

Course:	CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS-DISC (INAFU6804_014_2007_3)
Instructor:	Beckley Michael Charles
Evaluation:	Conceptual Foundations Discussion Section Evaluation
Dates:	December 11, 2007 - December 21, 2007
No. of Respondents:	18
No. of Students:	23
Percent Completed:	78%

Section: Instructor Performance

1:
**Discussion section Instructor's performance inspires interest in the course content
(1=no, not at all, 5=yes, very much so)**

n =18

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	3	16.67
Very Good	4	4	22.22
Excellent	5	11	61.11
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
Mean: 4.44 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.78			

2:
**Discussion section Instructor's attitude toward students
(1=very negative, 5=very positive)**

n =18

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	2	11.11
Very Good	4	3	16.67
Excellent	5	13	72.22
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
Mean: 4.61 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.70			

3:
**Discussion section Instructor's responsiveness to students'
questions and comments**

n =18

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	1	5.56
Very Good	4	4	22.22
Excellent	5	13	72.22

Not Applicable 0 0 0.00

Mean: 4.67 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.59

4:
**Discussion section Instructor's presentation of expectations to students
(1=not clear, 5=very clear)**

n =18

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	2	11.11
Very Good	4	4	22.22
Excellent	5	12	66.67
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 4.56 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.70

5:
Discussion section Instructor's ability to make complex material easy to understand

n =18

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	1	5.56
Good	3	1	5.56
Very Good	4	6	33.33
Excellent	5	10	55.56
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 4.39 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.85

6:
Overall evaluation of the discussion section Instructor

n =18

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	1	5.56
Very Good	4	4	22.22
Excellent	5	13	72.22
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 4.67 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.59

7:
Extent to which the discussion section instructor contributed to this course: (1 = very little, 5 = very much so)

n =18

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	3	16.67
Excellent	5	15	83.33
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 4.83 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.38

**Please provide brief, specific and constructive comments on the discussion section
Instructor's performance in the discussion section:**

Michael Beckley is an excellent section leader. He has in-depth knowledge of the material. His teaching style is tough but fair. It was my impression after speaking with students in the class that not only did we find Michael competent but also very approachable.

Mike is incredibly sharp. He is excellent at presenting the material in a clear and concise manner and he is equally excellent in guiding discussion and asking incisive questions pushing us to really understand the core roots of a debate or an issue. He is the ideal section leader.

Knowledgeable helpful fair. Towards the end of the semester there were two weeks of readings that we had to go over very briefly. This was a curriculum flaw not an instructor flaw.

Mike was a very strong discussion leader and was always clearly very prepared for the section. He led discussion when necessary but also allowed students to take the helm for the second half of each class. He was also both strict and fair with his running of the class. It was an excellent discussion section

It was difficult to participate in class. There were a few students who did a lot of speaking and if you were not one of those students it was difficult to get a word in. Often students who had their hands raised were not called on.

I think Michael's academic and professional standing in the class is very commendable. He seemed to have a strong understanding of the material throughout the semester. If I had to choose a PA for another CA class I would definitely ask for Mike again. Bottom line he made the class interesting especially for those who had no prior experience with IR. Best

M Beckley led the discussion group in a way that tested us and made the class that much more interesting. His brisk clear style was very helpful in going over the material and in challenging students to explore the implications of the reading material.

Beckley is the best. I heard of other discussion section leaders that were just horrible. I feel fortunate to have been in Beckley's section.

Mike was great. His 1-hour review of that week's readings was always excellent. He was brilliant in the way he broke down complex theories to understandable levels. No question ever stumped him. He was accessible and answered email questions right away. He almost made CF fun. In short he was a model T.A. and I enjoyed being in his section.

Course:	CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS-DISC (INAFU6804_012_2007_3)
Instructor:	Beckley Michael Charles
Evaluation:	Conceptual Foundations Discussion Section Evaluation
Dates:	December 11, 2007 - December 21, 2007
No. of Respondents:	9
No. of Students:	24
Percent Completed:	38%

Section: Instructor Performance

1:
**Discussion section Instructor's performance inspires interest in the course content
(1=no, not at all, 5=yes, very much so)**

n =9

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	2	22.22
Excellent	5	7	77.78
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
Mean: 4.78 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.44			

2:
**Discussion section Instructor's attitude toward students
(1=very negative, 5=very positive)**

n =9

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	1	11.11
Very Good	4	1	11.11
Excellent	5	7	77.78
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
Mean: 4.67 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.71			

3:
**Discussion section Instructor's responsiveness to students'
questions and comments**

n =9

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	3	33.33

Excellent	5	6	66.67
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
Mean: 4.67 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.50			

4:
Discussion section Instructor's presentation of expectations to students
(1=not clear, 5=very clear)

n =9

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	1	11.11
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	8	88.89
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
Mean: 4.78 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.67			

5:
Discussion section Instructor's ability to make complex material easy to understand

n =9

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	2	22.22
Excellent	5	7	77.78
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
Mean: 4.78 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.44			

6:
Overall evaluation of the discussion section Instructor

n =9

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	2	22.22
Excellent	5	7	77.78
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
Mean: 4.78 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.44			

7:
Extent to which the discussion section instructor contributed to this course: (1 = very little, 5 = very much so)

n =9

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	1	11.11
Excellent	5	8	88.89
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

**Please provide brief, specific and constructive comments on the discussion section
Instructor's performance in the discussion section:**

Our TA is very smart and his explanation about many materials was very helpful for us to deepen our understanding. I wanted to have a further reading list to develop my interest on some issues. but his advice was very helpful.

The instructor was clear concise and actively encouraged student participation.

Mike was a great discussion section instructor. HE made the material interesting gave it a certain depth from his experience and reading and was witty to boot. My criticisms would be that he was a little aloof and that he frequently spoke too fast when going over the material.

Michael Beckley was the best professor teacher I had all semester which is a huge compliment to the Poli Sci PhD department but rather disappointing considering that I m comparing an underpaid overworked PhD candidate to tenured professors at SIPA. He consistently challenged us to think about the readings not only in academic terms but also in terms of application to real world policy. He also broke things down just enough where you still had to internalize the thought process but got all the mechanics to put everything together.

Excellent discussion leader. Always prepared. Very knowledgeable and articulate. All my friends were jealous of this section.

Michael Beckley was an excelent instructor. He made an extensive and complex material easy to understand he created an intellectually creative not a stresfull athmosphere in the classroom he much more than the lecture speakers made me intrested in the course material.

Course:	CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS-DISC (INAFU6804_002_2007_3)
Instructor:	Beckley Michael Charles
Evaluation:	Conceptual Foundations Discussion Section Evaluation
Dates:	December 11, 2007 - December 21, 2007
No. of Respondents:	13
No. of Students:	18
Percent Completed:	72%

Section: Instructor Performance

1:
Discussion section Instructor's performance inspires interest in the course content
(1=no, not at all, 5=yes, very much so)

n =13

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	3	23.08
Very Good	4	3	23.08
Excellent	5	7	53.85
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
Mean: 4.31 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.85			

2:
Discussion section Instructor's attitude toward students
(1=very negative, 5=very positive)

n =13

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	3	23.08
Excellent	5	10	76.92
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
Mean: 4.77 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.44			

3:
Discussion section Instructor's responsiveness to students' questions and comments

n =13

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	5	38.46
Excellent	5	8	61.54

Not Applicable 0 0 0.00

Mean: 4.62 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.51

4:

**Discussion section Instructor's presentation of expectations to students
(1=not clear, 5=very clear)**

n =13

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
----------	--------	-----------	---------

Poor	1	0	0.00
------	---	---	------

Fair	2	0	0.00
------	---	---	------

Good	3	1	7.69
------	---	---	------

Very Good	4	5	38.46
-----------	---	---	-------

Excellent	5	7	53.85
-----------	---	---	-------

Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
----------------	---	---	------

Mean: 4.46 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.66

5:

Discussion section Instructor's ability to make complex material easy to understand

n =13

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
----------	--------	-----------	---------

Poor	1	0	0.00
------	---	---	------

Fair	2	0	0.00
------	---	---	------

Good	3	1	7.69
------	---	---	------

Very Good	4	5	38.46
-----------	---	---	-------

Excellent	5	7	53.85
-----------	---	---	-------

Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
----------------	---	---	------

Mean: 4.46 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.66

6:

Overall evaluation of the discussion section Instructor

n =13

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
----------	--------	-----------	---------

Poor	1	0	0.00
------	---	---	------

Fair	2	0	0.00
------	---	---	------

Good	3	0	0.00
------	---	---	------

Very Good	4	5	38.46
-----------	---	---	-------

Excellent	5	8	61.54
-----------	---	---	-------

Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
----------------	---	---	------

Mean: 4.62 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.51

7:

Extent to which the discussion section instructor contributed to this course: (1 = very little, 5 = very much so)

n =13

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
----------	--------	-----------	---------

Poor	1	0	0.00
------	---	---	------

Fair	2	0	0.00
------	---	---	------

Good	3	0	0.00
------	---	---	------

Very Good	4	5	38.46
-----------	---	---	-------

Excellent	5	8	61.54
-----------	---	---	-------

Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
----------------	---	---	------

Mean: 4.62 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.51

Please provide brief, specific and constructive comments on the discussion section Instructor's performance in the discussion section:

Though his speed of lecture is too rapid to me he is so nice and clever. Thanks to him I could enjoy this course. Thank you very much.

Fantastic work. Very good summaries of articles and clear presentation of key ideas. Thoroughly increased my understanding of course materials.

He was always available and provided a lot of help with the papers. He was also very responsive to students and supported their needs to the best of his abilities. His presentations of the readings were concise and informative and greatly added to the course.

Mike was awesome--I think all the students that had other section leaders wished that they were in Mike's section. He did a great job of breaking down dense readings and helping us apply the theories to current events. Once he gets his PhD I think Columbia should hire him.

Mike was an excellent instructor. He picked out key ideas from the readings and facilitated discussion very effectively. His ability to establish a collegial yet professional rapport with the class encouraged students to share their ideas. I liked the fact that while he encouraged students to share their views he insisted that they be substantive. His approach brought rather dry material to life. I am glad I ended up in his section and I definitely learned a lot.

Course:	CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS-DISC (INAFU6804_018_2008_3)
Instructor:	Beckley Michael Charles
Evaluation:	Conceptual Foundations Discussion Section Evaluation
Dates:	December 01, 2008 - December 19, 2008
No. of Respondents:	8
No. of Students:	15
Percent Completed:	53%

Section: Instructor Performance

1:
Discussion section Instructor's performance inspires interest in the course content
(1=no, not at all, 5=yes, very much so)

n =8

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	1	12.50
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	6	75.00
Not Applicable	0	1	12.50
Mean: 4.43 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 1.51			

2:
Discussion section Instructor's attitude toward students
(1=very negative, 5=very positive)

n =8

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	1	12.50
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	6	75.00
Not Applicable	0	1	12.50
Mean: 4.43 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 1.51			

3:
Discussion section Instructor's responsiveness to students' questions and comments

n =8

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	1	12.50
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	1	12.50
Excellent	5	6	75.00

Not Applicable 0 0 0.00

Mean: 4.50 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 1.07

4:
**Discussion section Instructor's presentation of expectations to students
(1=not clear, 5=very clear)**

n =8

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
----------	--------	-----------	---------

Poor	1	1	12.50
------	---	---	-------

Fair	2	0	0.00
------	---	---	------

Good	3	0	0.00
------	---	---	------

Very Good	4	0	0.00
-----------	---	---	------

Excellent	5	6	75.00
-----------	---	---	-------

Not Applicable	0	1	12.50
----------------	---	---	-------

Mean: 4.43 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 1.51

5:
Discussion section Instructor's ability to make complex material easy to understand

n =8

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
----------	--------	-----------	---------

Poor	1	0	0.00
------	---	---	------

Fair	2	0	0.00
------	---	---	------

Good	3	1	12.50
------	---	---	-------

Very Good	4	0	0.00
-----------	---	---	------

Excellent	5	6	75.00
-----------	---	---	-------

Not Applicable	0	1	12.50
----------------	---	---	-------

Mean: 4.71 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.76

6:
Overall evaluation of the discussion section Instructor

n =8

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
----------	--------	-----------	---------

Poor	1	0	0.00
------	---	---	------

Fair	2	1	12.50
------	---	---	-------

Good	3	0	0.00
------	---	---	------

Very Good	4	0	0.00
-----------	---	---	------

Excellent	5	6	75.00
-----------	---	---	-------

Not Applicable	0	1	12.50
----------------	---	---	-------

Mean: 4.57 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 1.13

7:
Extent to which the discussion section instructor contributed to this course: (1 = very little, 5 = very much so)

n =8

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
----------	--------	-----------	---------

Poor	1	1	12.50
------	---	---	-------

Fair	2	0	0.00
------	---	---	------

Good	3	0	0.00
------	---	---	------

Very Good	4	0	0.00
-----------	---	---	------

Excellent	5	6	75.00
-----------	---	---	-------

Not Applicable	0	1	12.50
----------------	---	---	-------

Mean: 4.43 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 1.51

Please provide brief, specific and constructive comments on the discussion section

Instructor's performance in the discussion section:

The instructor was extremely well versed in the reading material and came prepared every class. He is obviously very knowledgeable on the many subjects we cover in CF. Most importantly he challenges students and maintains an free and open environment for discussion.

some of the questions to tie together the material were too broad or vague and students couldn't answer the questions right away

intelligent and pithy discussions but can improve on acknowledging those who raise their hands during lecture discussion.

The discussion section was very useful and in many ways more engaging than the lectures. The instructor demonstrated great knowledge of many of the topics and made sure that students participated as well as understood the main concepts and how they applied to key issues in international affairs. The instructor was tough on grading but this is expected in all the core classes.

Course:	CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS-DISC (INAFU6804_012_2008_3)
Instructor:	Beckley Michael Charles
Evaluation:	Conceptual Foundations Discussion Section Evaluation
Dates:	December 01, 2008 - December 19, 2008
No. of Respondents:	7
No. of Students:	16
Percent Completed:	44%

Section: Instructor Performance

1:
Discussion section Instructor's performance inspires interest in the course content
(1=no, not at all, 5=yes, very much so)

n =7

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	1	14.29
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	6	85.71
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
Mean: 4.43 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 1.51			

2:
Discussion section Instructor's attitude toward students
(1=very negative, 5=very positive)

n =7

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	1	14.29
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	6	85.71
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
Mean: 4.57 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 1.13			

3:
Discussion section Instructor's responsiveness to students' questions and comments

n =7

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	1	14.29
Very Good	4	1	14.29
Excellent	5	5	71.43

Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
----------------	---	---	------

Mean: 4.57 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.79

4:

**Discussion section Instructor's presentation of expectations to students
(1=not clear, 5=very clear)**

n =7

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	1	14.29
Very Good	4	1	14.29
Excellent	5	5	71.43
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 4.57 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.79

5:

Discussion section Instructor's ability to make complex material easy to understand

n =7

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	1	14.29
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	1	14.29
Excellent	5	5	71.43
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 4.29 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 1.50

6:

Overall evaluation of the discussion section Instructor

n =7

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	1	14.29
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	6	85.71
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 4.57 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 1.13

7:

Extent to which the discussion section instructor contributed to this course: (1 = very little, 5 = very much so)

n =7

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	1	14.29
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	6	85.71
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 4.57 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 1.13

Please provide brief, specific and constructive comments on the discussion section

Instructor's performance in the discussion section:

Mike was an excellent TA. He stated his expectations up front which was important. I felt he challenged me to really grasp the reading and come up with coherent arguments.

Mike made the course material accessible and fun without demeaning the quality of the content. In fact he contributed more to the CF course than most of the lectures. His standards may have been a bit higher than other discussion leaders but that was generally ok because I still learned a lot more from the discussion than other resources.

I learned more from my discussion instructor than from the lecture speakers. During our discussions he was very organized logical and responsive to all the questions and comments we had.

The discussion was too much concentrated on summary of specific topics of the readings instead of bringing up discussions issue. I would have appreciated more to discuss the outcomes of the readings applied to real issues that would have help me to better understand the course.

Beckley is an excellent TA who really taught the material in an engaging manner that was easy to understand. Although he put a lot of students on edge after the first lecture when he said he would cold call I think in the end it was effective in establishing the right tone in the classroom. I just don t understand why he has to be a stricter grader relative to the other TA s. Overall great job Mike

Course:	CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS-DISC (INAFU6804_002_2008_3)
Instructor:	Beckley Michael Charles
Evaluation:	Conceptual Foundations Discussion Section Evaluation
Dates:	December 01, 2008 - December 19, 2008
No. of Respondents:	10
No. of Students:	18
Percent Completed:	56%

Section: Instructor Performance

1:
Discussion section Instructor's performance inspires interest in the course content
(1=no, not at all, 5=yes, very much so)

n =10

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	1	10.00
Good	3	1	10.00
Very Good	4	4	40.00
Excellent	5	4	40.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
Mean: 4.10 Median:4 Std. Dev.: 0.99			

2:
Discussion section Instructor's attitude toward students
(1=very negative, 5=very positive)

n =10

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	1	10.00
Very Good	4	5	50.00
Excellent	5	4	40.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
Mean: 4.30 Median:4 Std. Dev.: 0.67			

3:
Discussion section Instructor's responsiveness to students' questions and comments

n =10

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	1	10.00
Very Good	4	5	50.00
Excellent	5	4	40.00

Not Applicable 0 0 0.00

Mean: 4.30 Median:4 Std. Dev.: 0.67

4:

**Discussion section Instructor's presentation of expectations to students
(1=not clear, 5=very clear)**

n =10

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
----------	--------	-----------	---------

Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	4	40.00
Excellent	5	6	60.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 4.60 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.52

5:

Discussion section Instructor's ability to make complex material easy to understand

n =10

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
----------	--------	-----------	---------

Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	1	10.00
Very Good	4	4	40.00
Excellent	5	5	50.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 4.40 Median:4.5 Std. Dev.: 0.70

6:

Overall evaluation of the discussion section Instructor

n =10

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
----------	--------	-----------	---------

Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	1	10.00
Very Good	4	4	40.00
Excellent	5	5	50.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 4.40 Median:4.5 Std. Dev.: 0.70

7:

Extent to which the discussion section instructor contributed to this course: (1 = very little, 5 = very much so)

n =10

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
----------	--------	-----------	---------

Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	1	10.00
Very Good	4	2	20.00
Excellent	5	6	60.00
Not Applicable	0	1	10.00

Mean: 4.56 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.73

Please provide brief, specific and constructive comments on the discussion section

Instructor's performance in the discussion section:

I feel that Beckley did a great job with the class. My only criticism was that sometimes he tried to move through the material so quickly that we didn't have adequate time to really discuss the material. I struggled to participate sometimes because he would ask a question and move on. Sometimes without real discussion. This was because he placed a strong emphasis on the presentation which I also thought was really good. I know this is a trade off but I think that sometimes we could have spent more time just discussing the merits and faults of the different theories.

The instructor was very helpful in answering students questions and giving clarity in understanding the various theories of international relations. He pushed us to think beyond our own boxes which made our discussions lively and provocative. He was also accessible to students during midterms and finals to answer questions and give feedback.

Excellent and passionate about making his students learn the material.

The section was very interesting. One comment that I would make is that it would have been even more interesting if the instructor was able to apply theories that we studied to real-life examples. Just studying theory in the abstract is not very useful from my perspective. Otherwise a great class. Presentations were a great idea.

Good overall performance. Good feedback on essays. Felt like the instructor some times was looking for very specific answers for the students and overlooking other input that what he was looking for. Interrupting students. Should allow room for the discussion to take unexpected unscripted turns.

Excellent TA. Very knowledgeable and great at distilling the main points from the readings.