
8. Effectiveness in explaining concepts.....	①	②	③	④ ●
9. Ability to stimulate interest in subject.....	①	②	③	④ ●
10. Encouragement of class participation.....	①	②	③	● ⑤
11. Fairness in grading.....	①	②	③	● ⑤
12. Promptness in returning assignments.....	①	②	③	● ⑤
13. Quality of feedback to students.....	①	②	③	④ ●
14. Availability outside of class.....	①	②	● ③	④ ⑤
15. Overall rating of instructor.....	①	②	③	④ ●
16. Were the grading criteria clearly stated.....	①	②	③	④ ●
	•	•	•	•

Please turn over and complete comments section

Please comment on:

STRENGTHS of the course and of the Instructor:


Great class, well organized,
Excellent professor, explains concepts well,
Course was challenging but not too bad

WEAKNESSES of the course and of the Instructor:

Midterm took same amount of time as
Response Paper, but worth way more.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Great course. Merchik is great!



Department of International Relations
Course / Faculty Evaluation



Course Number:

C	A	S	IR	5	6	1
---	---	---	----	---	---	---

 Section:

A	1
---	---

Course Title: Religion and International Relations

Instructor: Merchik

Semester/Year: Spring 2016

Instructions

- * Use #2 Pencil, Blue or Black Ink Pen only
- * Make DARK Marks
- * Example: ① ② ③ ● ⑤

Course Evaluation

	Poor			Excellent
1. Relevance of assigned readings [(1) low to (5) high].....	①	②	③	④ ●
2. Difficulty of course [(1) easy to (5) difficult].....	①	②	③	● ⑤
3. Workload in course [(1) light to (5) heavy].....	①	②	●	④ ⑤
4. Overall rating of discussion instructor (if applicable).....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
5. Overall rating of lab instructor (if applicable).....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
6. Usefulness of assignments and papers.....	①	②	③	④ ●
7. Overall course rating.....	①	②	③	④ ●
	•	•	•	•

Faculty Evaluation

	Poor			Excellent
8. Effectiveness in explaining concepts.....	①	②	③	④ ●
9. Ability to stimulate interest in subject.....	①	②	③	● ⑤
10. Encouragement of class participation.....	①	②	③	④ ●
11. Fairness in grading.....	①	②	③	④ ●
12. Promptness in returning assignments.....	①	②	③	④ ●
13. Quality of feedback to students.....	①	②	③	④ ●
14. Availability outside of class.....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
15. Overall rating of instructor.....	①	②	③	④ ●
16. Were the grading criteria clearly stated.....	①	②	③	④ ●
	•	•	•	•

Please turn over and complete comments section

Please comment on:

STRENGTHS of the course and of the Instructor:

- Readings were useful
- Professor was clear and informative, as well as enthusiastic about the course

WEAKNESSES of the course and of the Instructor:

- Sometimes the pace of the ~~course~~ course felt fast at times
- Some topics could have been ~~tag~~ broken down more

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Good class, glad this was my first grad class as an undergrad.



Department of International Relations
Course / Faculty Evaluation



Course Number:

C	A	S	I	R	S	6	1
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

 Section:

--	--

Course Title: Religion & IR

Instructor: Mendrik

Semester/Year: Spring 2016

Instructions

* Use #2 Pencil, Blue or Black Ink Pen only

* Make DARK Marks

* Example: ① ② ③ ● ⑤

Course Evaluation

	Poor			Excellent
1. Relevance of assigned readings [(1) low to (5) high].....	①	②	③	④ ●
2. Difficulty of course [(1) easy to (5) difficult].....	①	②	③	④ ● ⑤
3. Workload in course [(1) light to (5) heavy].....	①	②	③	④ ● ⑤
4. Overall rating of discussion instructor (if applicable).....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
5. Overall rating of lab instructor (if applicable).....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
6. Usefulness of assignments and papers.....	①	②	③	④ ● ⑤
7. Overall course rating.....	①	②	③	④ ● ⑤
	•	•	•	• •

Faculty Evaluation

	Poor			Excellent
8. Effectiveness in explaining concepts.....	①	②	③	④ ●
9. Ability to stimulate interest in subject.....	①	②	③	④ ● ⑤
10. Encouragement of class participation.....	①	②	③	④ ● ⑤
11. Fairness in grading.....	①	②	③	④ ● ⑤
12. Promptness in returning assignments.....	①	②	③	④ ● ⑤
13. Quality of feedback to students.....	①	②	③	④ ● ⑤
14. Availability outside of class.....	①	②	③	④ ● ⑤
15. Overall rating of instructor.....	①	②	③	④ ● ⑤
16. Were the grading criteria clearly stated.....	①	②	③	④ ● ⑤
	•	•	•	• •

Please turn over and complete comments section

Please comment on:

STRENGTHS of the course and of the Instructor:

Good lecturer, knowledgeable, drew on a
large of theories & regions

WEAKNESSES of the course and of the Instructor:

Class structure was sometimes weak
due to undergrad/grad split, as
well as disciplinary variation

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Great guy, very informative class



Department of International Relations
Course / Faculty Evaluation



Course Number:

C	A	S	IR	5	6	1
---	---	---	----	---	---	---

 Section:

A	1
---	---

Course Title: Religion and International
Instructor: Menchik Relations
Semester/Year: Spring 2016

Instructions

- * Use #2 Pencil, Blue or Black Ink Pen only
- * Make DARK Marks
- * Example: ① ② ③ ● ⑤

Course Evaluation

- | | Poor | | | Excellent |
|---|------|---|---|-----------|
| 1. Relevance of assigned readings [(1) low to (5) high]..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 2. Difficulty of course [(1) easy to (5) difficult]..... | ① | ② | ③ | ● ⑤ |
| 3. Workload in course [(1) light to (5) heavy]..... | ① | ② | ③ | ● ⑤ |
| 4. Overall rating of discussion instructor (if applicable)..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 5. Overall rating of lab instructor (if applicable)..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 6. Usefulness of assignments and papers..... | ① | ② | ③ | ● ⑤ |
| 7. Overall course rating..... | ① | ② | ③ | ● ⑤ |
| | • | • | • | • • |

Faculty Evaluation

- | | Poor | | | Excellent |
|---|------|---|---|-----------|
| 8. Effectiveness in explaining concepts..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 9. Ability to stimulate interest in subject..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 10. Encouragement of class participation..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 11. Fairness in grading..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 12. Promptness in returning assignments..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 13. Quality of feedback to students..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 14. Availability outside of class..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 15. Overall rating of instructor..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 16. Were the grading criteria clearly stated..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| | • | • | • | • • |

Please turn over and complete comments section

Please comment on:

STRENGTHS of the course and of the Instructor:

WEAKNESSES of the course and of the Instructor:

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Enlightening + productive course.



Department of International Relations
Course / Faculty Evaluation



Course Number:

C	A	S	1	R	5	0	1
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

 Section:

--	--

Course Title: Religion + IR

Instructor: Menchik

Semester/Year: Spring 2016

Instructions

* Use #2 Pencil, Blue or Black Ink Pen only

* Make DARK Marks

* Example: ① ② ③ ● ⑤

Course Evaluation

	Poor			Excellent
1. Relevance of assigned readings [(1) low to (5) high].....	①	②	③	● ⑤
2. Difficulty of course [(1) easy to (5) difficult].....	①	②	③	● ⑤
3. Workload in course [(1) light to (5) heavy].....	①	②	● ③	④ ⑤
4. Overall rating of discussion instructor (if applicable).....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
5. Overall rating of lab instructor (if applicable).....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
6. Usefulness of assignments and papers.....	①	②	③	④ ● ⑤
7. Overall course rating.....	①	②	③	④ ● ⑤
	•	•	•	• •

Faculty Evaluation

	Poor			Excellent
8. Effectiveness in explaining concepts.....	①	②	③	④ ● ⑤
9. Ability to stimulate interest in subject.....	①	②	③	④ ● ⑤
10. Encouragement of class participation.....	①	②	③	● ④ ⑤
11. Fairness in grading.....	①	②	③	④ ● ⑤
12. Promptness in returning assignments.....	①	②	③	④ ● ⑤
13. Quality of feedback to students.....	①	②	③	④ ● ⑤
14. Availability outside of class.....	①	②	③	④ ● ⑤
15. Overall rating of instructor.....	①	②	③	④ ● ⑤
16. Were the grading criteria clearly stated.....	①	②	③	④ ● ⑤
	•	•	•	• •

Please turn over and complete comments section

Please comment on:

STRENGTHS of the course and of the Instructor:

WEAKNESSES of the course and of the Instructor:

GENERAL COMMENTS:

While not a difficult course in terms of time/understanding concepts, it definitely challenged me to think more critically and better apply concepts to a broader field.

Thank you!



Department of International Relations
Course / Faculty Evaluation



Course Number:

C	A	S	R	N	S	6	1
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

 Section:

--	--

Course Title: IR and Religion

Instructor: Dr. Merchik

Semester/Year: Spring 2016

Instructions

- * Use #2 Pencil, Blue or Black Ink Pen only
- * Make DARK Marks
- * Example: ① ② ③ ● ⑤

Course Evaluation

	Poor			Excellent
1. Relevance of assigned readings [(1) low to (5) high].....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
2. Difficulty of course [(1) easy to (5) difficult].....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
3. Workload in course [(1) light to (5) heavy].....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
4. Overall rating of discussion instructor (if applicable).....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
5. Overall rating of lab instructor (if applicable).....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
6. Usefulness of assignments and papers.....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
7. Overall course rating.....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
	•	•	•	• •

Faculty Evaluation

	Poor			Excellent
8. Effectiveness in explaining concepts.....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
9. Ability to stimulate interest in subject.....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
10. Encouragement of class participation.....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
11. Fairness in grading.....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
12. Promptness in returning assignments.....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
13. Quality of feedback to students.....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
14. Availability outside of class.....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
15. Overall rating of instructor.....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
16. Were the grading criteria clearly stated.....	①	②	③	④ ⑤
	•	•	•	• •

Please turn over and complete comments section

Please comment on:

STRENGTHS of the course and of the Instructor:

Hard class, heavy material but great professor

WEAKNESSES of the course and of the Instructor:

A lot to take in; subject can ~~diffi~~ hardly be taught in a semester.

GENERAL COMMENTS:





Department of International Relations
Course / Faculty Evaluation



Course Number:

C	A	S	IR	561
---	---	---	----	-----

 Section:

--	--

Course Title: International Relations and Religion

Instructor: Pr. Jeffrey Neufeldt

Semester/Year: Spr. 2016

Instructions

* Use #2 Pencil, Blue or Black Ink Pen only

* Make DARK Marks

* Example: ① ② ③ ● ⑤

Course Evaluation

- | | Poor | | | Excellent |
|---|------|---|---|-----------|
| 1. Relevance of assigned readings [(1) low to (5) high]..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 2. Difficulty of course [(1) easy to (5) difficult]..... | ① | ② | ● | ④ ⑤ |
| 3. Workload in course [(1) light to (5) heavy]..... | ① | ② | ● | ④ ⑤ |
| 4. Overall rating of discussion instructor (if applicable)..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 5. Overall rating of lab instructor (if applicable)..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 6. Usefulness of assignments and papers..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 7. Overall course rating..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |

• • • • •

Faculty Evaluation

- | | Poor | | | Excellent |
|---|------|---|---|-----------|
| 8. Effectiveness in explaining concepts..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 9. Ability to stimulate interest in subject..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 10. Encouragement of class participation..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 11. Fairness in grading..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 12. Promptness in returning assignments..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 13. Quality of feedback to students..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 14. Availability outside of class..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 15. Overall rating of instructor..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 16. Were the grading criteria clearly stated..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |

• • • • •

Please turn over and complete comments section

Please comment on:

STRENGTHS of the course and of the Instructor:

WEAKNESSES of the course and of the Instructor:

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Include Readings on Abrahamic Religions in East Asia
and Russia



Department of International Relations
Course / Faculty Evaluation



Course Number:

C	A	S	5	6	1
---	---	---	---	---	---

 Section:

0	6	1
---	---	---

Course Title: Polymers
Instructor: M. M. M.
Semester/Year: SP17 Lat

Instructions

- * Use #2 Pencil, Blue or Black Ink Pen only
- * Make DARK Marks
- * Example: ① ② ③ ● ⑤

Course Evaluation

- | | Poor | | | Excellent |
|---|------|---|---|-----------|
| 1. Relevance of assigned readings [(1) low to (5) high]..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 2. Difficulty of course [(1) easy to (5) difficult]..... | ① | ② | ● | ④ ⑤ |
| 3. Workload in course [(1) light to (5) heavy]..... | ① | ② | ● | ④ ⑤ |
| 4. Overall rating of discussion instructor (if applicable)..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 5. Overall rating of lab instructor (if applicable)..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 6. Usefulness of assignments and papers..... | ① | ② | ③ | ● ⑤ |
| 7. Overall course rating..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| | • | • | • | • • |

Faculty Evaluation

- | | Poor | | | Excellent |
|---|------|---|---|-----------|
| 8. Effectiveness in explaining concepts..... | ① | ② | ③ | ● ⑤ |
| 9. Ability to stimulate interest in subject..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 10. Encouragement of class participation..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 11. Fairness in grading..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 12. Promptness in returning assignments..... | ① | ② | ③ | ● ⑤ |
| 13. Quality of feedback to students..... | ① | ② | ● | ④ ⑤ |
| 14. Availability outside of class..... | ① | ② | ③ | ● ⑤ |
| 15. Overall rating of instructor..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● |
| 16. Were the grading criteria clearly stated..... | ① | ② | ③ | ● ⑤ |
| | • | • | • | • • |

Please turn over and complete comments section


Please comment on:

STRENGTHS of the course and of the Instructor:

clear and structured interest in subject matter

WEAKNESSES of the course and of the Instructor:

GENERAL COMMENTS:



Department of International Relations
Course / Faculty Evaluation



Course Number: C A S I R 5 6 1 Section: A 1

Course Title: International Relations & Religion

Instructor: Jeremy Menchik

Semester/Year: Spring 2016

Instructions

* Use #2 Pencil, Blue or Black Ink Pen only

* Make DARK Marks

* Example: (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Course Evaluation

	Poor			Excellent
1. Relevance of assigned readings [(1) low to (5) high].....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4) (5)
2. Difficulty of course [(1) easy to (5) difficult].....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4) (5)
3. Workload in course [(1) light to (5) heavy].....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4) (5)
4. Overall rating of discussion instructor (if applicable).....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4) (5)
5. Overall rating of lab instructor (if applicable).....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4) (5)
6. Usefulness of assignments and papers.....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4) (5)
7. Overall course rating.....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4) (5)
	.	.	.	.

Faculty Evaluation

	Poor			Excellent
8. Effectiveness in explaining concepts.....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4) (5)
9. Ability to stimulate interest in subject.....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4) (5)
10. Encouragement of class participation.....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4) (5)
11. Fairness in grading.....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4) (5)
12. Promptness in returning assignments.....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4) (5)
13. Quality of feedback to students.....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4) (5)
14. Availability outside of class.....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4) (5)
15. Overall rating of instructor.....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4) (5)
16. Were the grading criteria clearly stated.....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4) (5)
	.	.	.	.

Please turn over and complete comments section

Please comment on:


STRENGTHS of the course and of the Instructor:

Presentations → pair graduate & undergraduate students
Readings & discussion fostered interest in subject.

WEAKNESSES of the course and of the Instructor:

Too much emphasis on Islam & Christianity

GENERAL COMMENTS:



Department of International Relations
Course / Faculty Evaluation



Course Number:

C	A	S	IR	S	6	1
---	---	---	----	---	---	---

 Section:

--	--

Course Title: Religion & IR

Instructor: Jeremy Menchik

Semester/Year: Spring 2016

Instructions

* Use #2 Pencil, Blue or Black Ink Pen only

* Make DARK Marks

* Example: ① ② ③ ● ⑤

Course Evaluation

- | | Poor | | | Excellent |
|---|------|---|-----|-----------|
| 1. Relevance of assigned readings [(1) low to (5) high]..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● ⑤ |
| 2. Difficulty of course [(1) easy to (5) difficult]..... | ① | ② | ● ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 3. Workload in course [(1) light to (5) heavy]..... | ① | ② | ③ | ● ④ ⑤ |
| 4. Overall rating of discussion instructor (if applicable)..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 5. Overall rating of lab instructor (if applicable)..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 6. Usefulness of assignments and papers..... | ① | ② | ③ | ● ④ ⑤ |
| 7. Overall course rating..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● ⑤ |

• • • • •

Faculty Evaluation

- | | Poor | | | Excellent |
|---|------|---|---|-----------|
| 8. Effectiveness in explaining concepts..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● ⑤ |
| 9. Ability to stimulate interest in subject..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● ⑤ |
| 10. Encouragement of class participation..... | ① | ② | ③ | ● ④ ⑤ |
| 11. Fairness in grading..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● ⑤ |
| 12. Promptness in returning assignments..... | ① | ② | ③ | ● ④ ⑤ |
| 13. Quality of feedback to students..... | ① | ② | ③ | ● ④ ⑤ |
| 14. Availability outside of class..... | ① | ② | ③ | ● ④ ⑤ |
| 15. Overall rating of instructor..... | ① | ② | ③ | ● ④ ⑤ |
| 16. Were the grading criteria clearly stated..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● ⑤ |

• • • • •

Please turn over and complete comments section

Please comment on:

STRENGTHS of the course and of the Instructor:

The course was arranged well, and the readings were very helpful.

WEAKNESSES of the course and of the Instructor:

1. The response papers felt like "busy work" to me. Granted, it's a mixed undergrad/grad course, so there was probably no way around it, but as a graduate student, it felt like some.
2. There should have been readings on religions other than Islam. The course was very top heavy on Islam.

GENERAL COMMENTS:



Department of International Relations
Course / Faculty Evaluation



Course Number: CAS PO 589 Section: A1
Course Title: Modern Religion and IR
Instructor: Menchick
Semester/Year: Spring 2016

Instructions

- * Use #2 Pencil, Blue or Black Ink Pen only
- * Make DARK Marks
- * Example: (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Course Evaluation

- | | Poor | | | Excellent |
|---|------|-----|-----|-----------|
| 1. Relevance of assigned readings [(1) low to (5) high]..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) (5) |
| 2. Difficulty of course [(1) easy to (5) difficult]..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) (5) |
| 3. Workload in course [(1) light to (5) heavy]..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) (5) |
| 4. Overall rating of discussion instructor (if applicable)..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) (5) |
| 5. Overall rating of lab instructor (if applicable)..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) (5) |
| 6. Usefulness of assignments and papers..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) (5) |
| 7. Overall course rating..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) (5) |

Faculty Evaluation

- | | Poor | | | Excellent |
|---|------|-----|-----|-----------|
| 8. Effectiveness in explaining concepts..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) (5) |
| 9. Ability to stimulate interest in subject..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) (5) |
| 10. Encouragement of class participation..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) (5) |
| 11. Fairness in grading..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) (5) |
| 12. Promptness in returning assignments..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) (5) |
| 13. Quality of feedback to students..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) (5) |
| 14. Availability outside of class..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) (5) |
| 15. Overall rating of instructor..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) (5) |
| 16. Were the grading criteria clearly stated..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) (5) |

Please turn over and complete comments section

Please comment on:

STRENGTHS of the course and of the Instructor:

amazing knowledge of subject and incredible ability to explain complicated topics, willing to go above and beyond to ensure student understanding of course content, very personable, easy to approach and ask questions to, captivating lecturer, and just overall great professor.

WEAKNESSES of the course and of the Instructor:

/

GENERAL COMMENTS:

One of the best professors I've had at BU, great guy.



Department of International Relations
Course / Faculty Evaluation



Course Number:

C	A	S	I	R	S	b	I
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

 Section:

--	--

Course Title: IR and Religion

Instructor: Jeremy Menchek

Semester/Year: Spring 2016

Instructions

* Use #2 Pencil, Blue or Black Ink Pen only

* Make DARK Marks

* Example: ① ② ③ ● ⑤

Course Evaluation

- | | Poor | | | Excellent |
|---|------|---|-----|-----------|
| 1. Relevance of assigned readings [(1) low to (5) high]..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● ⑤ |
| 2. Difficulty of course [(1) easy to (5) difficult]..... | ① | ② | ● ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 3. Workload in course [(1) light to (5) heavy]..... | ① | ② | ③ | ● ④ ⑤ |
| 4. Overall rating of discussion instructor (if applicable)..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 5. Overall rating of lab instructor (if applicable)..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 6. Usefulness of assignments and papers..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● ⑤ |
| 7. Overall course rating..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● ⑤ |
| | • | • | • | • • |

Faculty Evaluation

- | | Poor | | | Excellent |
|---|------|---|---|-----------|
| 8. Effectiveness in explaining concepts..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● ⑤ |
| 9. Ability to stimulate interest in subject..... | ① | ② | ③ | ● ④ ⑤ |
| 10. Encouragement of class participation..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● ⑤ |
| 11. Fairness in grading..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● ⑤ |
| 12. Promptness in returning assignments..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● ⑤ |
| 13. Quality of feedback to students..... | ① | ② | ③ | ● ④ ⑤ |
| 14. Availability outside of class..... | ① | ② | ③ | ● ④ ⑤ |
| 15. Overall rating of instructor..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● ⑤ |
| 16. Were the grading criteria clearly stated..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ● ⑤ |
| | • | • | • | • • |

Please turn over and complete comments section



Please comment on:

STRENGTHS of the course and of the Instructor:

WEAKNESSES of the course and of the Instructor:

GENERAL COMMENTS:





Department of International Relations
Course / Faculty Evaluation



Course Number:

C	A	S	R	N	5	6	1
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

 Section:

--	--

Course Title: IR and Religion

Instructor: Professor Menchik

Semester/Year: Spring 2016

Instructions

* Use #2 Pencil, Blue or Black Ink Pen only

* Make DARK Marks

* Example: ① ② ③ ● ⑤

Course Evaluation

- | | Poor | | | Excellent |
|---|------|---|---|-----------|
| 1. Relevance of assigned readings [(1) low to (5) high]..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 2. Difficulty of course [(1) easy to (5) difficult]..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 3. Workload in course [(1) light to (5) heavy]..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 4. Overall rating of discussion instructor (if applicable)..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 5. Overall rating of lab instructor (if applicable)..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 6. Usefulness of assignments and papers..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 7. Overall course rating..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| | • | • | • | • • |

Faculty Evaluation

- | | Poor | | | Excellent |
|---|------|---|---|-----------|
| 8. Effectiveness in explaining concepts..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 9. Ability to stimulate interest in subject..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 10. Encouragement of class participation..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 11. Fairness in grading..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 12. Promptness in returning assignments..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 13. Quality of feedback to students..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 14. Availability outside of class..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 15. Overall rating of instructor..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| 16. Were the grading criteria clearly stated..... | ① | ② | ③ | ④ ⑤ |
| | • | • | • | • • |

Please turn over and complete comments section

Please comment on:

STRENGTHS of the course and of the Instructor:

The course provides an excellent overview of the various political elements that religion utilizes.

WEAKNESSES of the course and of the Instructor:

There was a lot of teaching focusing on ISIS. Would have preferred to read more about them.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Great class



Course Number:

C	A	S				
---	---	---	--	--	--	--

 Section:

--	--

Course Title: IR 561

Instructor: Dr. Menchik

Semester/Year: Spring '16

Instructions

- * Use #2 Pencil, Blue or Black Ink Pen only
- * Make DARK Marks
- * Example: (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Course Evaluation

- | | Poor | | | | Excellent |
|---|------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| 1. Relevance of assigned readings [(1) low to (5) high]..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 2. Difficulty of course [(1) easy to (5) difficult]..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 3. Workload in course [(1) light to (5) heavy]..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 4. Overall rating of discussion instructor (if applicable)..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 5. Overall rating of lab instructor (if applicable)..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 6. Usefulness of assignments and papers..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 7. Overall course rating..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |

• • • • •

Faculty Evaluation

- | | Poor | | | | Excellent |
|---|------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| 8. Effectiveness in explaining concepts..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 9. Ability to stimulate interest in subject..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 10. Encouragement of class participation..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 11. Fairness in grading..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 12. Promptness in returning assignments..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 13. Quality of feedback to students..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 14. Availability outside of class..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 15. Overall rating of instructor..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 16. Were the grading criteria clearly stated..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |

• • • • •

Please turn over and complete comments section

Please comment on:

STRENGTHS of the course and of the Instructor:

Dr. Menchik did a wonderful job teaching the course. He engaged with the students and cared about what we had to say on the given topic. He was always seeking to improve.

WEAKNESSES of the course and of the Instructor:

GENERAL COMMENTS:



Course Number:

C	A	S	R	N	5	0	1
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

 Section:

A	1
---	---

Course Title: IR + Religion

Instructor: Menchik

Semester/Year: Spring 2016

Instructions

- * Use #2 Pencil, Blue or Black Ink Pen only
- * Make DARK Marks
- * Example: (1) (2) (3) ● (5)

Course Evaluation

	Poor				Excellent
1. Relevance of assigned readings [(1) low to (5) high].....	(1)	(2)	(3)	●	(5)
2. Difficulty of course [(1) easy to (5) difficult].....	(1)	(2)	(3)	●	(5)
3. Workload in course [(1) light to (5) heavy].....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	●
4. Overall rating of discussion instructor (if applicable).....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
5. Overall rating of lab instructor (if applicable).....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
6. Usefulness of assignments and papers.....	(1)	(2)	(3)	●	(5)
7. Overall course rating.....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	●
	•	•	•	•	•

Faculty Evaluation

	Poor				Excellent
8. Effectiveness in explaining concepts.....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	●
9. Ability to stimulate interest in subject.....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	●
10. Encouragement of class participation.....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	●
11. Fairness in grading.....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	●
12. Promptness in returning assignments.....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	●
13. Quality of feedback to students.....	(1)	(2)	(3)	●	(5)
14. Availability outside of class.....	(1)	(2)	(3)	●	(5)
15. Overall rating of instructor.....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	●
16. Were the grading criteria clearly stated.....	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	●
	•	•	•	•	•

Please turn over and complete comments section

Please comment on:

STRENGTHS of the course and of the Instructor:

- stimulating + challenging in the way a student should want
- I enjoyed the flow of topics week-to-week
- Fav. readings: pro-life movement, orphan scandal
- inclusive for all skill levels 99% of the time
- accessible + realistically valuable
- snacks! :)

WEAKNESSES of the course and of the Instructor:

- so much reading, couldn't do it all but genuinely tried
- sometimes over my head

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Thank you for challenging us and inspiring us to constantly re-evaluate global perspectives.
Best IR course I've had.



Department of International Relations
Course / Faculty Evaluation



Course Number:

C	A	S	12	561
---	---	---	----	-----

 Section:

--	--

Course Title: Region 8 International Relations

Instructor: Jerry Munchik

Semester/Year: Spring 2016

Instructions

- * Use #2 Pencil, Blue or Black Ink Pen only
- * Make DARK Marks
- * Example: (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Course Evaluation

1. Relevance of assigned readings [(1) low to (5) high].....
2. Difficulty of course [(1) easy to (5) difficult].....
3. Workload in course [(1) light to (5) heavy].....
4. Overall rating of discussion instructor (if applicable).....
5. Overall rating of lab instructor (if applicable).....
6. Usefulness of assignments and papers.....
7. Overall course rating.....

Poor			Excellent	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Faculty Evaluation

8. Effectiveness in explaining concepts.....
9. Ability to stimulate interest in subject.....
10. Encouragement of class participation.....
11. Fairness in grading.....
12. Promptness in returning assignments.....
13. Quality of feedback to students.....
14. Availability outside of class.....
15. Overall rating of instructor.....
16. Were the grading criteria clearly stated.....

Poor			Excellent	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Please turn over and complete comments section

Please comment on:

STRENGTHS of the course and of the Instructor:

Effective overview of REGIONAL CONTEXTS
with good balance of qualitative / quantitative study

WEAKNESSES of the course and of the Instructor:

- Very Islam-Focused
- Little interaction with Judaism
- Western-Focused in terms of Historical backgrounds
- perhaps more time for student-student group work

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Thank you for your rigorous & vivacious
devotion to Religion & IR &
for working
closely with students,
particularly in your ability to listen closely
to students' questions / responses



Course Number: ^{G R S}
~~0~~ ~~A~~ ~~S~~ | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 1 Section: A | 1
 Course Title: Religion + International Rel.
 Instructor: Menchik
 Semester/Year: Spring 2016

Instructions

- * Use #2 Pencil, Blue or Black Ink Pen only
- * Make DARK Marks
- * Example: (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Course Evaluation

- | | Poor | | | | Excellent |
|---|------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| 1. Relevance of assigned readings [(1) low to (5) high]..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 2. Difficulty of course [(1) easy to (5) difficult]..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 3. Workload in course [(1) light to (5) heavy]..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 4. Overall rating of discussion instructor (if applicable)..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 5. Overall rating of lab instructor (if applicable)..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 6. Usefulness of assignments and papers..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 7. Overall course rating..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| | . | . | . | . | . |

Faculty Evaluation

- | | Poor | | | | Excellent |
|---|------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| 8. Effectiveness in explaining concepts..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 9. Ability to stimulate interest in subject..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 10. Encouragement of class participation..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 11. Fairness in grading..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 12. Promptness in returning assignments..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 13. Quality of feedback to students..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 14. Availability outside of class..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 15. Overall rating of instructor..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| 16. Were the grading criteria clearly stated..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| | . | . | . | . | . |

Please turn over and complete comments section

Please comment on:

STRENGTHS of the course and of the Instructor:

Very knowledgeable, very organized and well laid out curriculum. Also well structured + interesting lectures that didn't overwhelm the class time.

WEAKNESSES of the course and of the Instructor:

- some repetitive reading, especially in Secularization theory, But I think it was probably valuable for undergrads.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Hated the class room, and that ^{with} the mix of grad + undergrad students, grads dominated discussion, but readings and assignments had to cater to undergrads.