





B. FLORKIEWICZ
Evaluation of Instruction Program Report
 20S: ANTHRO 1 DIS 1E: HUMAN EVOLUTION
 No. of responses = 4
 Enrollment = 16
 Response Rate = 25%

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	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Very High or Always	n=4 av.=8.75 md=9 dev.=0.5
2.2)	Teaching Assistant Concern – The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	Very Low or Never	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Very High or Always	n=3 av.=8.67 md=9 dev.=0.58
2.3)	Organization – Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	Very Low or Never	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Very High or Always	n=4 av.=8.75 md=9 dev.=0.5
2.4)	Scope – The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.	Very Low or Never	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Very High or Always	n=4 av.=8.75 md=9 dev.=0.5
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 1 3 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Very High or Always	n=4 av.=8.75 md=9 dev.=0.5
2.6)	Communication Skills – The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	Very Low or Never	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Very High or Always	n=4 av.=8.75 md=9 dev.=0.5
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 1 3 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Very High or Always	n=4 av.=8.75 md=9 dev.=0.5
2.8)	Overall – What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?	Very Low or Never	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Very High or Always	n=4 av.=8.75 md=9 dev.=0.5


3. Your View of Section Characteristics:

3.1)	Difficulty (relative to other courses)	Low	0 4 0 1 2 3	High	n=4 av.=2 md=2 dev.=0
3.2)	Workload/pace was	Too Slow	0 4 0 1 2 3	Too Much	n=4 av.=2 md=2 dev.=0
3.3)	Integration of section with course was	Poor	0 1 3 1 2 3	Excellent	n=4 av.=2.75 md=3 dev.=0.5
3.4)	Texts, required readings	Poor	0 3 1 1 2 3	Excellent	n=4 av.=2.25 md=2 dev.=0.5
3.5)	Homework assignments	Poor	0 1 3 1 2 3	Excellent	n=4 av.=2.75 md=3 dev.=0.5


3.6) Graded materials, examinations



3.7) Lecture presentations



3.8) Class discussions



4. Comments:

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

- FLORKIEWICZ was a super helpful TA who would go out of her way to help students, provide resources, and make sure everything was fair. The discussion sections were quite helpful, and it was obvious she was very knowledgeable on the content. Made the online format less stressful for us students in this hectic time.
- I really loved Britt as a TA. She was really understanding from the start about the different limitations that students could have with remote learning and still managed to really engage us really well throughout the discussion. She was also really good at communicating announcements on a weekly basis and through emails.
- This was the first TA that has ever done so much for students in order to fully comprehend the course material. She made sure to explain difficult topics and went out of her way to simplify notes and really helped us and prepared us for the midterms and final I can not thank her enough. She is so helpful and is an approachable person which allowed us to ask questions without hesitation because we knew she was very knowledgeable. She would give us many examples that clarified topics and you could clearly tell that she was well informed on what she was teaching us because she answered everything so well, sometimes better than our textbook or lectures. I really do recommend her as a teaching assistant in this class for any other students. She was a huge help throughout the course.
- Very accommodating and helpful

Profile

Subunit: ANTHRO
 Name of the instructor: B. FLORKIEWICZ
 Name of the course: 20S: ANTHRO 1 DIS 1E: HUMAN EVOLUTION
 (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=4	av.=8.75
2.2) Teaching Assistant Concern – The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	Very Low or Never									Very High or Always	n=3	av.=8.67
2.3) Organization – Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	Very Low or Never									Very High or Always	n=4	av.=8.75
2.4) Scope – The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.	Very Low or Never									Very High or Always	n=4	av.=8.75
2.5) Interaction – Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.	Very Low or Never									Very High or Always	n=4	av.=8.75
2.6) Communication Skills – The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	Very Low or Never									Very High or Always	n=4	av.=8.75
2.7) Value – The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.	Very Low or Never									Very High or Always	n=4	av.=8.75
2.8) Overall – What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?	Very Low or Never									Very High or Always	n=4	av.=8.75

3. Your View of Section Characteristics:

3.1) Difficulty (relative to other courses)	Low									High	n=4	av.=2.00
3.2) Workload/pace was	Too Slow									Too Much	n=4	av.=2.00
3.3) Integration of section with course was	Poor									Excellent	n=4	av.=2.75
3.4) Texts, required readings	Poor									Excellent	n=4	av.=2.25
3.5) Homework assignments	Poor									Excellent	n=4	av.=2.75
3.6) Graded materials, examinations	Poor									Excellent	n=4	av.=2.75
3.7) Lecture presentations	Poor									Excellent	n=4	av.=2.50
3.8) Class discussions	Poor									Excellent	n=4	av.=2.50