

201508-ECON300-0101-MTHDS ECON ANALYSIS - Prateik Dalmia - Teaching Assistant Report (TA-View) Fall 2015

University of Maryland Course Evaluation Fall 2015

Number of Students Enrolled: 23

Number of Evaluations Submitted: 13

Response Rate: 56.5%

Subject Details

DIVISION_SD BSOS
DEPARTMENT BSOS-Economics
INSTR_CT 1
TA_CT 1
TEACHING_ROLE TA

Report Comments

This report presents feedback received from students for the course **201508-ECON300-0101-MTHDS ECON ANALYSIS** and for the Teaching Assistant **Prateik Dalmia** in that course. Course means are provided as well as department, college, and college course-level means (e.g., all 200-level courses in a college). Means are calculated from all responses by all students in the unit (i.e., course section, department, college, course-level in a college) on that item and exclude NA/not applicable responses. A grade table is included on the next page.

Indication is provided below for the Large Lecture Group if there is one affiliated with this course section.

Semester: 201508

Course #: ECON300

Section #: 0101

Course Name: 201508-ECON300-0101-MTHDS ECON ANALYSIS

Large Lecture Group: 201508-ECON300-0101

Teaching Assistant: Prateik Dalmia

Creation Date Tue, Jan 19, 2016

Grade Distribution:

| Student Count | Grade A | Grade B | Grade C | Grade D | Grade F | Grade PS | Grade W |
|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 23 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |

Grade distribution is current as of January 4, 2016 and includes students receiving a W for the course. Some grades are not included (e.g., Cancel, Incomplete). Student Count reflects total enrollment as of September 27, 2015 and includes any students auditing the course.

Administrator University-wide Teaching Assistant Items

Results are for use by teaching assistants, faculty/instructors, and for administrative purposes. N/A responses have been excluded from the following calculations.

University of Maryland Teaching Assistant (TA) Prateik Dalmia Items

By Score

Scale is Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

| Question | Course | Department | College | Course Level |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--------|------------|---------|--------------|
| | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| The teaching assistant (TA) treated students with respect. | 3.75 | 3.43 | 3.24 | 2.97 |
| The teaching assistant (TA) was well-prepared for class. | 3.33 | 3.25 | 3.13 | 2.86 |
| Overall, this teaching assistant (TA) was an effective teacher. | 3.33 | 3.12 | 3.00 | 2.73 |

By Frequency

1. The teaching assistant (TA) treated students with respect.

| Options | Score | Count | Percentage |
|-------------------|-------|-------|------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Disagree | 1 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Neutral | 2 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Agree | 3 | 3 | 25.0% |
| Strongly Agree | 4 | 9 | 75.0% |

| Statistics | Value |
|--------------------|---------|
| Response Count | 12 |
| Mean | 3.75 |
| Standard Deviation | +/-0.45 |

2. The teaching assistant (TA) was well-prepared for class.

| Options | Score | Count | Percentage |
|-------------------|-------|-------|------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Disagree | 1 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Neutral | 2 | 2 | 16.7% |
| Agree | 3 | 4 | 33.3% |
| Strongly Agree | 4 | 6 | 50.0% |

| Statistics | Value |
|--------------------|---------|
| Response Count | 12 |
| Mean | 3.33 |
| Standard Deviation | +/-0.78 |

3. Overall, this teaching assistant (TA) was an effective teacher.

| Options | Score | Count | Percentage |
|-------------------|-------|-------|------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Disagree | 1 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Neutral | 2 | 1 | 8.3% |
| Agree | 3 | 6 | 50.0% |
| Strongly Agree | 4 | 5 | 41.7% |

| Statistics | Value |
|--------------------|---------|
| Response Count | 12 |
| Mean | 3.33 |
| Standard Deviation | +/-0.65 |

Additional TA Prateik Dalmia related comments (e.g., about the discussion/lab/studio section, TA's teaching style, etc.)

Comment

The discussion section was very useful. I thought the TA was specifically very good at keeping us engaged and helping us understand relevant concepts.

This TA was not my TA.

End of Report

