Instructor: KOROTKOVA, N.    ID: 203932154
Department: LING
Course: FIELD METHODS 160    ID: 253556201
Type: DIS 001A
Enrollment: 12

Processed: 10 forms... 83.3% response rate
04-02-2012 03:27:45

| 1. Year in School | | 2. UCLA GPA | | 3. Expected Grade | | 4. Requirement Fulfilled | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| # valid responses: | 10 | # valid responses: | 10 | # valid responses: | 10 | # valid responses: | 9 |
| Freshman: | 0.00 % | Below 2.0: | 0.00 % | A: | 40.00 % | Major: | 66.67 % |
| Sophomore: | 0.00 % | 2.0 - 2.49: | 0.00 % | B: | 30.00 % | Related Field: | 22.22 % |
| Junior: | 20.00 % | 2.5 - 2.99: | 0.00 % | C: | 0.00 % | G.E.: | 0.00 % |
| Senior: | 80.00 % | 3.0 - 3.49: | 50.00 % | D: | 0.00 % | None: | 11.11 % |
| Graduate: | 0.00 % | 3.5 +: | 50.00 % | F: | 0.00 % | | |
| Other: | 0.00 % | Not Established | 0.00 % | P: | 0.00 % | | |
| | | | | NP: | 0.00 % | | |
| | | | | ?: | 30.00 % | | |

| Questions | Not Appl | Low 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Medium 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | High 9 | No Rsp | Rsp | Mean | Mdn | Std Dev |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 7.10 | 8.00 | 2.2 |
| 6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 6.90 | 8.00 | 2.6 |
| 7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized. | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 6.00 | 2.3 |
| 8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 5.90 | 6.50 | 2.7 |
| 9. Students felt welcome in seeking help. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 6.60 | 7.50 | 2.5 |
| 10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 5.80 | 6.00 | 2.8 |
| 11. Value of the sections justified time and effort. | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 4.90 | 5.50 | 3.0 |
| 12. Your overall rating of the T.A. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 6.40 | 7.00 | 2.2 |
| 13. Nonstandard Question. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 |
| 14. Nonstandard Question. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 |
| 15. Nonstandard Question. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 |
| 16. Nonstandard Question. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 |
| 17. Nonstandard Question. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 |
| 18. Nonstandard Question. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 |

| Course Characteristics | Not Appl | Low | Medium | High | #No Resp | #Val Resp |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19. Difficulty (Relative to Other Courses) | 0 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 20. Workload/Pace Was | 0 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 10 |
| 21. Integration of Section with Course was | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 9 |
| 22. Texts, Required Readings | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 |
| 23. Homework Assignments | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 9 |
| 24. Graded Materials, Examinations | 4 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 9 |
| 25. Lecture Presentations | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 9 |
| 26. Class Discussions | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 9 |

# UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES
# EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION PROGRAM
# CLASS HEADER

| COURSE ID NUMBER | | | | | | | | | YEAR | | TERM |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 5 | 3 | – | 5 | 5 | 6 | – | 2 | 0 | 1 | |

**INSTRUCTOR ID NUMBER**

| 2 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

INSTRUCTOR NAME:    KOROTKOVA, N.

YEAR:    2012 WINTER

COURSE:    LING   0160

SECTION:    001A

ENROLLMENT:    12

Natasha is a good TA. Hilda Koopman is just super disorganized, so her TA need to coordinate the class material with the class objective, which Natasha ~~more or less fulfilled~~ more or less fulfilled. Natasha is a good TA, but Hilda needs someone who can explain her thoughts to the students.

THANK YOU. Your assistance in improving teaching is appreciated.

Natasha is really nice, but doesn't always seem to be on the same page as Prof Koopman or the rest of the class. She doesn't seem as organized as she could be & isn't as helpful in her advice as one would hope. However, she is great at getting back to us quickly (i.e. with feedback online) & was even available for office hours/appointments via Skype! Also, she is a sweet & caring person :)

THANK YOU. Your assistance in improving teaching is appreciated.

Teaching assistant was clearly knowledgeable about the material, & gave us clear instructions on her expectations. The organization of the class wasn't very clear, but she did her best to help us figure out what the professor wanted. I really appreciate her straightforwardness; it made it a lot easier to get things done!

THANK YOU. Your assistance in improving teaching is appreciated.

You're a great TA, but you need to work on your communication skills. You, as an educator, should be able to communicate with the students. You have to be as clear as possible.

THANK YOU. Your assistance in improving teaching is appreciated.

Natasha was very knowledgable and gave a lot of helpful feedback. She's very blunt & straightforward. The one problem I had was how disorganized the class was. I never knew what was due or when & I didn't get any grade feedback until like 8th week.

Natalia was a very honest, straightforward, TA. Worked hard to communicate our faults with us, in a good way. Only criticism is the strangeness of the course + my confusion about when + where stuff was due

I thought you were a great TA, appreciated your availability and critique.

THANK YOU. Your assistance in improving teaching is appreciated.

A lot of things were unclear in this class, which made me frustrated all the time.

THANK YOU. Your assistance in improving teaching is appreciated.