




B. FLORKIEWICZ
Evaluation of Instruction Program Report
 21W: ANTHRO 1 DIS 1I: HUMAN EVOLUTION
 No. of responses = 5
 Enrollment = 16
 Response Rate = 31.25%

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 0 5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Very High or Always | n=5 av.=9 md=9 dev.=0 |
| 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 5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Very High or Always | n=5 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 0 5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Very High or Always | n=5 av.=9 md=9 dev.=0 |
| 2.4) | Scope – The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas. | Very Low or Never | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Very High or Always | n=5 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 5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Very High or Always | n=5 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 5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Very High or Always | n=5 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 5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Very High or Always | n=5 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 5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Very High or Always | n=5 av.=9 md=9 dev.=0 |

3. Your View of Section Characteristics:

| | | | | | |
|------|--|----------|----------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|
| 3.1) | Difficulty (relative to other courses) | Low | 0 3 2 1 2 3 | High | n=5 av.=2.4 md=2 dev.=0.55 |
| 3.2) | Workload/pace was | Too Slow | 0 4 1 1 2 3 | Too Much | n=5 av.=2.2 md=2 dev.=0.45 |
| 3.3) | Integration of section with course was | Poor | 0 0 5 1 2 3 | Excellent | n=5 av.=3 md=3 dev.=0 |

| | | | |
|------|--------------------------------|--|---|
| 3.4) | Texts, required readings | | n=4 av.=2.5 md=2.5 dev.=0.58 ab.=1 |
| 3.5) | Homework assignments | | n=5 av.=2.6 md=3 dev.=0.55 |
| 3.6) | Graded materials, examinations | | n=4 av.=2.25 md=2.5 dev.=0.96 ab.=1 |
| 3.7) | Lecture presentations | | n=4 av.=3 md=3 dev.=0 ab.=1 |
| 3.8) | Class discussions | | n=5 av.=3 md=3 dev.=0 |

4. Comments:

- 4.1) Please identify what you perceive to be the real strengths and weaknesses of this teaching assistant and course.
- Britt is by far one of the best TA's I have had at UCLA given that I am a sophomore and this is my winter quarter - she is so understanding and kind and is literally the only reason why I didn't drop this course. She is so knowledgeable and kind and was always so accommodating to the students, especially in the GroupMe. Britt if you read this know that you are literally the best :)
 - Britt was amazing! She was so passionate about the course material and it made her discussion sections super engaging. She was very welcoming and approachable and created a class environment in which I always felt comfortable asking questions. She was very approachable and had such a deep knowledge of the content that she could always explain complex topics in a way that made them relevant to our lives and easier to grasp and expanded them beyond the course material. She was so understanding of students' different situations in these crazy times and showed a lot of care for her students and it made section a lot less stressful. She was truly fantastic, would make an amazing professor!!!
 - Britt was one of the most welcoming and engaging TA's I have ever had. She made discussion sections interesting and understandable. She was very responsive to student input, making sure to answer concerns in discussion section and especially in the class GroupMe. She would regularly answer students' questions outside of business hours, at a response rate greater than any TA I have ever had. She is knowledgeable on the course content and provided great outside connections that relate to her personal work and experiences. Great TA ! Thank you Britt!!!!
 - Honestly, Britt is the best TA I've ever had. Super understanding, super helpful, super knowledgeable, and super into anthropology! I think you'll make an amazing professor, Britt! :)
 - The absolute best!! Strengths are definitely that she is super chill and really concerned with making sure we understood the material and answered basically everyone's questions Super approachable and pretty quick responses.

Profile

Subunit: ANTHRO
 Name of the instructor: B. FLORKIEWICZ
 Name of the course: 21W: ANTHRO 1 DIS 1: 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=5 | 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=5 | av.=9.00 |
| 2.3) Organization – Section presentations were well prepared and organized. | Very Low or Never | | | | | | | | | Very High or Always | n=5 | av.=9.00 |
| 2.4) Scope – The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas. | Very Low or Never | | | | | | | | | Very High or Always | n=5 | 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=5 | av.=9.00 |
| 2.6) Communication Skills – The teaching assistant had good communication skills. | Very Low or Never | | | | | | | | | Very High or Always | n=5 | 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=5 | av.=9.00 |
| 2.8) Overall – What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant? | Very Low or Never | | | | | | | | | Very High or Always | n=5 | av.=9.00 |

3. Your View of Section Characteristics:

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----------|-----|----------|
| 3.1) Difficulty (relative to other courses) | Low | | | | | | | | | High | n=5 | av.=2.40 |
| 3.2) Workload/pace was | Too Slow | | | | | | | | | Too Much | n=5 | av.=2.20 |
| 3.3) Integration of section with course was | Poor | | | | | | | | | Excellent | n=5 | av.=3.00 |
| 3.4) Texts, required readings | Poor | | | | | | | | | Excellent | n=4 | av.=2.50 |
| 3.5) Homework assignments | Poor | | | | | | | | | Excellent | n=5 | av.=2.60 |
| 3.6) Graded materials, examinations | Poor | | | | | | | | | Excellent | n=4 | av.=2.25 |
| 3.7) Lecture presentations | Poor | | | | | | | | | Excellent | n=4 | av.=3.00 |
| 3.8) Class discussions | Poor | | | | | | | | | Excellent | n=5 | av.=3.00 |