BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



9500 GILMAN DRIVE LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

## Student ASE Evaluation for Vineet Pandey Department of Computer Science and Engineering

CSE 151 - Intro to A.I. Stats Approach (Chaudhuri, Kamalika) Spring 2015

Number of Evaluations Submitted: 10 Number of Students Enrolled: 166

1. The Teaching Assistant was well organized and prepared for class.

3 (30.0%): Strongly Agree

0 (0.0%): Agree

2 (20.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree

2 (20.0%): Disagree

3 (30.0%): Strongly Disagree 0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

2. The Teaching Assistant consistently arrived at lecture, section/lab, office hours and exams on time.

5 (50.0%): Strongly Agree

2 (20.0%): Agree

1 (10.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree

0 (0.0%): Disagree

2 (20.0%): Strongly Disagree 0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

3. The Teaching Assistant presented course material clearly and answered questions accurately in class.

3 (30.0%): Strongly Agree

1 (10.0%): Agree

1 (10.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree

2 (20.0%): Disagree

3 (30.0%): Strongly Disagree 0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

4. The Teaching Assistant helped develop my thinking skills on the subject.

3 (30.0%): Strongly Agree

1 (10.0%): Agree

3 (30.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree

0 (0.0%): Disagree

3 (30.0%): Strongly Disagree 0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

5. Feedback from the Teaching Assistant on assignments, exams and/or papers was helpful and constructive.

3 (30.0%): Strongly Agree

0 (0.0%): Agree

3 (30.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree

1 (10.0%): Disagree

2 (20.0%): Strongly Disagree 1 (10.0%): Not Applicable

6. The Teaching Assistant's explanations were appropriate, being neither too complicated nor too simple.

3 (30.0%): Strongly Agree

1 (10.0%): Agree

0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree

3 (30.0%): Disagree

3 (30.0%): Strongly Disagree 0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

7. The Teaching Assistant answered questions clearly and effectively, helping students to make connections among the course readings, assignments, and lectures.

3 (30.0%): Strongly Agree

1 (10.0%): Agree

1 (10.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree

3 (30.0%): Disagree

2 (20.0%): Strongly Disagree 0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

8. The Teaching Assistant was genuinely interested in and enthusiastic about teaching.

5 (50.0%): Strongly Agree

1 (10.0%): Agree

0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree

1 (10.0%): Disagree

3 (30.0%): Strongly Disagree 0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

9. The Teaching Assistant was accessible to students outside of class (office hours, e-mail, etc.).

3 (30.0%): Strongly Agree

1 (10.0%): Agree

1 (10.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree

1 (10.0%): Disagree

1 (10.0%): Strongly Disagree 3 (30.0%): Not Applicable

10. The Teaching Assistant effectively connected the section/lab exercises with the material covered in lecture.

3 (30.0%): Strongly Agree

0 (0.0%): Agree

2 (20.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree

1 (10.0%): Disagree

4 (40.0%): Strongly Disagree 0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

11. In terms of communication skills, did the Teaching Assistant demonstrate any of the following? (check all that apply)

6 (60.0%): No issues Too quiet 0 (0.0%): Too loud 2 (20.0%): Too fast 0 (0.0%): Too slow

1 (10.0%): Poor grammar and/or English language skills

1 (10.0%): Used filler words such as "um"

0 (0.0%): Other (please describe)

12. I would recommend this Teaching Assistant to other students.

3 (33.3%): Strongly Agree

0 (0.0%): Agree

2 (22.2%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree

2 (22.2%): Disagree

2 (22.2%): Strongly Disagree 1: [No Response]

- 13. Please describe this person's greatest strengths as a Teaching Assistant.
- Enthusiasm.
- Teaches what is applicable to real life work.

- too smart
- 14. Please describe this person's greatest weaknesses as a Teaching Assistant.
- did not prepare much material for discussion and often reviewed general concept without necessarily making connections to the problem sets
- Doesn't pay enough attention to student needs. Could work on acknowledging when a student is thinking towards the correct answer, instead of dismissing the entire response just because it isn't 100% correct.
- Everything about him. He doesn't give enough feedback that could help us finish the HW. To make thing even worse, he would express everything verbally, and I have no idea how on earth someone with CS background can do that. It is impossible to follow along as he speaks, because he hardly writes anything. On piazza, if students try to discuss something, he would interrupt in between like a spy so that we don't share answers. His teaching style is not intellectually stimulating and he would make a terrible teacher in future:(
- too abstract

## 15. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation? *Please provide any additional constructive comments*

- Attended 2 of his discussion session and he wastes half of the discussion period talking about irrelevant things, whereas the other 3 Teaching Assistant(s) jump straight to the course material. Students usually leave 15 minutes into the discussion because it was unhelpful and a waste of time.
- Try to understand from undergrads' prospective not from a grad student's prospective
- Very enthusiastic and can tell he is knowledgeable, but does not consider how to wisely use the
  discussion time. Because no material is prepared beforehand, there is a tendency to talk too
  much about minor topics in overly great detail and to talk about topics that students do not
  believe to be relevant.
- You must be at his level to understand/learn from him

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, Computer Science and Engineering, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.