

OID/Evaluation of Instruction Program
CLASS SUMMARY FOR INTRO TO HIST LING

2013 WINTER
Form B

Instructor: KOROTKOVA, N. ID: 203932154
Department: LING
Course: INTRO TO HIST LING 110 ID: 253385201
Type: DIS 001A
Enrollment: 18

Processed: 15 forms... 83.3% response rate
04-18-2013 12:02:55

1. Year in School	2. UCLA GPA	3. Expected Grade	4. Requirement Fulfilled
# valid responses: 15	# valid responses: 14	# valid responses: 15	# valid responses: 15
Freshman: 0.00 %	Below 2.0: 0.00 %	A: 53.33 %	Major: 100.00 %
Sophomore: 6.67 %	2.0 - 2.49: 7.14 %	B: 33.33 %	Related Field: 0.00 %
Junior: 6.67 %	2.5 - 2.99: 21.43 %	C: 6.67 %	G.E.: 0.00 %
Senior: 86.67 %	3.0 - 3.49: 42.86 %	D: 0.00 %	None: 0.00 %
Graduate: 0.00 %	3.5 +: 28.57 %	F: 0.00 %	
Other: 0.00 %	Not Established 0.00 %	P: 0.00 %	
		NP: 0.00 %	
		?: 6.67 %	

Questions	Not Low				Medium				High		No				Std
	Appl	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Rsp	Rsp	Mean	Mdn	
5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	1	5	3	0	15	6.73	8.00	2.0
6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	0	0	1	1	0	2	2	5	2	2	0	15	6.40	7.00	2.0
7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	1	3	0	15	6.20	7.00	2.5
8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas.	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	5	3	0	15	6.93	8.00	1.9
9. Students felt welcome in seeking help.	0	0	2	0	1	2	2	3	3	2	0	15	6.20	7.00	2.2
10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	0	1	2	0	0	3	2	4	1	2	0	15	5.73	6.00	2.5
11. Value of the sections justified time and effort.	0	0	3	1	0	4	2	1	2	2	0	15	5.47	5.00	2.4
12. Your overall rating of the T.A.	0	1	1	0	0	4	2	3	2	2	0	15	6.00	6.00	2.3
13. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0.00	0.00	0.0
14. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0.00	0.00	0.0
15. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0.00	0.00	0.0
16. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0.00	0.00	0.0
17. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0.00	0.00	0.0
18. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	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	3	11	1	0	15
20. Workload/Pace Was	0	1	14	0	0	15
21. Integration of Section with Course was	0	1	9	5	0	15
22. Texts, Required Readings	1	2	9	3	0	15
23. Homework Assignments	1	2	7	5	0	15
24. Graded Materials, Examinations	2	0	6	7	0	15
25. Lecture Presentations	1	1	8	5	0	15
26. Class Discussions	0	4	7	4	0	15

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

COURSE ID NUMBER												YEAR		TERM
2	5	3	-	3	8	5	-	2	0	1				
0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	F	
1	1	1		1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1		
2	2	2		2	2	2		2	2	2	2	2	Sp	
3	3	3		3	3	3		3	3	3	3	3	Su	
4	4	4		4	4	4		4	4	4	4	4		
5	5	5		5	5	5		5	5	5	5	5		
6	6	6		6	6	6		6	6	6	6	6		
7	7	7		7	7	7		7	7	7	7	7		
8	8	8		8	8	8		8	8	8	8	8		
9	9	9		9	9	9		9	9	9	9	9		

INSTRUCTOR ID NUMBER									
2	0	3	9	3	2	1	5	4	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	
7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	
8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	

INSTRUCTOR NAME: KOROTKOVA, N.

YEAR: 2013 WINTER

COURSE: LING 0110

SECTION: 001A

ENROLLMENT: 18

WRITTEN COMMENTS

Instructor: Korotkova, N.
Instructor ID: 203932154
Department: Linguistics
Course Name: LING 110 DISC 1A
Course ID: 253385201
Enrollment: 18
Forms Processed: 15
Year and Quarter: Winter 2013

3) Natasha is nice and she is trying to help everyone in the class. I like this class.
6) I hope I could understand her hand-writing.
7) Her writing is pretty bad. She couldn't manage time. Section was not helpful. She has poor teaching skill.
8) Her intentions were well, but she really needs to work on expressing herself and explaining things clearly.
9) A god-send. The best TA ever. Statues should be erected of her in Ackerman. Future generations of bruins will sing songs of her strengths and teaching assistantship.
13) Weakness: unapproachable. Unfriendly vibe. Quiet voice Strength: knowledgeable. Very helpful. Excellent review sessions
14) The only issue during discussion was getting students to participate. It may work better to pick a certain person and call on them for an answer, rather than wait for someone to volunteer. Often, at least two people will have an answer, but are afraid to speak up.
15) I felt welcome in seeking help outside of class. However, Natasha was not very clear in her explanations and made more more confused in general.

OID/Evaluation of Instruction Program
CLASS SUMMARY FOR INTRO TO HIST LING

2013 WINTER
Form B

Instructor: KOROTKOVA, N. ID: 203932154
Department: LING
Course: INTRO TO HIST LING 110 ID: 253385202
Type: DIS 001B
Enrollment: 20

Processed: 15 forms... 75.0% response rate
04-18-2013 12:03:09

1. Year in School		2. UCLA GPA		3. Expected Grade		4. Requirement Fulfilled	
# valid responses: 15		# valid responses: 15		# valid responses: 15		# valid responses: 15	
Freshman:	0.00 %	Below 2.0:	0.00 %	A:	40.00 %	Major:	100.00 %
Sophomore:	0.00 %	2.0 - 2.49:	0.00 %	B:	26.67 %	Related Field:	0.00 %
Junior:	6.67 %	2.5 - 2.99:	6.67 %	C:	0.00 %	G.E.:	0.00 %
Senior:	93.33 %	3.0 - 3.49:	26.67 %	D:	0.00 %	None:	0.00 %
Graduate:	0.00 %	3.5 +:	66.67 %	F:	0.00 %		
Other:	0.00 %	Not Established	0.00 %	P:	0.00 %		
				NP:	0.00 %		
				?:	33.33 %		

Questions	Not Appl		Low		Medium					High		No Rsp	Rsp	Mean	Mdn	Std Dev
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	3	4	0	15	7.60	7.00	1.1	
6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	2	4	0	15	7.40	7.00	1.2	
7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	5	2	3	0	15	6.87	7.00	1.6	
8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas.	0	0	0	2	1	1	5	1	2	3	0	15	6.33	6.00	2.0	
9. Students felt welcome in seeking help.	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	2	3	0	15	6.87	7.00	1.5	
10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	0	0	1	1	1	4	2	2	1	3	0	15	6.00	6.00	2.2	
11. Value of the sections justified time and effort.	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	3	1	3	0	15	6.53	6.00	1.6	
12. Your overall rating of the T.A.	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	3	2	0	15	6.60	6.00	1.5	
13. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	14	1	6.00	6.00	0.0	
14. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0.00	0.00	0.0	
15. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0.00	0.00	0.0	
16. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0.00	0.00	0.0	
17. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0.00	0.00	0.0	
18. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	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	13	2	0	15
20. Workload/Pace Was	0	1	14	0	0	15
21. Integration of Section with Course was	0	0	11	4	0	15
22. Texts, Required Readings	0	0	13	2	0	15
23. Homework Assignments	1	0	12	2	0	15
24. Graded Materials, Examinations	1	0	13	1	0	15
25. Lecture Presentations	1	0	13	1	0	15
26. Class Discussions	0	2	11	2	0	15

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

COURSE ID NUMBER												YEAR		TERM
2	5	3	-	3	8	5	-	2	0	2				
0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	F	
1	1	1		1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1		
2	2	2		2	2	2		2	2	2	2	2	Sp	
3	3	3		3	3	3		3	3	3	3	3	Su	
4	4	4		4	4	4		4	4	4	4	4		
5	5	5		5	5	5		5	5	5	5	5		
6	6	6		6	6	6		6	6	6	6	6		
7	7	7		7	7	7		7	7	7	7	7		
8	8	8		8	8	8		8	8	8	8	8		
9	9	9		9	9	9		9	9	9	9	9		

INSTRUCTOR ID NUMBER											
2	0	3	9	3	2	1	5	4			
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2			
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3			
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4			
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5			
6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6			
7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7			
8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8			
9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9			

INSTRUCTOR NAME: KOROTKOVA, N.

YEAR: 2013 WINTER

COURSE: LING 0110

SECTION: 001B

ENROLLMENT: 20

WRITTEN COMMENTS

Instructor: Korotkova, N.
Instructor ID: 203932154
Department: Linguistics
Course Name: LING 110 DISC 1B
Course ID: 253385202
Enrollment: 20
Forms Processed: 15
Year and Quarter: Winter 2013

3) Very concerned and organized. I love you!

11) Her handwriting is a bit hard to read.

12) Thank you for answering my many questions!

13) Exercises done in class were very helpful for what we were learning in class.

15) Apparently, Natasha knows all details related to the course. She tries to open our eyes to wider perspective. If could have been much better if she knew how to communicate more actively and effectively