UCLA EIP       D. KIM         Evaluation of Instruction Program Report         23W: PUB AFF 115 DIS 1B: QUANT METHODS         No. of responses = 2         Enrollment = 20         Response Rate = 10%						
1. Background Information:						
<sup>1.1)</sup> Year in School:						
Freshman		0 n=2				
Sophomore		1				
Junior		1				
Senior		0				
Graduate		0				
Other		0				
<sup>1.2)</sup> UCLA GPA:						
Below 2.0		0 n=2				
2.0 - 2.49		0				
2.5 - 2.99		0				
3.0 - 3.49		0				
3.5+		2				
Not Established		0				
<sup>1.3)</sup> Expected Grade:						
А		2 n=2				
В		0				
C		0				
D		0				
F		0				
Р		0				
NP		0				
?		0				
<sup>1.4)</sup> What requirements does this course fulfill?						
Major		2 n=2				
Related Field		0				
G.E.		0				
None		0				

2. To What Extent Do You Feel That:		
<sup>2.1)</sup> Teaching Assistant Knowledge – The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	Very Low or 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 Very High Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	or n=2 av.=9 md=9 dev.=0
<ul> <li><sup>22)</sup> Teaching Assistant Concern – The T. A. was concerned about student learning.</li> </ul>	Very Low or 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 Very High Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	or n=2 av.=8.5 md=8.5 dev.=0.71
<sup>2.3)</sup> Organization – Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	Very Low or 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 Very High Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	or n=2 av.=8.5 md=8.5 dev.=0.71
<sup>2.4)</sup> Scope – The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.	Very Low or 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 Very High Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	or n=2 av.=8.5 md=8.5 dev.=0.71
<sup>2.5)</sup> Interaction – Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.	Very Low or 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 Very High Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	or n=2 av.=7.5 md=7.5 dev.=2.12
<sup>2.6)</sup> Communication Skills – The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	Very Low or 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 Very High Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	or n=2 av.=9 md=9 dev.=0
<sup>2.7)</sup> Value – The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.	Very Low or 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 Very High Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	or n=2 av.=9 md=9 dev.=0
<sup>2.8)</sup> Overall – What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?	Very Low or 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 Very High Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	or n=2 av.=8.5 md=8.5 dev.=0.71
3. Your View of Section Characteristics:		
<sup>3.1)</sup> Difficulty (relative to other courses)	Low 0 2 0 High	n=2 av.=2 md=2 dev.=0

<sup>3.2)</sup> Workload/pace was	Too Slow	0	2	0	Too Much	n=2 av.=2 md=2 dev.=0
<sup>33)</sup> Integration of section with course was	Poor	0	0	2	Excellent	n=2 av.=3 md=3 dev.=0
<sup>34)</sup> Texts, required readings	Poor	0	2	0	Excellent	n=2 av.=2 md=2 dev.=0
<sup>3.5)</sup> Homework assignments	Poor	0	0	2	Excellent	n=2 av.=3 md=3 dev.=0
<sup>36)</sup> Graded materials, examinations	Poor	0		1 1 3	Excellent	n=2 av.=2.5 md=2.5 dev.=0.71
<sup>3.7)</sup> Lecture presentations	Poor	0		1 3	Excellent	n=2 av.=2.5 md=2.5 dev.=0.71
<sup>3.8)</sup> Class discussions	Poor	0	2	0	Excellent	n=2 av.=2 md=2 dev.=0
4. Comments:						

- <sup>4.1)</sup> Please identify what you perceive to be the real strengths and weaknesses of this teaching assistant and course.
- Doeun was a very intelligent and knowledgeable TA. She was very good at expanding on course materials in our labs.
- Ms. Kim was extremely knowledgeable about our course content. She always was able to help and even added extra advice that was extremely helpful. Students also seemed to always be comfortable going to her for help. Overall, this was an extremely strong discussion section/lab and there is almost nothing that I would change.

## Profile

Subunit:

## PUB AFF

Name of the instructor: Name of the course: (Name of the survey) D. KIM

23W: PUB AFF 115 DIS 1B: QUANT METHODS

Very Low or

Values used in the profile line: Mean

## 2. To What Extent Do You Feel That:

- <sup>2.1)</sup> Teaching Assistant Knowledge The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.
- <sup>2.2)</sup> Teaching Assistant Concern The T.A. was concerned about student learning.
- <sup>2.3)</sup> Organization Section presentations were well prepared and organized.
- $^{2.4)} \ \ \, Scope-The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.$
- $^{2.5)}\,$  Interaction Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.
- 2.6) Communication Skills The teaching assistant had good communication skills.
- 2.7) Value The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.
- <sup>2.8)</sup> Overall What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?

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.=3.00
3.6)	Graded materials, examinations	Poor	 Excellent	n=2	av.=2.50
3.7)	Lecture presentations	Poor	Excellent	n=2	av.=2.50
3.8)	Class discussions	Poor	 Excellent	n=2	av.=2.00

Never		1	Always	n=2	av.=9.00
Very Low or Never		1	Very High or Always	n=2	av.=8.50
Very Low or Never			Very High or Always	n=2	av.=8.50
Very Low or Never		┦	Very High or Always	n=2	av.=8.50
Very Low or Never	+ $+$		Very High or Always	n=2	av.=7.50
Very Low or Never			Very High or Always	n=2	av.=9.00
Very Low or Never		/	Very High or Always	n=2	av.=9.00
Very Low or Never		4	Very High or Always	n=2	av.=8.50

Very High or