

Final Evaluation (CTEF Numeric) (Reader) for Nalisnick, Eric Thomas COMP-SCI 274A LEC A (34980), Winter Qtr 2017

Responses: 27/41 (65.85%)

A. Please comment on the following areas and be as specific as possible:

1. What are the Reader's teaching strengths?

- Eric wrote an entire homework assignment and provided framework code for students to complete their solutions. The assignment was well-constructed and interesting. I think he truly went above and beyond in doing this.
- Fair Evaluation
- good
- He is very patient and responsible.
- Responses and grading were prompt.
- Thorough understanding of the material
- Very helpful and knows everything he should about the course material !
- 20 blank answer(s).

2. How can this Reader improve as an instructional assistant?

- good
- He is good enough.
- More comments
- Some of the grading was just wrong, but the points taken off were minor and Smyth said in class that if we contested a grade then we were more likely to lose more points than to get back the lost ones which made it almost impossible to address the issue.
- There are occasional typos in homework assignments and note sets. Eric was always prompt in correcting and clarifying these, but perhaps some of them could have been caught during proofreading.
- 22 blank answer(s).

3. Any other comments about this course?

- good
- HW4 was interesting
- No
- One of the best courses I have taken
- 23 blank answer(s).

B. Please choose the appropriate rating:

If you have no opinion on the question asked or if it does not apply, please select "Not Applicable."

4. The course Reader shows enthusiasm for and is interested in the subject.

UCI EEE Evaluations

Final Evaluation (CTEF Numeric) (Reader) for Nalisnick, Eric Thomas COMPSCI 274A LEC A (34980), Winter Qtr 2017

18	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
5	8	Value: 8
1	7	Value: 7
1	6 (Good)	Value: 6
0	5	Value: 5
0	4	Value: 4
0	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
0	2	Value: 2
0	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
0	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
2	Not Applicable	No Value
8.60	Mean	
9.00	Median	
0.75	Std Dev	

5. The course Reader stimulates your interest in the subject.

17	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
6	8	Value: 8
2	7	Value: 7
0	6 (Good)	Value: 6
0	5	Value: 5
0	4	Value: 4
0	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
0	2	Value: 2
0	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
0	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
2	Not Applicable	No Value
8.60	Mean	
9.00	Median	
0.63	Std Dev	

6. The course Reader meets stated objectives of the course.

20	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
4	8	Value: 8
0	7	Value: 7
1	6 (Good)	Value: 6
0	5	Value: 5
0	4	Value: 4
0	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
0	2	Value: 2
0	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
0	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
1	Not Applicable	No Value
8.72	Mean	
9.00	Median	
0.66	Std Dev	

7. The course Reader is accessible and responsive.

UCI EEE Evaluations

Final Evaluation (CTEF Numeric) (Reader) for Nalisnick, Eric Thomas COMPSCI 274A LEC A (34980), Winter Qtr 2017

19	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
6	8	Value: 8
0	7	Value: 7
0	6 (Good)	Value: 6
1	5	Value: 5
0	4	Value: 4
0	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
0	2	Value: 2
0	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
0	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
1	Not Applicable	No Value
8.62	Mean	
9.00	Median	
0.84	Std Dev	

8. The course Reader creates an open and fair learning environment.

18	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
7	8	Value: 8
0	7	Value: 7
1	6 (Good)	Value: 6
0	5	Value: 5
0	4	Value: 4
0	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
0	2	Value: 2
0	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
0	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
1	Not Applicable	No Value
8.62	Mean	
9.00	Median	
0.68	Std Dev	

9. The course Reader encourages students to think in this course.

18	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
7	8	Value: 8
0	7	Value: 7
1	6 (Good)	Value: 6
0	5	Value: 5
0	4	Value: 4
0	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
0	2	Value: 2
0	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
0	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
1	Not Applicable	No Value
8.62	Mean	
9.00	Median	
0.68	Std Dev	

10. The course Reader's presentations and explanations of concepts were clear.

UCI EEE Evaluations

Final Evaluation (CTEF Numeric) (Reader) for Nalisnick, Eric Thomas COMPSCI 274A LEC A (34980), Winter Qtr 2017

17	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
3	8	Value: 8
3	7	Value: 7
0	6 (Good)	Value: 6
0	5	Value: 5
0	4	Value: 4
0	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
0	2	Value: 2
0	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
0	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
4	Not Applicable	No Value
8.61	Mean	
9.00	Median	
0.71	Std Dev	

11. What overall evaluation would you give this Reader?

20	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
5	8	Value: 8
1	7	Value: 7
1	6 (Good)	Value: 6
0	5	Value: 5
0	4	Value: 4
0	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
0	2	Value: 2
0	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
0	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
0	Not Applicable	No Value
8.63	Mean	
9.00	Median	
0.73	Std Dev	

Final Evaluation (CTEF Numeric) (TA) for Nalisnick, Eric Thomas COMPSCI 175 DIS 1 (34331), Winter Qtr 2018

Responses: 11/57 (19.3%)

A. Please comment on the following areas and be as specific as possible:

1. What are the Teaching Assistant's teaching strengths?

- Dude knows way too much
- Helpful during the discussion sessions that he held at the beginning of the quarter
- His Jupyter demos were very helpful in giving us a starting point for our projects.
- Nice person.
- Really really helpful at all stages of the course, always there to help out with questions I had. The discussion Eric gave were really interesting at the time they were given, and really helpful later in the course as a reference for getting comfortable with machine learning libraries. Eric also seemed really knowledgeable about all the topics in the course.
- The TA is very knowledgeable in AI and ML, and he is easy to talk to one-on-one.
- very smart
- 4 blank answer(s).

2. How can this TA improve as a teacher?

- Could talk about the code more and clearer.
- Go to cambridge
- have more discussions
- The TA could be more enthusiastic during discussions. For an undergraduate class, he dives too deep into the mathematical details of certain machine learning algorithms, as well as deep learning, making it very difficult to understand for the typical student. When he goes deep into the details, it doesn't even help for the actual projects being done, so that makes me less inclined to go to discussions. He could make his notebooks a lot more concise than the way they are now, as they did not help me too much with my actual project. Overall, he goes too deep into the details of certain concepts and barely scratches the surface of how to practically implement those concepts in code.
- 7 blank answer(s).

3. Any other comments about this course?

- Good course
- great class, i liked how we were given a lot of time to put effort in the project
- None
- 8 blank answer(s).

B. Please choose the appropriate rating:

If you have no opinion on the question asked or if it does not apply, please select "Not Applicable."

4. The course TA shows enthusiasm for and is interested in the subject.

UCI EEE Evaluations

Final Evaluation (CTEF Numeric) (TA) for Nalisnick, Eric Thomas COMPSCI 175 DIS 1 (34331), Winter Qtr 2018

4	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
3	8	Value: 8
1	7	Value: 7
1	6 (Good)	Value: 6
0	5	Value: 5
0	4	Value: 4
0	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
0	2	Value: 2
0	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
0	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
0	Not Applicable	No Value
8.11	Mean	
8.00	Median	
0.99	Std Dev	

5. The course TA stimulates your interest in the subject.

4	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
3	8	Value: 8
1	7	Value: 7
0	6 (Good)	Value: 6
0	5	Value: 5
0	4	Value: 4
1	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
0	2	Value: 2
0	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
0	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
0	Not Applicable	No Value
7.78	Mean	
8.00	Median	
1.81	Std Dev	

6. The course TA meets stated objectives of the course.

4	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
3	8	Value: 8
1	7	Value: 7
1	6 (Good)	Value: 6
0	5	Value: 5
0	4	Value: 4
0	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
0	2	Value: 2
0	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
0	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
0	Not Applicable	No Value
8.11	Mean	
8.00	Median	
0.99	Std Dev	

7. The course TA is accessible and responsive.

UCI EEE Evaluations

Final Evaluation (CTEF Numeric) (TA) for Nalisnick, Eric Thomas COMPSCI 175 DIS 1 (34331), Winter Qtr 2018

5	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
1	8	Value: 8
1	7	Value: 7
2	6 (Good)	Value: 6
0	5	Value: 5
0	4	Value: 4
0	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
0	2	Value: 2
0	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
0	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
0	Not Applicable	No Value
8.00	Mean	
9.00	Median	
1.25	Std Dev	

8. The course TA creates an open and fair learning environment.

4	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
2	8	Value: 8
2	7	Value: 7
0	6 (Good)	Value: 6
1	5	Value: 5
0	4	Value: 4
0	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
0	2	Value: 2
0	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
0	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
0	Not Applicable	No Value
7.89	Mean	
8.00	Median	
1.29	Std Dev	

9. The course TA encourages students to think in this course.

4	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
2	8	Value: 8
2	7	Value: 7
0	6 (Good)	Value: 6
1	5	Value: 5
0	4	Value: 4
0	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
0	2	Value: 2
0	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
0	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
0	Not Applicable	No Value
7.89	Mean	
8.00	Median	
1.29	Std Dev	

10. The course TA's presentations and explanations of concepts were clear.

UCI EEE Evaluations

Final Evaluation (CTEF Numeric) (TA) for Nalisnick, Eric Thomas COMPSCI 175 DIS 1 (34331), Winter Qtr 2018

4	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
1	8	Value: 8
3	7	Value: 7
0	6 (Good)	Value: 6
0	5	Value: 5
1	4	Value: 4
0	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
0	2	Value: 2
0	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
0	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
0	Not Applicable	No Value
7.67	Mean	
8.00	Median	
1.56	Std Dev	

11. Assignments and exams covered important aspects of the course.

3	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
2	8	Value: 8
1	7	Value: 7
1	6 (Good)	Value: 6
0	5	Value: 5
0	4	Value: 4
0	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
0	2	Value: 2
0	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
0	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
2	Not Applicable	No Value
8.00	Mean	
8.00	Median	
1.07	Std Dev	

12. What overall evaluation would you give this teaching assistant?

4	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
3	8	Value: 8
1	7	Value: 7
0	6 (Good)	Value: 6
0	5	Value: 5
1	4	Value: 4
0	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
0	2	Value: 2
0	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
0	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
0	Not Applicable	No Value
7.89	Mean	
8.00	Median	
1.52	Std Dev	

13. What overall evaluation would you give this course?

UCI EEE Evaluations

Final Evaluation (CTEF Numeric) (TA) for Nalisnick, Eric Thomas COMPSCI 175 DIS 1 (34331), Winter Qtr 2018

5	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
0	8	Value: 8
2	7	Value: 7
1	6 (Good)	Value: 6
1	5	Value: 5
0	4	Value: 4
0	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
0	2	Value: 2
0	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
0	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
0	Not Applicable	No Value
7.78	Mean	
9.00	Median	
1.47	Std Dev	

C. Please answer:

14. Based on completed assignments thus far, what is your current course grade or approximate standing?

6	A	Value: 4
2	B	Value: 3
0	C	Value: 2
0	D	Value: 1
0	F	Value: 0
1	NA	No Value
3.75	Mean	
4.00	Median	
0.43	Std Dev	

15. How much academic dishonesty seemed to occur in this course? If applicable, please describe the type of academic dishonesty that occurred (not the particular students involved).

1.

0	A lot
0	Some
0	A little
9	None I could discern
2. Examples:
 - 11 blank answer(s).

16. How helpful were the textbooks and/or readings to your overall learning experience?

- | | |
|----------|------------|
| 2 | Very |
| 1 | Adequately |
| 3 | Somewhat |
| 3 | Not at all |

17. How challenging was this course?

- | | |
|----------|------------|
| 1 | Very |
| 5 | Adequately |
| 2 | Somewhat |
| 1 | Not at all |