

Instructor Name:	Term:	Evaluation Type:	Class Description:
Ivan Willis Rasmussen	Spring 2017	Final	SOCS-SHU 275-001 (22794) - US-China Relations (Lecture)

19 out of 25 students eligible to evaluate completed the survey.

Survey Response Rate: 76.0%

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
Overall evaluation of the instructor(s).	4.9	0.3	100.0%	19	100.0%	Very Poor	0	0.0%
						Poor	0	0.0%
						Adequate	0	0.0%
						Good	2	10.5%
						Excellent	17	89.5%
Overall evaluation of the course.	4.8	0.4	100.0%	19	100.0%	Very Poor	0	0.0%
						Poor	0	0.0%
						Adequate	0	0.0%
						Good	3	15.8%
						Excellent	16	84.2%
The instructor(s) provided an environment that was conducive to learning.	4.8	0.4	100.0%	19	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	4	21.1%
						Strongly Agree	15	78.9%
The instructor(s) provided helpful feedback on assessed class components (e.g., exams, papers).	4.6	0.6	94.7%	19	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	1	5.3%
						Agree	5	26.3%
						Strongly Agree	13	68.4%

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
The course objectives were clearly stated.	4.6	0.6	94.7%	19	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	1	5.3%
						Agree	5	26.3%
						Strongly Agree	13	68.4%
The course was well organized.	4.6	0.6	94.7%	19	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	1	5.3%
						Agree	5	26.3%
						Strongly Agree	13	68.4%
The course was intellectually stimulating.	4.8	0.4	100.0%	19	100.0%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
						Disagree	0	0.0%
						Neutral	0	0.0%
						Agree	4	21.1%
						Strongly Agree	15	78.9%

Question	Average	Standard Deviation	Response % of 2 Highest Ratings	# of Students Who Answered the Question	Question Response Rate	Answer	# of Responses to the Answer	Answer %
My primary reason for taking this course:				19	100.0%	Advisor recommendation	0	0.0%
						Other specific degree requirement	0	0.0%
						Elective credits required for a degree	1	5.3%
						Instructor(s) reputation	1	5.3%
						General interest in subject matter	11	57.9%
						Major requirement	5	26.3%
						Minor requirement	0	0.0%
						Non-degree requirement	0	0.0%
						Peer recommendation	1	5.3%

Course Comments

How many hours a week did you work on this course? (Optional)

- 2
- 4
- 4
- Two hours

- 4
- 4
- 5
- 4
- 4
- 3
- 5
- 4 hours for Ivan

What grade do you expect to earn in this course? (Optional)

- A-
- B
- A- to A
- B
- A, hopefully
- A

- A-/A
- A
- A
- B+ or A- hopefully
- Hopefully an A since I need it to get my study away...
- A-
- A-

Instructor Comments

What about the course or the instructor was effective in helping you learn? (Optional)

- The books chosen were good. The readings were also informative.
- Ivan is really fun in class! He makes lots of jokes, and is very animated in his lectures! This makes each class very fun and informative at the same time.
- Ivan is incredibly talented at teaching and manages to make any information interesting! I am a big fan of his courses, and look forward to taking more in the coming years
- The lectures were engaging because the instructor presented in an emphatic way. With every sentence you could tell he knew what he was talking about but was never talking down at students- something I appreciated immensely.
- Professor Rasmussen was always a joy to learn from, he always makes the lessons enjoyable and informative. He also creates an environment that makes it very comfortable for students to share their own ideas, so that it is not just him speaking at students, but also valuing our own ideas and prompting discussion. This is the second class I've taken of his and I enjoyed this one just as much as the first.

- Rasmussen is the bomb.com when it comes to international relations, great interactive learning environment, and a well-structured class
- He is very clear about everything and a great lecturer
- Ivan is a fantastic professor and one of the best I've had at NYU. He's both entertaining and incredibly informative. I genuinely look forward to each class, knowing that it'll be fun and that I'll learn something.
- Professor Rasmussen was always available and very organized. He made the class so interesting and was always so enthusiastic!!
- Professor Rasmussen is able to make the class interesting, including the thoughts of students and class materials. Also, Professor Rasmussen is able to refer to contemporary events as well as historical events in order to make a thorough understanding of the material and topics/themes covered.
- Ability to make learning fun

What would you suggest to improve the course? (Optional)

- Its a learning preference but I'd prefer a bit more academic depth. Either more reading or fewer topics covered deeper. Even if its not a 300 level I don't think it hurts to push students a little on occasion. We are here after all because we want to learn, so set the bar after the better students not the ones who like a more relaxed college because then the better will be brought down there too. Maybe suggest students to read the news on the matter, start class talking about a recent development.
- Easier grading.

Just kidding, it was a great course.
- There is a large disparity of knowledge between the freshmen and the upperclassmen, which can make it hard to keep up when discussing obscure historical or political situations. That is not a criticism of the class, however, merely a fact of this institution, where so many of are classes are focused on highly specific matters of Chinese culture, history, politics etc.
- I just think that this specific professor made it seem like such a chill class because of the constant jokes, which were enjoying, but then graded pretty harshly. This expectation should be clearly stated at the beginning.
- More simulations!

- Having taken a class with Ivan before, I'd say make more specific grading rubrics. I had a lot of demerits on big assignments due to requirements I didn't know existed (ehrmmm address for the letter assignment,)
- Guiding questions provided with readings assigned.
- More detailed information and going deeper into each issue historically or currently. Some issues like Chongqing Model may worth two classes to go deeper and more well-rounded on that.