

Winter Quarter 2016
Selected Evaluations* (2)
Student Evaluation of Teaching

 Enrollment 59
 % responding 84%

	5	4	3	2	1				
	5 %	4 %	3 %	2 %	1 %	\bar{X}	SD	M	N
Please indicate the overall educational value of the course. (excellent very good satisfactory fair poor)	23 46%	16 32%	9 18%	2 4%	0 0%	4.2	0.9	4.0	50
UCD Grade Point Average: (5) 4-3.6, (4) 3.5-3.1, (3) 3-2.6, (2) 2.5-2.1, (1) 2 or below	17 36%	18 38%	9 19%	2 4%	1 2%	4.0	1.0	4.0	47
Expected grade in this course: (5) A, (4) B, (3) C, (2) D, (1) F	17 35%	25 51%	6 12%	1 2%	0 0%	4.2	0.7	4.0	49
Your interest in the subject matter before taking this course: (5) Very high, (4) Somewhat high, (3) Moderate, (2) Low, (1) Very low	18 36%	15 30%	13 26%	2 4%	2 4%	3.9	1.1	4.0	50
Please indicate the overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant. (excellent very good satisfactory fair poor)	14 28%	23 46%	11 22%	2 4%	0 0%	4.0	0.8	4.0	50
TA demonstrates knowledge and command of the subject matter. (5) Excellent, (4) Very good, (3) Good, (2) Fair, (1) Poor	27 54%	19 38%	4 8%	0 0%	0 0%	4.5	0.6	5.0	50
TA is well prepared for section. (5) Excellent, (4) Very good, (3) Good, (2) Fair, (1) Poor	29 58%	18 36%	3 6%	0 0%	0 0%	4.5	0.6	5.0	50
TA is effective in encouraging student participation. (5) Excellent, (4) Very good, (3) Good, (2) Fair, (1) Poor	15 30%	22 44%	9 18%	4 8%	0 0%	4.0	0.9	4.0	50
TA encourages students to express opinions and respects divergent points of view. (5) Excellent, (4) Very good, (3) Good, (2) Fair, (1) Poor	23 47%	16 33%	7 14%	3 6%	0 0%	4.2	0.9	4.0	49
TA is responsive to questions and student requests. (5) Excellent, (4) Very good, (3) Good, (2) Fair, (1) Poor	29 58%	14 28%	5 10%	1 2%	1 2%	4.4	0.9	5.0	50
TA explains and clarifies difficult material. (5) Excellent, (4) Very good, (3) Good, (2) Fair, (1) Poor	19 38%	21 42%	6 12%	2 4%	2 4%	4.1	1.0	4.0	50
TA clearly defines expectations of student. (5) Excellent, (4) Very good, (3) Good, (2) Fair, (1) Poor	15 31%	15 31%	12 24%	4 8%	3 6%	3.7	1.2	4.0	49
TA provides helpful comments on assignments. (5) Excellent, (4) Very good, (3) Good, (2) Fair, (1) Poor	14 29%	16 33%	9 18%	6 12%	4 8%	3.6	1.2	4.0	49
TA helps the student appreciate course topics. (5) Excellent, (4) Very good, (3) Good, (2) Fair, (1) Poor	14 29%	19 39%	10 20%	5 10%	1 2%	3.8	1.0	4.0	49

TA demonstrates knowledge and command of the subject matter. (5) Excellent, (4) Very good, (3) Good, (2) Fair, (1) Poor

NA

You rule!

Definitely knew what he was talking about.

TA is well prepared for section. (5) Excellent, (4) Very good, (3) Good, (2) Fair, (1) Poor

He prepared a power point for every class with the most important points of lecture.

NA

Carlos makes excellent slides to present in discussion, and it is obvious that he has put a great amount of effort and care into his work.

Keeps it mad real

Had good slides/questions up.

TA is effective in encouraging student participation. (5) Excellent, (4) Very good, (3) Good, (2) Fair, (1) Poor

Very open to discussion; engaging discussions

NA

Super helpful when approached

Encouraged students to talk about contemporary political events.

TA encourages students to express opinions and respects divergent points of view. (5) Excellent, (4) Very good, (3) Good, (2) Fair, (1) Poor

NA

Fairly balances conversations

TA is responsive to questions and student requests. (5) Excellent, (4) Very good, (3) Good, (2) Fair, (1) Poor

Addressing questions appropriately

NA

Very accommodating with office hours.

I receive accomodations from the SDC, and Carlos was beyond helpful when it came to reveiving those accomodations as well as answering questions in office hours.

Leads the conversation well

E-mail response time :(

TA explains and clarifies difficult material. (5) Excellent, (4) Very good, (3) Good, (2) Fair, (1) Poor

Would reexplain any topics students struggled with; good at explaining in a different way

NA

Employs multiple explanations, displaying thorough knowledge of the subject.

Often made things more confusing, again, by going into basic easily understandable concepts way too much - and leaving more complex concepts that actually should've been discussed (i.e. the genocide, Straus & Weinstein readings) alone. A lot has to do with the structure of the class/professor's agenda itself, though.

Never thorough enough. Always left instructions very vague and subject to interpretation. Never got things across efficiently.

TA clearly defines expectations of student. (5) Excellent, (4) Very good, (3) Good, (2) Fair, (1) Poor

Clearly outlined expectations and grading

Again, I was not sure how specific I was expected to be for the HW Assignment and Midterm. I was not sure how much information I HAD to include.

I didn't feel the expectations for the homework and the midterm essay were defined as explicitly as they could be.

Absolutley, and available for help often

Confused about what exactly he wanted on our homework/tests.

Does not dissect our mistakes, does not point them out.

TA provides helpful comments on assignments. (5) Excellent, (4) Very good, (3) Good, (2) Fair, (1) Poor

Lack of comments. Not very explanatory. It did not sound constructive. I knew what to improve on but did not know how.

Crushing it

Worked hard on grading the assignments, but was even more confused by the passed-back comments.

It is extremely difficult to figure out exactly why you did not get full points on a question. Not clear at all.

TA helps the student appreciate course topics. (5) Excellent, (4) Very good, (3) Good, (2) Fair, (1) Poor

I did not enjoy this course as much as I thought I would because the TA seemed to be biased. I am not a polisci /communications / IR major and I felt he graded extra hard.

Carlos was by far one of the best teacher assistants, I've had on this campus! He was enthusiastic, a phenomenal explainer that was always more than willing to work with his students and address their concerns.

I enjoy how Carlos relates what we are learning to what is occurring in the political world at present. Not only am I learning the course material, I am engaging in global issues.

Very helpful, initially unapproachable but he is very knowledgable about the course materials. A bit of a tough grader but always fair.

Seems to enjoy subject and it shows

To be fair, this was hard to do for anyone who had to spend 4 weeks explaining hypothesis and models over and over again - with confusing mounting with every unnecessary explanation.

Term	Eval Opened	CRN	Subject	Course	Section	Enrollment	% Response
Winter Quarter 2016	3/7/2016 12:00 AM	39021	POL	002	A03	29	89
Winter Quarter 2016	3/7/2016 12:00 AM	39022	POL	002	A04	30	80