UCLA | EIP

# B. FLORKIEWICZ
Evaluation of Instruction Program Report
18S: PSYCH M149 DIS 1B: LANG DEV & SOCIOL
No. of responses = 2
Enrollment = 7
Response Rate = 28.57%


Survey Results

1. Background Information:

1.1) Year in School:

		n=2
Freshman		0
Sophomore		0
Junior		1
Senior		1
Graduate		0
Other		0

1.2) UCLA GPA:

		n=2
Below 2.0		0
2.0 - 2.49		0
2.5 - 2.99		1
3.0 - 3.49		0
3.5+		1
Not Established		0

1.3) Expected Grade:

		n=2
A		0
B		2
C		0
D		0
F		0
P		0
NP		0
?		0

1.4) What requirements does this course fulfill?

|		n=2
Major		2
Related Field		0
G.E.		0
None		0

2. To What Extent Do You Feel That:

2.1) Teaching Assistant Knowledge – The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.

Very Low or Never | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 | Very High or Always
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

n=2
av.=8.5
md=8.5
dev.=0.71

2.2) Teaching Assistant Concern – The T.A. was concerned about student learning.

Very Low or Never | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 | Very High or Always
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

n=2
av.=9
md=9
dev.=0

2.3) Organization – Section presentations were well prepared and organized.

Very Low or Never | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 | Very High or Always
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

n=2
av.=8.5
md=8.5
dev.=0.71

2.4) Scope – The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.

Very Low or Never | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 | Very High or Always
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

n=2
av.=9
md=9
dev.=0

2.5) Interaction – Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.

Very Low or Never | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 | Very High or Always
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

n=2
av.=9
md=9
dev.=0

2.6) Communication Skills – The teaching assistant had good communication skills.

Very Low or Never | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 | Very High or Always
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

n=2
av.=9
md=9
dev.=0

2.7) Value – The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.

Very Low or Never | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 | Very High or Always
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

n=2
av.=9
md=9
dev.=0

2.8) Overall – What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?

Very Low or Never | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 | Very High or Always
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

n=2
av.=9
md=9
dev.=0

3. Your View of Section Characteristics:

3.1) Difficulty (relative to other courses)

Low | 0 2 0 | High
1 2 3

n=2
av.=2
md=2
dev.=0

3.2) Workload/pace was

Too Slow | 0 2 0 | Too Much
1 2 3

n=2
av.=2
md=2
dev.=0

3.3) Integration of section with course was

Poor | 0 0 2 | Excellent
1 2 3

n=2
av.=3
md=3
dev.=0

3.4) Texts, required readings

Poor | 0 2 0 | Excellent
1 2 3

n=2
av.=2
md=2
dev.=0

3.5) Homework assignments

Poor | 0 1 1 | Excellent
1 2 3

n=2
av.=2.5
md=2.5
dev.=0.71

3.6) **Graded materials, examinations**

Poor   Excellent

n=2
av.=2
md=2
dev.=0

3.7) **Lecture presentations**

Poor   Excellent

n=1
av.=3
md=3
dev.=0
ab.=1

3.8) **Class discussions**

Poor   Excellent

n=2
av.=3
md=3
dev.=0

Profile

2. To What Extent Do You Feel That:

2.1)	Teaching Assistant Knowledge – The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	Very Low or Never — Very High or Always	n=2	av.=8.50
2.2)	Teaching Assistant Concern – The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	Very Low or Never — Very High or Always	n=2	av.=9.00
2.3)	Organization – Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	Very Low or Never — Very High or Always	n=2	av.=8.50
2.4)	Scope – The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.	Very Low or Never — Very High or Always	n=2	av.=9.00
2.5)	Interaction – Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.	Very Low or Never — Very High or Always	n=2	av.=9.00
2.6)	Communication Skills – The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	Very Low or Never — Very High or Always	n=2	av.=9.00
2.7)	Value – The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.	Very Low or Never — Very High or Always	n=2	av.=9.00
2.8)	Overall – What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?	Very Low or Never — Very High or Always	n=2	av.=9.00

3. Your View of Section Characteristics:

3.1)	Difficulty (relative to other courses)	Low — High	n=2	av.=2.00
3.2)	Workload/pace was	Too Slow — Too Much	n=2	av.=2.00
3.3)	Integration of section with course was	Poor — Excellent	n=2	av.=3.00
3.4)	Texts, required readings	Poor — Excellent	n=2	av.=2.00
3.5)	Homework assignments	Poor — Excellent	n=2	av.=2.50
3.6)	Graded materials, examinations	Poor — Excellent	n=2	av.=2.00
3.7)	Lecture presentations	Poor — Excellent	n=1	av.=3.00
3.8)	Class discussions	Poor — Excellent	n=2	av.=3.00

Comments Report

4. Comments:

4.1) Please identify what you perceive to be the real strengths and weaknesses of this teaching assistant and course.

- Brittany has been an amazing TA. She does a great job at clarifying material and deeply cares for her students. She has such a great attitude and makes sure to get back to her students via email at an instant. I have enjoyed having her as a TA.

- Brittany was always very helpful and really amazing at answering questions and explaining concepts from the lectures. I always felt that I could asked for help and really enjoyed the sections because they helped better understand lectures/ the homework and the exams. Thank you for everything!