

Columbia University: International & Public Affairs
Fall 2022 Course Evaluation (end of semester)

Course: INAFU6549_001_2022_3-PeacebuildingAfterMassViolence: INAFU6549_001_2022_3 - Peacebuilding After Mass Violence
Instructor: Severine Autesserre *
Response Rate: 12/18 (66.67%)

1 - Covered the subject matter expected at time of enrollment					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly disagree	(1)	0	0.00%		4.33
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%		
Uncertain	(3)	3	25.00%	■	
Agree	(4)	2	16.67%	■	
Strongly Agree	(5)	7	58.33%	■	
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate			Mean		STD
12/18 (66.67%)			4.33		0.89

2 - Nature of the course					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Very Practical	(1)	1	8.33%	■	3.58
Mostly Practical	(2)	1	8.33%	■	
Neutral	(3)	2	16.67%	■	
Mostly Theoretical	(4)	6	50.00%	■	
Very Theoretical	(5)	2	16.67%	■	
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate			Mean		STD
12/18 (66.67%)			3.58		1.16

3 - Work load for the course					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Very light	(1)	0	0.00%		3.92
Moderately light	(2)	1	8.33%	■	
Average	(3)	3	25.00%	■	
Moderately heavy	(4)	4	33.33%	■	
Very heavy	(5)	4	33.33%	■	
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate			Mean		STD
12/18 (66.67%)			3.92		1.00

4 - Organization of the course					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		4.33
Fair	(2)	1	8.33%	■	
Good	(3)	2	16.67%	■	
Very Good	(4)	1	8.33%	■	
Excellent	(5)	8	66.67%	■	
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate			Mean		STD
12/18 (66.67%)			4.33		1.07

Columbia University: International & Public Affairs
Fall 2022 Course Evaluation (end of semester)

Course: INAFU6549_001_2022_3-PeacebuildingAfterMassViolence: INAFU6549_001_2022_3 - Peacebuilding After Mass Violence
Instructor: Severine Autesserre *
Response Rate: 12/18 (66.67%)

5 - Difficulty of the course relative to other courses						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Not challenging	(1)	2	16.67%		<p>3.08</p>	
Somewhat challenging	(2)	3	25.00%			
Neutral	(3)	0	0.00%			
Challenging	(4)	6	50.00%			
Very challenging	(5)	1	8.33%			
				0 25 50 100	Question	
Response Rate				Mean		STD
12/18 (66.67%)				3.08		1.38

6 - Relevance and quality of assigned readings						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Poor	(1)	1	8.33%		<p>4.08</p>	
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%			
Good	(3)	2	16.67%			
Very Good	(4)	3	25.00%			
Excellent	(5)	6	50.00%			
				0 25 50 100	Question	
Response Rate				Mean		STD
12/18 (66.67%)				4.08		1.24

7 - Relevance and quality of the written assignments						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Poor	(1)	1	8.33%		<p>3.92</p>	
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%			
Good	(3)	2	16.67%			
Very Good	(4)	5	41.67%			
Excellent	(5)	4	33.33%			
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%			
				0 25 50 100	Question	
Response Rate				Mean		STD
12/18 (66.67%)				3.92		1.16

8 - Overall evaluation of the course						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Poor	(1)	1	8.33%		<p>4.00</p>	
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%			
Good	(3)	3	25.00%			
Very Good	(4)	2	16.67%			
Excellent	(5)	6	50.00%			
				0 25 50 100	Question	
Response Rate				Mean		STD
12/18 (66.67%)				4.00		1.28

Columbia University: International & Public Affairs

Fall 2022 Course Evaluation (end of semester)

Course: INAFU6549_001_2022_3-PeacebuildingAfterMassViolence: INAFU6549_001_2022_3 - Peacebuilding After Mass Violence

Instructor: Severine Autesserre *

Response Rate: 12/18 (66.67%)

9 - Please provide brief, specific, and constructive comments on the overall course organization and subject matter:

Response Rate 12/18 (66.67%)

- This course was my favorite of the semester! I learned so much about the various forms of peacebuilding and some of the critiques of the field and how to improve them. The course is very well organized and offers lots of ways for us as individuals and students to better our writing and speaking skills which is crucial and oftentimes ignored in classes. The readings were engaging and relevant and class discussions were facilitated well and kept us from falling asleep or getting bored. Things like having us discuss with a partner first and asking us to present helped keep things interesting and far from dull.
- Course materials are outdated and do not reflect current debates on peacebuilding, peacekeeping, and localized approaches. Moreover, the syllabus seems to have been copied from a Barnard undergraduate-level seminar and is therefore far too elementary for a graduate-level course. While class discussions were organized, the style of 1-book per week led to much groupthink during discussion sections. The same reading load can be applied but a variation in sources, and an update on the reading list (removing out-dated readings) is much-needed. Furthermore, the reading list needs to be heavily decolonized, the lack of required readings from scholars of color (or scholars from the nation of study) is stark. There is an undue focus on Rwanda/ DR Congo and Bosnia in the class. It would have been interesting to explore peacebuilding in other regions (Nepal/El Salvador/Burundi/Sudan) which buck traditional models of peacebuilding. Personally would have preferred greater engagement from the professor in teaching and challenging students. There was little need for the Professor to utilize such a significant portion of class time to inform on how to craft a research paper, research methodology etc. At this level, students can be expected to be familiar with such concepts, processes, and practices. Class time could have been better used to focus on the material and content.
- This course was extremely organized. The subject matter all fell under the umbrella of peacebuilding, but each class delved into a specific manner in which peace could be achieved.
- This was one of the best courses I have taken at SIPA, however it was one of the most demanding courses as well. The amount of weekly reading (while was emphasized upfront) was a lot when balancing 4 other classes. It is heavily student lead through discussions, but I wish we could have gotten more practical experiences from the professor. She knowledge and involvement in the field is so great, I wish we would have heard more specifically from her rather than discussing the readings most of the class.
- I had high expectations going into this course, but unfortunately they were not met. While the subject matter and content was fascinating, the structure of the course regularly impeded us from having engaging or thought-provoking dialogue. This class was designed more like an undergraduate course than a graduate course. There was too much of focus on basic skills like synthesizing material, public speaking, and writing a research paper. While most of us are used to writing 15-20 page papers at SIPA, we were given an entire semester to design a "puzzle" but only had 5-10 pages of space to answer it which was not nearly sufficient. My fellow students were brilliant, and I wish we had gotten to spend more time discussing and debating topics with them rather than doing things like simulations and oral presentations.
- Prof. Autesserre is incredibly organized and the course runs like clockwork. She spends a lot the course talking about academic procedure, how to structure the assignments, how to lead a discussion, and how to do research. By contrast the discussion of peacebuilding itself is thin, confined mostly to criticism of existing practices, but little in the way of learning about effective methods.
- it was very clear what the expectations, deadlines etc. were well in advance.
- First, there was easily over 200 pages of reading most weeks and it is absolutely required! So keep that in mind. The course was very well-organized with a full administrative section at the beginning of each class. It was more like an undergraduate course, especially the assignments-- the professor has a very specific way that she wants things structured, including the 'puzzle' submission, the outline, and the paper itself. You have to watch the Panopto videos which are 20-something minutes long to understand what she wants and even then, you have a pretty good chance of not getting a good grade because the requirements she's looking for are like "have an interesting research puzzle" or "be well-situated in the literature" which can be very subjective. I think a much better way of organizing the final paper would be just to have a few examples of a good argument, a good outline, and a good paper on the courseworks page. Having such a short final paper but making it so restrictive in its formatting while still requiring the research element of the paper is challenging. My final comment is that there was one class with a Barnard librarian. She was very kind and knowledgeable but unfortunately SIPA students can't access many of the Barnard portals and links that she taught us. SIPA teaches a completely separate course that all students are required to take during orientation so maybe this could be taught at a more advanced level with a SIPA librarian!
- The course was well organized. In addition, the professor was outstanding and the classes were tremendously beneficial. This has dramatically helped my professional life and career prospects in International peace and security.
- I believe this is the best course available on peacebuilding. Very challenging from the first session, and a little heavy on the required readings, but all the materials are definitely relevant and of great value for anyone interested in this field. Great syllabus structure and very interesting class components, such as a negotiation simulation.
- This course is well suited for students who had gaps in their undergrad learning or not much work experience and need practice with writing papers or making presentations. This is the focus of the course, more than content about peace building. Not recommend for grad students with experience who want more detailed or in-depth discussion of peace building.
- The course was well-organized and straightforward. It was certainly weighted toward the first half of the semester, but it was helpful to have a lighter workload toward the end of the semester. The expectations and assignments were clear, and the professor made sure we understood the assignments and had enough time to answer questions. I would have liked to read a greater diversity of authors, including the number of different authors we read, as well as race, gender, area of expertise, etc.

10 - Instructor's performance inspires interest in the course content

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly disagree	(1)	0	0.00%		4.33
Disagree	(2)	2	16.67%	■	
Uncertain	(3)	1	8.33%	■	
Agree	(4)	0	0.00%		
Strongly Agree	(5)	9	75.00%	■	
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate				Mean	
12/18 (66.67%)				4.33	
				STD	
				1.23	

Columbia University: International & Public Affairs
Fall 2022 Course Evaluation (end of semester)

Course: INAFU6549_001_2022_3-PeacebuildingAfterMassViolence: INAFU6549_001_2022_3 - Peacebuilding After Mass Violence
Instructor: Severine Autesserre *
Response Rate: 12/18 (66.67%)

11 - Instructor's attitude toward students					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Very negative	(1)	0	0.00%		4.50
Somewhat negative	(2)	0	0.00%		
Neutral	(3)	0	0.00%		
Mostly positive	(4)	6	50.00%	██████████	
Very positive	(5)	6	50.00%	██████████	
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate			Mean		STD
12/18 (66.67%)			4.50		0.52

12 - Instructor's responsiveness to students' questions and comments					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		3.75
Fair	(2)	3	25.00%	██████	
Good	(3)	2	16.67%	████	
Very Good	(4)	2	16.67%	████	
Excellent	(5)	5	41.67%	██████████	
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate			Mean		STD
12/18 (66.67%)			3.75		1.29

13 - Instructor's presentation of expectations to students					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		4.83
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%		
Good	(3)	0	0.00%		
Very Good	(4)	2	16.67%	████	
Excellent	(5)	10	83.33%	██████████████████	
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate			Mean		STD
12/18 (66.67%)			4.83		0.39

14 - Instructor's ability to make complex material easy to understand					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		4.33
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%		
Good	(3)	3	25.00%	██████	
Very Good	(4)	2	16.67%	████	
Excellent	(5)	7	58.33%	██████████	
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate			Mean		STD
12/18 (66.67%)			4.33		0.89

Columbia University: International & Public Affairs
Fall 2022 Course Evaluation (end of semester)

Course: INAFU6549_001_2022_3-PeacebuildingAfterMassViolence: INAFU6549_001_2022_3 - Peacebuilding After Mass Violence
Instructor: Severine Autesserre *
Response Rate: 12/18 (66.67%)

15 - The exams accurately assess what students are expected to know						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Strongly disagree	(1)	0	0.00%		4.40	
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%			
Uncertain	(3)	1	8.33%			
Agree	(4)	1	8.33%			
Strongly Agree	(5)	3	25.00%			
N/A	(0)	7	58.33%			
				0 25 50 100	Question	
Response Rate				Mean		STD
12/18 (66.67%)				4.40		0.89

16 - Overall evaluation of the course instructor						
Severine Autesserre						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		4.08	
Fair	(2)	2	16.67%			
Good	(3)	1	8.33%			
Very Good	(4)	3	25.00%			
Excellent	(5)	6	50.00%			
Response Rate				Mean		STD
12/18 (66.67%)				4.08		1.16

17 - Guest speakers contributed significantly to this course						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Strongly disagree	(1)	0	0.00%		4.50	
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%			
Uncertain	(3)	0	0.00%			
Agree	(4)	2	16.67%			
Strongly Agree	(5)	2	16.67%			
N/A	(0)	8	66.67%			
Response Rate				Mean		STD
12/18 (66.67%)				4.50		0.58

Columbia University: International & Public Affairs

Fall 2022 Course Evaluation (end of semester)

Course: INAFU6549_001_2022_3-PeacebuildingAfterMassViolence: INAFU6549_001_2022_3 - Peacebuilding After Mass Violence

Instructor: Severine Autesserre *

Response Rate: 12/18 (66.67%)

18 - Please provide brief, specific, and constructive comments on the instructor's performance:

Severine Autesserre

Response Rate 12/18 (66.67%)

- Professor Autesserre was wonderful! I was so pleased to have her as a professor. She helped me grow substantially as a student with both my writing and speaking skills which I really appreciated. She was always friendly and always kept class discussions moving forward and engaging! Highly recommend taking a class with her if you can!
- The Professor should not use such a significant portion of class time on research methods. While the approach is well-suited for undergrads, the 'hand-holding' felt condescending and was a significant drain on time that could have been used for discussion. Nevertheless, the professor is extremely helpful and easily contactable making engagements fulfilling and enjoyable. Furthermore, class discussions were well-proportioned but I would have preferred hearing more of the professor's own thoughts, opinions, and critiques.
- I highly enjoyed taking this course with Professor Autesserre. I thought she guided conversation gracefully, but wished she shared her own opinions more in class (as opposed to just reading her books). This was a highly engaging class, however, and felt like Professor Autesserre facilitated conversation between students in a natural and favorable way. The material was deep and nuanced. I wish we could have studied more the practical elements of building peace -- what does it look like to be a peacekeeper on the day-to-day? What does the Program Manager of a small NGO do on a daily basis to support peacebuilding?
- She is so incredibly knowledgeable on the subject and her experience in the field is so beneficial to students looking to go into the peacebuilding field. If you are remotely interested in seeing a different side to the conventional peacebuilding frame work, take her course! She also wants her students to succeed and that is very refreshing.
- I wish that Professor Autesserre had been more willing to share her opinions and insight with us - that is why most of us took the class! Because we wanted to hear from her! We tried to engage with her every class to hear her thoughts on these important and fascinating topics, but her response to our questions was almost always "it's in my book." I didn't like the way that our discussions were timed and people were constantly cut off. She also spent a great deal of time talking about public speaking and encouraged us not to read from our notes, yet came to class every day and inconspicuously read off of her notes word for word.
- Prof. Autesserre encourages a lot of participation in discussions. She limits her own role to jotting down who gets to speak next, and I often wish I knew what she was thinking. She is very helpful in office hours.
- I really enjoyed the class
- Professor Autesserre is a brilliant professor at the cutting edge of her field. Empathy, intelligence, passion, and inclusion is at the core of her writing and teaching style. War and human atrocities can be difficult to assess critically but she explains both what is needed with what is feasible. Her management of seminar conversation is excellent and we hit on so many important issues thanks to her blend of letting students speak and guiding the conversation. Her selection of readings was excellent and helped me understand so much about the field. The inclusion of her own personal experiences and books strongly improved the class because I felt like I understood her perspective on different aspects of peacebuilding AND why she came to those conclusions. She's one of those rare practitioner-professors that clearly excels in both environments!
- You were, without a doubt, my favorite professor in your Peacebuilding After Mass Violence class. I could comprehend all the peacebuilding strategies we studied in class and even make connections between them to promote international peace and security. The fact that your students actively participate in the discussions, which are usually exciting and straightforward, is the best aspect of your teaching technique, for example, role play. You never distance yourself from the students; even the shyest student participates in critical discussion. I count it a great privilege to have a professor like you as part of my experience. Your lectures and publications have broadened both my thinking and analytic ability. Thank you.
- One of the best professors I had during my master's program. Her insight and detailed analysis on peacebuilding challenges and opportunities are contagious and I greatly enjoyed having her as professor.
- Professor Autesserre puts lots of time and effort into helping students with their assignments, so this is great. Less responsive when there are questions about course content and peace building.
- Professor Autesserre is clearly very passionate about the course material, and helped us become more interested as well. I would have liked Professor Autesserre to take more of a stance when we were discussing issues and let us know what she personally thought, rather than acting as a moderator.

19 - The Teaching Assistants (TAs) contributed significantly to this course

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly disagree	(1)	0	0.00%	 	0.00
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%		
Uncertain	(3)	0	0.00%		
Agree	(4)	0	0.00%		
Strongly Agree	(5)	0	0.00%		
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate				Mean	STD
0/18 (0.00%)				0.00	0.00

20 - Please provide brief, specific, and constructive comments on the TA's performance (if applicable)

Response Rate 0/18 (0%)