




V.E. MATEU MARTIN
Evaluation of Instruction Program Report
 181: LING 130 DIS 1A: LANGUAGE DEVELOPMNT
 No. of responses = 3
 Enrollment = 12
 Response Rate = 25%


Survey Results

1. Background Information:


1.1) Year in School:




1.2) UCLA GPA:



1.3) Expected Grade:



1.4) What requirements does this course fulfill?




2. To What Extent Do You Feel That:

2.1)	Teaching Assistant Knowledge – The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=3 av.=9 md=9 dev.=0
2.2)	Teaching Assistant Concern – The T. A. was concerned about student learning.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=3 av.=9 md=9 dev.=0
2.3)	Organization – Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=3 av.=9 md=9 dev.=0
2.4)	Scope – The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=3 av.=9 md=9 dev.=0
2.5)	Interaction – Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=2 av.=9 md=9 dev.=0 ab.=1
2.6)	Communication Skills – The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=3 av.=9 md=9 dev.=0
2.7)	Value – The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=3 av.=9 md=9 dev.=0
2.8)	Overall – What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=3 av.=9 md=9 dev.=0

3. Your View of Section Characteristics:


3.1)	Difficulty (relative to other courses)	Low		High	n=3 av.=2.33 md=2 dev.=0.58
3.2)	Workload/pace was	Too Slow		Too Much	n=3 av.=2 md=2 dev.=0
3.3)	Integration of section with course was	Poor		Excellent	n=3 av.=2.67 md=3 dev.=0.58
3.4)	Texts, required readings	Poor		Excellent	n=2 av.=2.5 md=2.5 dev.=0.71 ab.=1
3.5)	Homework assignments	Poor		Excellent	n=2 av.=2.5 md=2.5 dev.=0.71 ab.=1

3.6) Graded materials, examinations




n=2
 av.=2.5
 md=2.5
 dev.=0.71
 ab.=1

3.7) Lecture presentations



n=3
 av.=2.67
 md=3
 dev.=0.58

3.8) Class discussions



n=3
 av.=2.67
 md=3
 dev.=0.58

Profile

Subunit: LING
 Name of the instructor: V.E. MATEU MARTIN
 Name of the course: 181: LING 130 DIS 1A: LANGUAGE DEVELOPMNT
 (Name of the survey)

Values used in the profile line: Mean

2. To What Extent Do You Feel That:

2.1) Teaching Assistant Knowledge – The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	Very Low or Never									Very High or Always	n=3	av.=9.00
2.2) Teaching Assistant Concern – The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	Very Low or Never									Very High or Always	n=3	av.=9.00
2.3) Organization – Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	Very Low or Never									Very High or Always	n=3	av.=9.00
2.4) Scope – The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.	Very Low or Never									Very High or Always	n=3	av.=9.00
2.5) Interaction – Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.	Very Low or Never									Very High or Always	n=2	av.=9.00
2.6) Communication Skills – The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	Very Low or Never									Very High or Always	n=3	av.=9.00
2.7) Value – The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.	Very Low or Never									Very High or Always	n=3	av.=9.00
2.8) Overall – What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?	Very Low or Never									Very High or Always	n=3	av.=9.00

3. Your View of Section Characteristics:

3.1) Difficulty (relative to other courses)	Low									High	n=3	av.=2.33
3.2) Workload/pace was	Too Slow									Too Much	n=3	av.=2.00
3.3) Integration of section with course was	Poor									Excellent	n=3	av.=2.67
3.4) Texts, required readings	Poor									Excellent	n=2	av.=2.50
3.5) Homework assignments	Poor									Excellent	n=2	av.=2.50
3.6) Graded materials, examinations	Poor									Excellent	n=2	av.=2.50
3.7) Lecture presentations	Poor									Excellent	n=3	av.=2.67
3.8) Class discussions	Poor									Excellent	n=3	av.=2.67

Comments Report

4. Comments:

- ^{4.1)} Please identify what you perceive to be the real strengths and weaknesses of this teaching assistant and course.

The evaluation will not be displayed due to low response rate.