




B. FLORKIEWICZ
Evaluation of Instruction Program Report
 18S: ANTHRO M152P DIS 1D: LANG DEV & SOCIOL
 No. of responses = 7
 Enrollment = 14
 Response Rate = 50%


Survey Results

1. Background Information:


1.1) Year in School:




1.2) UCLA GPA:



1.3) Expected Grade:



1.4) What requirements does this course fulfill?



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=7 av.=9 md=9 dev.=0
2.2)	Teaching Assistant Concern – The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=7 av.=9 md=9 dev.=0
2.3)	Organization – Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=7 av.=9 md=9 dev.=0
2.4)	Scope – The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=7 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		Very High or Always	n=7 av.=9 md=9 dev.=0
2.6)	Communication Skills – The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=7 av.=9 md=9 dev.=0
2.7)	Value – The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=7 av.=9 md=9 dev.=0
2.8)	Overall – What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=7 av.=9 md=9 dev.=0

3. Your View of Section Characteristics:

3.1)	Difficulty (relative to other courses)	Low		High	n=7 av.=2.43 md=2 dev.=0.53
3.2)	Workload/pace was	Too Slow		Too Much	n=7 av.=2.14 md=2 dev.=0.38
3.3)	Integration of section with course was	Poor		Excellent	n=7 av.=3 md=3 dev.=0
3.4)	Texts, required readings	Poor		Excellent	n=6 av.=3 md=3 dev.=0 ab.=1
3.5)	Homework assignments	Poor		Excellent	n=7 av.=3 md=3 dev.=0

3.6) Graded materials, examinations



n=7
 av.=2.86
 md=3
 dev.=0.38

3.7) Lecture presentations



n=6
 av.=3
 md=3
 dev.=0
 ab.=1

3.8) Class discussions



n=7
 av.=3
 md=3
 dev.=0

Profile

Subunit: ANTHRO
 Name of the instructor: B. FLORKIEWICZ
 Name of the course: 18S: ANTHRO M152P DIS 1D: LANG DEV & SOCIOL
 (Name of the survey)

Values used in the profile line: Mean

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=7	av.=9.00
2.2) Teaching Assistant Concern – The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	Very Low or Never									Very High or Always	n=7	av.=9.00
2.3) Organization – Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	Very Low or Never									Very High or Always	n=7	av.=9.00
2.4) Scope – The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.	Very Low or Never									Very High or Always	n=7	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=7	av.=9.00
2.6) Communication Skills – The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	Very Low or Never									Very High or Always	n=7	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=7	av.=9.00
2.8) Overall – What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?	Very Low or Never									Very High or Always	n=7	av.=9.00

3. Your View of Section Characteristics:

3.1) Difficulty (relative to other courses)	Low									High	n=7	av.=2.43
3.2) Workload/pace was	Too Slow									Too Much	n=7	av.=2.14
3.3) Integration of section with course was	Poor									Excellent	n=7	av.=3.00
3.4) Texts, required readings	Poor									Excellent	n=6	av.=3.00
3.5) Homework assignments	Poor									Excellent	n=7	av.=3.00
3.6) Graded materials, examinations	Poor									Excellent	n=7	av.=2.86
3.7) Lecture presentations	Poor									Excellent	n=6	av.=3.00
3.8) Class discussions	Poor									Excellent	n=7	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.
- Amazing TA!! She really cares about her students succeeding. She also is so passionate and knowledgeable on most anthropological subjects. She is a really interesting lecturer.
 - Britt is literally the best TA I have ever had. She cares SO much about her students and always accommodates for people's individual needs. It's clear she wants all of her students to succeed, and she does everything she can to help them reach their full potential. Honestly, I have no idea what I would have done without her this year. Also, her hair is sick and she has a DOPE fashion sense. Thanks Britt!
 - Brittany has great communication skills and creates a very welcoming environment in her sections. It was easy to approach her outside of the discussions to ask for help and guidance. She made the discussion nicely incorporated with the lecture by not necessarily repeating the same information but providing further clarification and extra help.
 - I enjoyed the section a lot and was very glad I picked her as my TA. She went out of her way to make sure we understood the material and made sure we could do the home work assignments. If i could grade her out of 100 I would give her 100.