Instructor: KOROTKOVA, N.   ID: 203932154
Department: LING
Course: INTRO TO LINGUISTCS 20   ID: 253090205
Type: DIS 001E
Enrollment: 14

Processed: 8 forms... 57.1% response rate
01-13-2012 11:42:26

1. Year in School		2. UCLA GPA		3. Expected Grade		4. Requirement Fulfilled	
# valid responses:	8	# valid responses:	8	# valid responses:	8	# valid responses:	7
Freshman:	12.50 %	Below 2.0:	0.00 %	A:	50.00 %	Major:	85.71 %
Sophomore:	0.00 %	2.0 - 2.49:	0.00 %	B:	37.50 %	Related Field:	0.00 %
Junior:	87.50 %	2.5 - 2.99:	0.00 %	C:	0.00 %	G.E.:	0.00 %
Senior:	0.00 %	3.0 - 3.49:	25.00 %	D:	0.00 %	None:	14.29 %
Graduate:	0.00 %	3.5 +:	12.50 %	F:	0.00 %		
Other:	0.00 %	Not Established	62.50 %	P:	0.00 %		
				NP:	0.00 %		
				?:	12.50 %		

Questions	Not Appl	Low 1	2	3	Medium 4	5	6	7	8	High 9	No Rsp	Rsp	Mean	Mdn	Std Dev
5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	4	0	8	7.75	8.50	1.6
6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	0	8	6.63	7.00	2.1
7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	1	1	0	8	6.38	6.50	1.8
8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas.	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	1	2	0	8	6.38	6.00	2.1
9. Students felt welcome in seeking help.	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	0	8	6.88	7.50	2.2
10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	2	0	8	6.50	6.50	2.1
11. Value of the sections justified time and effort.	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	7	6.71	7.00	2.2
12. Your overall rating of the T.A.	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	1	2	1	7	6.86	7.00	2.2
13. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0.00	0.00	0.0
14. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0.00	0.00	0.0
15. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0.00	0.00	0.0
16. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0.00	0.00	0.0
17. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0.00	0.00	0.0
18. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	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	0	6	2	0	8
20. Workload/Pace Was	0	0	6	2	0	8
21. Integration of Section with Course was	0	1	5	2	0	8
22. Texts, Required Readings	1	0	6	1	0	8
23. Homework Assignments	1	1	5	1	0	8
24. Graded Materials, Examinations	1	0	6	1	0	8
25. Lecture Presentations	1	1	6	0	0	8
26. Class Discussions	0	1	7	0	0	8

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

COURSE ID NUMBER: 253-090-205

INSTRUCTOR ID NUMBER: 2039321 54

INSTRUCTOR NAME: KOROTKOVA, N.

YEAR: 2011 FALL

COURSE: LING   0020

SECTION: 001E

ENROLLMENT: 14

Highly knowledgable about the course material
Available for office hours
Great communication via e-mail, etc.

THANK YOU. Your assistance in improving teaching is appreciated.

· Natasha has a hard time getting students to talk, which is of course partly the students' doing. But even encouraging people to talk more would really help

NATASHA WAS VERY KNOWLEDGEABLE OF THE COURSE MATERIAL AND WAS ABLE TO UNDERSTAND OUR CONCERNS AND DOUBTS. HOWEVER, SHE SOMETIMES EXPLAINED MATERIAL TOO COMPLEXLY THAN EASILY BREAKING IT DOWN.

THANK YOU. Your assistance in improving teaching is appreciated.

Although she significantly improved throughout the quarter, Natasha did not make me feel very comfortable in her class or seeking help outside of class. It is clear that she is very intelligent but she was often rude when it came to class discussions. I was very disappointed to find myself losing points on assignments that were correct according to the answer key & professor. In seeking help outside of class, Natasha told me to talk to the professor or read the book rather than helping me herself. Oftentimes in class, although I knew the answer, I was intimidated to speak up because she was often quite rude.

However, as I mentioned she improved throughout the quarter and definitely put in extra effort to helping us for the final.

THANK YOU. Your assistance in improving teaching is appreciated.

Instructor: KOROTKOVA, N.   ID: 203932154
Department: LING
Course: INTRO TO LINGUISTCS 20   ID: 253090206
Type: DIS 001F
Enrollment: 17

Processed: 13 forms... 76.5% response rate
01-13-2012 11:42:34

1. Year in School		2. UCLA GPA		3. Expected Grade		4. Requirement Fulfilled	
# valid responses:	13	# valid responses:	13	# valid responses:	11	# valid responses:	11
Freshman:	0.00 %	Below 2.0:	0.00 %	A:	63.64 %	Major:	72.73 %
Sophomore:	7.69 %	2.0 - 2.49:	0.00 %	B:	18.18 %	Related Field:	0.00 %
Junior:	76.92 %	2.5 - 2.99:	0.00 %	C:	0.00 %	G.E.:	27.27 %
Senior:	15.38 %	3.0 - 3.49:	7.69 %	D:	0.00 %	None:	0.00 %
Graduate:	0.00 %	3.5 +:	23.08 %	F:	0.00 %		
Other:	0.00 %	Not Established	69.23 %	P:	0.00 %		
				NP:	0.00 %		
				?:	18.18 %		

Questions	Not Appl	Low 1	2	3	Medium 4	5	6	7	8	High 9	No Rsp	Rsp	Mean	Mdn	Std Dev
5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	4	5	0	13	7.69	8.00	1.6
6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4	0	13	7.54	8.00	1.7
7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	4	2	2	0	13	6.39	7.00	2.1
8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas.	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	3	3	0	13	6.92	7.00	2.4
9. Students felt welcome in seeking help.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	3	6	0	13	7.92	8.00	1.4
10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	0	1	1	0	2	2	1	4	0	2	0	13	5.62	6.00	2.4
11. Value of the sections justified time and effort.	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	2	5	2	0	13	6.62	8.00	2.4
12. Your overall rating of the T.A.	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	6	3	2	0	13	6.92	7.00	1.9
13. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0.00	0.00	0.0
14. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0.00	0.00	0.0
15. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0.00	0.00	0.0
16. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0.00	0.00	0.0
17. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0.00	0.00	0.0
18. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	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	0	8	4	1	12
20. Workload/Pace Was	0	0	11	1	1	12
21. Integration of Section with Course was	0	0	6	6	1	12
22. Texts, Required Readings	1	2	7	2	1	12
23. Homework Assignments	0	1	7	4	1	12
24. Graded Materials, Examinations	1	2	3	6	1	12
25. Lecture Presentations	0	3	6	3	1	12
26. Class Discussions	0	2	6	4	1	12

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

COURSE ID NUMBER			YEAR	TERM
2 5 3 – 0 9 0 – 2 0 6				

INSTRUCTOR ID NUMBER

2 0 3 9 3 2 1 5 4

INSTRUCTOR NAME:	KOROTKOVA, N.
YEAR:	2011 FALL
COURSE:	LING 0020
SECTION:	001F
ENROLLMENT:	17

Strengths:
- Natasha was very understanding that the course material was difficult
- I felt welcome asking questions and going to office hours.

Weaknesses:
- Sometimes it was hard to follow the ideas she was teaching but that might have just been because the ideas are hard to learn.

- More office hours would be nice

THANK YOU. Your assistance in improving teaching is appreciated.

Discussions were very helpful. Always helped review lecture material and with homework. I was glad for it!

Very Willing to help and friendly but often we were confused what she was asking or she had trouble understanding our 3 questions

THANK YOU. Your assistance in improving teaching is appreciated.

Natasha was very knowledgeable of the course material, and she helped me understand even the most difficult concepts. I enjoyed going to discussions every week.

THANK YOU. Your assistance in improving teaching is appreciated.

Some communication problems mainly due to accent/english language, but nothing major. ~~Objectives~~ Section lectures could have been more prepared.

Overall good T.A. and class :)

THANK YOU. Your assistance in improving teaching is appreciated.

The TA sometimes had problems communicating the questions she was asking, but she was always willing to rephrase the question, and she wanted us to understand

- I had trouble understanding her questions or what one was trying to explain sometimes but she was always willing to repeat
- I wish that more time was devoted to homework questions/making sure we understood the homework.