

Change report view: Ramsay, David Bradford ▼

MAS.S61 Special Subject in Media Technology

Survey Window: Spring 2021 End of Term | [View Current Catalog Entry](#) | [Print Report](#)

Report Includes Data for:

Students: For credit

Subjects: MAS.S61 Special Subject in Media Technology - Lecture L01

[\(filter data\)](#)

Eligible to Respond: 8
Total # of Respondents: 4
Response rate: 50%
Overall rating of subject: out of

Download Set of Individual Student Responses: [PDF](#) [raw data](#)

Due to pandemic-related disruptions in academic year 2020-21, many instructors have had to modify the scope and content of the subject, the means of delivery, the grading and assessment scheme, and other aspects of their subjects. In future versions of the subject many of these modifications may or may not be retained. These evaluation data specifically reflect feedback on a version taught during a disrupted term.

Show/Hide Comments

INSTRUCTORS

Subject Evaluation for Partially Remote Term

1=Strongly Disagree, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

NAME	Instructor stimulated my interest in the subject	Instructor displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	Instructor supported my learning
Picard, Rosalind W. , Instructor (LEC)	6.5 (4)	7.0 (4)	6.8 (4)
Ramsay, David Bradford , Teaching Assistant (LEC)	7.0 (3)	7.0 (3)	7.0 (3)
Liu, Yuanbo , Teaching Assistant (LEC)	6.7 (3)	7.0 (3)	6.7 (3)

Ramsay, David Bradford, Teaching Assistant in Lecture L01 - Overall rating:

Subject Evaluation for Partially Remote Term	Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)										
	AVG	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
Instructor stimulated my interest in the subject	7.0								3	7.0	0.0
Instructor displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7.0								3	7.0	0.0
Instructor supported my learning	7.0								3	7.0	0.0

Please provide comments on teaching (strengths, responsiveness to concerns, areas for improvement)

[Student 3505](#) - Best professor I have had in a long time.

SUBJECT

SUBJECT EVALUATION FOR PARTIALLY REMOTE TERM *Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)*

	AVG	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
The expectations for the subject were clearly defined	5.8		4	6.0	1.26
The learning objectives for the subject were met	6.8		4	7.0	0.5
The subject's assignments contributed to my learning	6.5		4	6.5	0.58
The subject's grading thus far has been fair	6.8		4	7.0	0.5
I was satisfied with my overall learning experience in this subject.	6.8		4	7.0	0.5

	AVG	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
How much time (in hours) did you spend per week on this subject?	10.7	3	10.0	2.08

Rating Scale: 1=Too Slow, 4=Just Right, 7=Too Fast, N/A=Not Applicable (4 is best)

	AVG	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4.8		4	4.5	0.96

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Disagree Nor Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (5 is best)

	AVG	1 2 3 4 5	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
I was able to easily locate necessary class materials.	4.8		4	5.0	0.5
Expectations for participation were clearly stated.	4.3		4	4.5	0.96
Instructions for graded assignments were clearly stated	4.5		4	4.5	0.58
An appropriate orientation to all technology required for the subject was provided.	3.8		4	3.5	0.96
I received feedback that improved my learning.	4.5		4	4.5	0.58

Please provide detail on any item for which you strongly disagree or strongly agree. Please be as specific as possible.

[Student 3505](#) - I would add an additional training module for data analysis, and some references on best practices for study design.

Rating Scale: 1=To No Extent, 2=To a Small Extent, 3=To a Moderate Extent, 4=To a Great Extent, N/A=Not Applicable (4 is best)

	AVG	1 2 3 4	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
Live (synchronous) lectures/class periods	3.8		4	4.0	0.5
Synchronous class discussions	3.8		4	4.0	0.5
Asynchronous learning activities (e.g., previously recorded presentation of course material, pre-class reading, answering pre-class questions, etc.)	3.5		2	3.5	0.71
Recitations	4.0		1	4.0	0.0
Office hours	3.3		3	3.0	0.58

Collaborative/Team Project-based work	4.0	4	4.0	0.0
Labs	4.0	1	4.0	0.0
Working on problem sets with others	4.0	1	4.0	0.0
Completing written assignments	3.3	4	3.0	0.5
Presentation & performance-related activities	3.3	4	3.5	0.96
Discussion forum (e.g., Piazza, Discord, Canvas, Stellar)	3.0	3	3.0	1.0

Were there other components that contributed to your learning in this subject?

[Student 28495](#) - passion of instructors, taking a project start to finish, high expectations combined with lots of support and inspiration = great!

Please feel free to offer suggestions for changes to this subject for future offerings (e.g., topics covered, format, delivery, assignments) and/or to leave other constructive comments below.

[Student 3505](#) - Should be a permanent offering. Fantastic content. Only thing needed would be more training on study design and data analysis.

[Show/Hide Comments](#)

[\(top of page\)](#)

Change report view: Ramsay, David Bradford ▼

MAS.S76 Special Subject in Media Arts and Sciences

Survey Window: Spring 2021 End of Term | [View Current Catalog Entry](#) | [Print Report](#)

Report Includes Data for:

Students: For credit

Subjects: MAS.S76 Special Subject in Media Arts and Sciences - Lecture L01

[\(filter data\)](#)
Eligible to Respond: Total # of

2

Respondents: 2
Response rate:

100%

Overall rating of subject:

out of

Download Set of Individual Student Responses: [PDF](#) [raw data](#)

Due to pandemic-related disruptions in academic year 2020-21, many instructors have had to modify the scope and content of the subject, the means of delivery, the grading and assessment scheme, and other aspects of their subjects. In future versions of the subject many of these modifications may or may not be retained. These evaluation data specifically reflect feedback on a version taught during a disrupted term.

Show/Hide Comments

INSTRUCTORS

Subject Evaluation for Partially Remote Term

1=Strongly Disagree, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

NAME	Instructor stimulated my interest in the subject	Instructor displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	Instructor supported my learning
Paradiso, Joseph A. , Instructor (LEC)	7.0 (2)	7.0 (2)	7.0 (2)
Cherston, Juliana Mae , Teaching Assistant (LEC)	7.0 (2)	7.0 (2)	7.0 (2)
Chwalek, Patrick , Teaching Assistant (LEC)	7.0 (2)	7.0 (2)	7.0 (2)
Ramsay, David Bradford , Teaching Assistant (LEC)	7.0 (2)	7.0 (2)	7.0 (2)

Ramsay, David Bradford, Teaching Assistant in Lecture L01 - Overall rating:

Subject Evaluation for Partially Remote Term	Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)										
	AVG	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
Instructor stimulated my interest in the subject	7.0								2	7.0	0.0
Instructor displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7.0								2	7.0	0.0
Instructor supported my learning	7.0								2	7.0	0.0

SUBJECT

SUBJECT EVALUATION FOR PARTIALLY REMOTE

TERM

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

	AVG	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
The expectations for the subject were clearly defined	6.5		2	6.5	0.71
The learning objectives for the subject were met	6.5		2	6.5	0.71
The subject's assignments contributed to my learning	6.5		2	6.5	0.71
The subject's grading thus far has been fair	7.0		1	7.0	0.0
I was satisfied with my overall learning experience in this subject.	6.5		2	6.5	0.71

	AVG	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
How much time (in hours) did you spend per week on this subject?	7.0	2	7.0	4.24

Rating Scale: 1=Too Slow, 4=Just Right, 7=Too Fast, N/A=Not Applicable (4 is best)

	AVG	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	4.0		2	4.0	0.0

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

[Student 50915](#) - Great class overall. It met my expectations and I learned a lot about what I came for. For the weekly assignments: it would be useful to get a quick brief on the key concepts to pay attention to in the readings. This could be written with the references on canvas or verbal at the end of the class (the week before each assignment).

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Disagree Nor Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (5 is best)

	AVG	1 2 3 4 5	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
I was able to easily locate necessary class materials.	5.0		2	5.0	0.0
Expectations for participation were clearly stated.	5.0		2	5.0	0.0
Instructions for graded assignments were clearly stated	5.0		2	5.0	0.0
An appropriate orientation to all technology required for the subject was provided.	5.0		1	5.0	0.0
I received feedback that improved my learning.	3.0		2	3.0	1.41

Please provide detail on any item for which you strongly disagree or strongly agree. Please be as specific as possible.

[Student 50915](#) - Our after class discussions were always helpful and enjoyable. Some brief written feedback on the illustrations each week would also be useful (though I don't think weekly grades are essential).

Rating Scale: 1=To No Extent, 2=To a Small Extent, 3=To a Moderate Extent, 4=To a Great Extent, N/A=Not Applicable (4 is best)

	AVG	1 2 3 4	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
Live (synchronous) lectures/class periods	4.0		2	4.0	0.0
Synchronous class discussions	4.0		1	4.0	0.0
Asynchronous learning activities (e.g., previously recorded presentation of course material, pre-class	3.0		1	3.0	0.0

[reading, answering pre-class questions, etc.\)](#)

Recitations	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Office hours	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Collaborative/Team Project-based work	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Labs	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Working on problem sets with others	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Completing written assignments	4.0	1	4.0	0.0
Presentation & performance-related activities	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Discussion forum (e.g., Piazza, Discord, Canvas, Stellar)	4.0	1	4.0	0.0

Were there other components that contributed to your learning in this subject?

[Student 50915](#) - Great to get to know everyone in ResEnv. Hope to work together on some projects in future :-)

[Show/Hide Comments](#)

[\(top of page\)](#)

Change report view: Ramsay, David Bradford ▼

MAS.836 Sensor Technologies for Interactive Environments

Survey Window: Spring 2019 End of Term | [View Current Catalog Entry](#) | [Print Report](#)

Report Includes Data for:

Students: For credit

Subjects: MAS.836 Sensor Technologies for Interactive Environments - Lecture L01

[\(filter data\)](#)

Eligible to Respond: Total # of

20

Respondents: 11

Response rate:

55%

Overall rating of subject: 4.6

out of 7

Download Set of Individual Student Responses: [PDF](#) [raw data](#)

Show/Hide Comments

INSTRUCTORS

Quality of Teaching				
1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)				
1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)				
NAME	Stimulated interest	Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	Helped me learn	Overall rating
Paradiso, Joseph A. , Lecturer (LEC)	4.4 (11)	6.6 (11)	3.5 (11)	3.7 (11)
Cherston, Juliana Mae , Teaching Assistant (LEC)	6.5 (4)	6.0 (4)	6.5 (4)	6.3 (3)
Jaffe, Caroline , Teaching Assistant (LEC)	6.2 (5)	5.6 (5)	6.2 (5)	6.3 (4)
Ramsay, David Bradford , Teaching Assistant (LEC)	6.7 (3)	7.0 (3)	7.0 (3)	7.0 (3)
Russell, Spencer Franklin , Teaching Assistant (LEC)	7.0 (3)	7.0 (3)	7.0 (3)	7.0 (2)
Chwalek, Patrick , Teaching Assistant (LEC)	6.0 (8)	6.0 (8)	5.8 (8)	5.7 (7)

Ramsay, David Bradford, Teaching Assistant in Lecture L01 - Overall rating: 7.0

Quality of Teaching											
Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)											
	AVG	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
Stimulated interest	6.7								3	7.0	0.58
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7.0								3	7.0	0.0
Helped me learn	7.0								3	7.0	0.0
						Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)					
	AVG	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
Overall rating	7.0								3	7.0	0.0

SUBJECT

SUBJECT

Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)

	AVG	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
Subject expectations were clearly defined	5.1								10	5.5	2.08
Subject's learning objectives were met	5.0								10	5.0	2.05
Assignments contributed to my learning	5.2								10	6.0	2.2
Grading thus far has been fair	4.9								9	5.0	1.62

Rating Scale: 1=Too Slow, 4=Just Right, 7=Too Fast, N/A=Not Applicable (4 is best)

	AVG	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	5.1								9	5.0	1.17

	AVG	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
Average hours you spent per week on this subject in the classroom	6.1	10	4.0	4.18
Average hours you spent per week on this subject outside of the classroom	8.4	10	7.0	4.97

Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent (7 is best)

	AVG	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
Overall rating of the subject	4.6								10	5.0	2.22

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

[Student 26978](#) - Lectures were quite hectic and hard to follow along. Although the example applications are interesting, the asides were too long and distracting and not always super relevant... A live demo of some examples might be cool too! I thought the labs and psets were well written and formulated to reinforce the material (that was never really taught formally in the first place). I was a bit confused on who this class is targeted for. I have quite a bit of EE background, and I sat through a lecture in which the first half seemed stupidly obvious (ohm's law and such) but it went on to wheatstone bridges which I was not very familiar with within an hour! Considering that I couldn't follow well, I couldn't imagine someone with less EE experience stood any chance. I think the breadth is too wide and should be narrowed down to focus on people with no EE background or at least some basic circuits understanding (and then not have to reteach that). I'm not sure if that's possible, but would really help with class consistency.

[Student 40747](#) - Lecture concepts jumped too quickly from way too simple to way too difficult with very little in between. Labs were helpful in learning the concepts, but would have been helpful to have more TAs consistently available to help (not just whoever happened to be in lab)

[Student 42024](#) - Though it's nice to have everything for this class on one day (lecture and recitation), it makes for an incredibly long day, in particular the lectures. I find it difficult to follow the entire lecture when it is nonstop for 2.5 hours.

[Student 48609](#) - no good coursenotes (the slides are a mess). I had to google a lot, and use information from other classes. why take the class at all then?

[Student 52046](#) - Excellent course for learning how sensors work and guiding you towards building a sensor project. I loved the class resources. Lectures seemed exhausting and perhaps some more hands-on focus on the sensors could have been done during lecture. Some labs were really hard and there were very few office hours available (sometimes just 1 hour a week). I would really increase the amount of office hours by at least 3.

[Student 52449](#) - The way the class is currently designed makes it very hard to follow and it requires so much time for someone new to electronics. There should be some flexibility with grading when it comes to submitting some late assignment specially when a student is really working hard on a pset/lab and prefers to hand it in late but with some learning gained. Learning a new topic requires some time and this should be taken into account when collecting assignment. Many times when I did not hand in my assignments on time, I was told that points will be deducted. The whole point of taking this class for me, is actually learning and I am not sure how deducting points when someone is working hard on a pset is helping in the learning.

[Show/Hide Comments](#)

[\(top of page\)](#)

Change report view: Ramsay, David Bradford ▼

MAS.836 Sensor Technologies for Interactive Environments

Survey Window: Spring 2015 End of Term | [View Current Catalog Entry](#) | [Print Report](#)

Report Includes Data for:

Students: For credit

Subjects: MAS.836 Sensor Technologies for Interactive Environments - Lecture L01

[\(filter data\)](#)

Eligible to Respond: Total # of

11

Respondents: 5

Response rate:

45%

Overall rating of subject: 6.0

out of 7

Download Set of Individual Student Responses: [PDF](#) [raw data](#)

Show/Hide Comments

INSTRUCTORS

Quality of Teaching		1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)			1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)	
NAME		Stimulated interest	Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	Helped me learn	Overall rating	
Paradiso, Joseph , Lecturer (LEC)		6.4 (5)	6.8 (5)	6.2 (5)	6.4 (5)	
Dementyev, Artem , Teaching Assistant (LEC)		6.0 (2)	6.5 (2)	6.5 (2)	6.5 (2)	
Ramsay, David Bradford , Teaching Assistant (LEC)		6.0 (5)	7.0 (5)	7.0 (5)	6.8 (5)	

Ramsay, David Bradford, Teaching Assistant in Lecture L01 - Overall rating: 6.8

Quality of Teaching	Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)											
	AVG	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV	
Stimulated interest	6.0								5	6.0	1.22	
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	7.0								5	7.0	0.0	
Helped me learn	7.0								5	7.0	0.0	

Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)												
		AVG	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
Overall rating		6.8								5	7.0	0.45

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

[Student 9287](#) - Best TA ever!

[Student 48919](#) - David organized recitations and made himself available for help. He knows the subject well and he is also very good at explaining the concepts. He has been extremely patient and helpful to answer my questions on the homework and labs.

SUBJECT

SUBJECT	Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)							RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
	AVG	1	2	3	4	5	6			
Subject expectations were clearly defined	5.8							4	6.5	1.89
Subject's learning objectives were met	6.0							4	6.0	0.82
Assignments contributed to my learning	6.5							4	6.5	0.58
Grading thus far has been fair	6.5							4	6.5	0.58

	Rating Scale: 1=Too Slow, 4=Just Right, 7=Too Fast, N/A=Not Applicable (4 is best)							RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
	AVG	1	2	3	4	5	6			
The pace of the class (content and assignments) was:	6.0							4	6.5	1.41

	AVG	RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
Average hours you spent per week on this subject in the classroom	4.5	4	4.0	1.91
Average hours you spent per week on this subject outside of the classroom	7.8	4	8.0	2.06

	Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent (7 is best)							RESPONSES	MEDIAN	STDEV
	AVG	1	2	3	4	5	6			
Overall rating of the subject	6.0							4	6.0	0.82

Comments on the subject (strengths, areas for improvement)

[Student 9287](#) - Excellent coverage of the field of sensor technologies, the breath of Prof. Paradiso's experience really shows! Some slides and concepts could be more clearly rendered, instead of scans of handwritten circuits and diagrams, but overall a great class!

[Student 48919](#) - Introduced a lot sensors and their principles in the lecture. It would be great if the labs can match the subject matters in the lecture and offer the chance to cover more applications of the sensors. The course was a little too technical for people without EE background.

[Student 50109](#) - I strongly feel this class should either have prerequisites or reduce the difficulty of the labs. It is impossible for someone without prior knowledge to complete the labs without help.

Show/Hide Comments

[\(top of page\)](#)