

## Summary of Course Evaluations, LISE, Fall 2020

Overall, 152 course evaluations were submitted by LISE students across all three semester – a relatively high rate of response. 72 were submitted by first semester students, 33 by third semester students, and 47 by fifth. Students across all semesters indicated 100% participation in project and other required courses, though less in Friday Lecture activities, which are available to all students (68% 1<sup>st</sup> semester, 47% 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 47% 5<sup>th</sup>). All in all, a relatively high level of activity and willingness to participate in the evaluation process emerges across all three semesters.

### 1<sup>st</sup> Semester

For by far the larger bulk of the students, the level and learning goals of the main project courses, Introduction to International Studies and 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> Century World history, were seen as on point and appropriate. The rationale for both courses was understood and especially World History was praised for its teaching style. It's noticeably clear that the "hybrid" teaching model was problematic for many students, with students in the online portion of the class sometimes feeling forgotten and unable to properly feel included. However, this is an inherent issue in such teaching models, and it will have to be seen the degree to which such issues in the future will need to be addressed.

All further courses from the semester – PBL and English Communication and Grammar – were well-reviewed. Again, noticeable about the bulk of student commentary, is that the purpose of the courses and their relation with the program was well-understood. Again, there were some notations about the hybrid teaching form (it was expressed that it might be better to choose either/or [online or in person]). Again, though, the degree to which that maintains an issue remains to be seen.

### 3<sup>rd</sup> Semester

Overall, 3<sup>rd</sup> semester had slightly more problematic reviews than 1<sup>st</sup>. There were in some cases concerns with instructors' familiarity with online teaching platforms (Zoom specifically) and especially vis-à-vis English Medium Communication in Multilingual Contexts, there were a distinct number of comment noting that students were unclear why they had the course, how it differed from 2<sup>nd</sup> semester courses of a similar kind and its overall fit into the program. It is also clear there were less experienced instructors filling in for full time instructors on leave in a couple of instances (there were some notations of seeming instructor inexperience with material and presentation). There was also worry about the coherency of the History of International Relations course. *It should be noted that in the case of the courses that were identified as most problematic in terms of relation with the bulk of the program that those courses have been replaced by new modules in the 2020 curriculum.*

### 5<sup>th</sup> Semester

5<sup>th</sup> semester students expressed the greatest sense of frustration with online teaching – potentially understandable as it is a heavy jolt to enter a final year in such a manner. By and large, learning goals were understood and all courses seen as relevant, though there was occasional fatigue with topics and a desire for some more exciting modes of presentation. A few standout remarks were noticeable. Firstly,

the focus on NGOs in International Organizations was appreciated; this was an oft-remarked point. Secondly, very simply, the level of enthusiasm around Malayna Raftapolous' teaching in International Human Rights deserves to be noted. It was identified by many students as one of their high points in their LISE experience as a whole. All in all, the electives were seen as useful, though it may be appropriate that Human Resource Management will no longer be part of the elective roster.