

Political Science Departmental Evaluations Spring 2013

Wallender 104605806

Teaching Assistants

The TAs discussion and/or presentations were understandable and clear

Response (n = 13)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Neutral	0	0.0%	0.0%
Agree	5	38.5%	38.5%
Strongly Agree	8	61.5%	100.0%
Median 5.00	Mean 4.62	Std. Dev. 0.5064	

The TA appeared well-prepared for class.

Response (n = 13)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Neutral	1	7.7%	7.7%
Agree	5	38.5%	46.2%
Strongly Agree	7	53.8%	100.0%
Median 5.00	Mean 4.46	Std. Dev. 0.6602	

The TA graded fairly.

Response (n = 13)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	1	7.7%	7.7%
Neutral	3	23.1%	30.8%
Agree	4	30.8%	61.5%
Strongly Agree	5	38.5%	100.0%
Median 4.00	Mean 4.00	Std. Dev. 1.0000	

The TA provided individual help when asked.

Response (n = 13)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Neutral	3	23.1%	23.1%
Agree	5	38.5%	61.5%
Strongly Agree	5	38.5%	100.0%
Median 4.00	Mean 4.15	Std. Dev. 0.8006	

I learned a lot in this discussion section/lab.

Response (n = 13)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	3	23.1%	23.1%
Neutral	1	7.7%	30.8%
Agree	3	23.1%	53.8%
Strongly Agree	6	46.2%	100.0%
Median 4.00	Mean 3.92	Std. Dev. 1.2557	

My overall rating of the TA is

Response (n = 11)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Ineffective	0	0.0%	0.0%
Below average	0	0.0%	0.0%
Above average	4	36.4%	36.4%
Highly average	3	27.3%	63.6%
Effective	4	36.4%	100.0%
Median 4.00	Mean 4.00	Std. Dev. 0.8944	

Political Science Departmental Evaluations Spring 2013

Wallender 104603806

Teaching Assistants

The TAs discussion and/or presentations were understandable and clear

Response (n = 8)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	1	12.5%	12.5%
Disagree	0	0.0%	12.5%
Neutral	0	0.0%	12.5%
Agree	0	0.0%	12.5%
Strongly Agree	7	87.5%	100.0%
Median 5.00	Mean 4.50	Std. Dev. 1.4142	

The TA appeared well-prepared for class.

Response (n = 8)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	1	12.5%	12.5%
Disagree	0	0.0%	12.5%
Neutral	0	0.0%	12.5%
Agree	1	12.5%	25.0%
Strongly Agree	6	75.0%	100.0%
Median 5.00	Mean 4.38	Std. Dev. 1.4079	

The TA graded fairly.

Response (n = 8)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	1	12.5%	12.5%
Disagree	1	12.5%	25.0%
Neutral	1	12.5%	37.5%
Agree	1	12.5%	50.0%
Strongly Agree	4	50.0%	100.0%
Median 4.50	Mean 3.75	Std. Dev. 1.5811	

The TA provided individual help when asked.

Response (n = 8)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	1	12.5%	12.5%
Disagree	0	0.0%	12.5%
Neutral	2	25.0%	37.5%
Agree	2	25.0%	62.5%
Strongly Agree	3	37.5%	100.0%
Median 4.00	Mean 3.75	Std. Dev. 1.3887	

I learned a lot in this discussion section/lab.

Response (n = 8)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	1	12.5%	12.5%
Disagree	1	12.5%	25.0%
Neutral	0	0.0%	25.0%
Agree	2	25.0%	50.0%
Strongly Agree	4	50.0%	100.0%
Median 4.50	Mean 3.88	Std. Dev. 1.5526	

My overall rating of the TA is

Response (n = 8)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Ineffective	0	0.0%	0.0%
Below average	0	0.0%	0.0%
Above average	0	0.0%	0.0%
Highly average	1	12.5%	12.5%
Effective	7	87.5%	100.0%
Median 5.00	Mean 4.88	Std. Dev. 0.3536	

Political Science Departmental Evaluations Spring 2013

Wallender 104606806

Teaching Assistants

The TAs discussion and/or presentations were understandable and clear

Response (n = 8)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	1	12.5%	12.5%
Disagree	0	0.0%	12.5%
Neutral	0	0.0%	12.5%
Agree	1	12.5%	25.0%
Strongly Agree	6	75.0%	100.0%
Median 5.00	Mean 4.38	Std. Dev. 1.4079	

The TA appeared well-prepared for class.

Response (n = 8)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	1	12.5%	12.5%
Disagree	0	0.0%	12.5%
Neutral	0	0.0%	12.5%
Agree	1	12.5%	25.0%
Strongly Agree	6	75.0%	100.0%
Median 5.00	Mean 4.38	Std. Dev. 1.4079	

The TA graded fairly.

Response (n = 8)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	1	12.5%	12.5%
Disagree	0	0.0%	12.5%
Neutral	2	25.0%	37.5%
Agree	2	25.0%	62.5%
Strongly Agree	3	37.5%	100.0%
Median 4.00	Mean 3.75	Std. Dev. 1.3887	

The TA provided individual help when asked.

Response (n = 8)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	1	12.5%	12.5%
Disagree	0	0.0%	12.5%
Neutral	2	25.0%	37.5%
Agree	3	37.5%	75.0%
Strongly Agree	2	25.0%	100.0%
Median 4.00	Mean 3.63	Std. Dev. 1.3025	

I learned a lot in this discussion section/lab.

Response (n = 8)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	1	12.5%	12.5%
Disagree	0	0.0%	12.5%
Neutral	1	12.5%	25.0%
Agree	4	50.0%	75.0%
Strongly Agree	2	25.0%	100.0%
Median 4.00	Mean 3.75	Std. Dev. 1.2818	

My overall rating of the TA is

Response (n = 8)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Ineffective	0	0.0%	0.0%
Below average	0	0.0%	0.0%
Above average	0	0.0%	0.0%
Highly average	3	37.5%	37.5%
Effective	5	62.5%	100.0%
Median 5.00	Mean 4.63	Std. Dev. 0.5176	

Political Science Departmental Evaluations Spring 2013

Wallender 104604806

Teaching Assistants

The TAs discussion and/or presentations were understandable and clear

Response (n = 14)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	3	21.4%	21.4%
Disagree	0	0.0%	21.4%
Neutral	0	0.0%	21.4%
Agree	0	0.0%	21.4%
Strongly Agree	11	78.6%	100.0%
Median 5.00	Mean 4.14	Std. Dev. 1.7033	

The TA appeared well-prepared for class.

Response (n = 14)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	3	21.4%	21.4%
Disagree	0	0.0%	21.4%
Neutral	0	0.0%	21.4%
Agree	0	0.0%	21.4%
Strongly Agree	11	78.6%	100.0%
Median 5.00	Mean 4.14	Std. Dev. 1.7033	

The TA graded fairly.

Response (n = 14)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	1	7.1%	7.1%
Disagree	0	0.0%	7.1%
Neutral	3	21.4%	28.6%
Agree	2	14.3%	42.9%
Strongly Agree	8	57.1%	100.0%
Median 5.00	Mean 4.14	Std. Dev. 1.2315	

The TA provided individual help when asked.

Response (n = 13)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	2	15.4%	15.4%
Disagree	0	0.0%	15.4%
Neutral	1	7.7%	23.1%
Agree	0	0.0%	23.1%
Strongly Agree	10	76.9%	100.0%
Median 5.00	Mean 4.23	Std. Dev. 1.5359	

I learned a lot in this discussion section/lab.

Response (n = 14)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	2	14.3%	14.3%
Disagree	0	0.0%	14.3%
Neutral	2	14.3%	28.6%
Agree	1	7.1%	35.7%
Strongly Agree	9	64.3%	100.0%
Median 5.00	Mean 4.07	Std. Dev. 1.4917	

Political Science Departmental Evaluations Fall 2012 Teaching Assistants

Wallender 104609

The TAs discussion and/or presentations were understandable and clear

Response (n = 16)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	1	6.3%	6.3%
Disagree	0	0.0%	6.3%
Neutral	0	0.0%	6.3%
Agree	4	25.0%	31.3%
Strongly Agree	11	68.8%	100.0%
Median 5.00	Mean 4.50	Std. Dev. 1.0328	

The TA appeared well-prepared for class.

Response (n = 16)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	1	6.3%	6.3%
Disagree	0	0.0%	6.3%
Neutral	1	6.3%	12.5%
Agree	3	18.8%	31.3%
Strongly Agree	11	68.8%	100.0%
Median 5.00	Mean 4.44	Std. Dev. 1.0935	

The TA graded fairly.

Response (n = 16)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	3	18.8%	18.8%
Neutral	2	12.5%	31.3%
Agree	4	25.0%	56.3%
Strongly Agree	7	43.8%	100.0%
Median 4.00	Mean 3.94	Std. Dev. 1.1814	

The TA provided individual help when asked.

Response (n = 16)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	1	6.3%	6.3%
Disagree	0	0.0%	6.3%
Neutral	3	18.8%	25.0%
Agree	4	25.0%	50.0%
Strongly Agree	8	50.0%	100.0%
Median 4.50	Mean 4.13	Std. Dev. 1.1475	

I learned a lot in this discussion section/lab.

Response (n = 16)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	2	12.5%	12.5%
Neutral	2	12.5%	25.0%
Agree	4	25.0%	50.0%
Strongly Agree	8	50.0%	100.0%
Median 4.50	Mean 4.13	Std. Dev. 1.0878	

My overall rating of the TA is

Response (n = 16)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Ineffective	1	6.3%	6.3%
Below average	0	0.0%	6.3%
Above average	2	12.5%	18.8%
Very average	4	25.0%	43.8%
Effective	9	56.3%	100.0%
Median 5.00	Mean 4.25	Std. Dev. 1.1255	

Political Science Departmental Evaluations Fall 2012 Teaching Assistants

Wallender 104601

The TAs discussion and/or presentations were understandable and clear

Response (n = 9)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	1	11.1%	11.1%
Disagree	0	0.0%	11.1%
Neutral	0	0.0%	11.1%
Agree	5	55.6%	66.7%
Strongly Agree	3	33.3%	100.0%
Median 4.00	Mean 4.00	Std. Dev. 1.2247	

The TA appeared well-prepared for class.

Response (n = 9)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	1	11.1%	11.1%
Disagree	0	0.0%	11.1%
Neutral	0	0.0%	11.1%
Agree	4	44.4%	55.6%
Strongly Agree	4	44.4%	100.0%
Median 4.00	Mean 4.11	Std. Dev. 1.2693	

The TA graded fairly.

Response (n = 9)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	1	11.1%	11.1%
Disagree	1	11.1%	22.2%
Neutral	2	22.2%	44.4%
Agree	3	33.3%	77.8%
Strongly Agree	2	22.2%	100.0%
Median 4.00	Mean 3.44	Std. Dev. 1.3333	

The TA provided individual help when asked.

Response (n = 9)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	1	11.1%	11.1%
Disagree	0	0.0%	11.1%
Neutral	0	0.0%	11.1%
Agree	4	44.4%	55.6%
Strongly Agree	4	44.4%	100.0%
Median 4.00	Mean 4.11	Std. Dev. 1.2693	

I learned a lot in this discussion section/lab.

Response (n = 9)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	1	11.1%	11.1%
Disagree	0	0.0%	11.1%
Neutral	3	33.3%	44.4%
Agree	2	22.2%	66.7%
Strongly Agree	3	33.3%	100.0%
Median 4.00	Mean 3.67	Std. Dev. 1.3229	

My overall rating of the TA is

Response (n = 9)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Ineffective	1	11.1%	11.1%
Below average	0	0.0%	11.1%
Above average	3	33.3%	44.4%
Highly average	0	0.0%	44.4%
Effective	5	55.6%	100.0%
Median 5.00	Mean 3.89	Std. Dev. 1.4530	

Political Science Departmental Evaluations Fall 2012 Teaching Assistants

Wallender 104603

The TAs discussion and/or presentations were understandable and clear

Response (n = 17)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Neutral	0	0.0%	0.0%
Agree	4	23.5%	23.5%
Strongly Agree	13	76.5%	100.0%
Median 5.00	Mean 4.76	Std. Dev. 0.4373	

The TA appeared well-prepared for class.

Response (n = 17)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Neutral	0	0.0%	0.0%
Agree	4	23.5%	23.5%
Strongly Agree	13	76.5%	100.0%
Median 5.00	Mean 4.76	Std. Dev. 0.4373	

The TA graded fairly.

Response (n = 17)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Neutral	1	5.9%	5.9%
Agree	5	29.4%	35.3%
Strongly Agree	11	64.7%	100.0%
Median 5.00	Mean 4.59	Std. Dev. 0.6184	

The TA provided individual help when asked.

Response (n = 17)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Neutral	3	17.6%	17.6%
Agree	7	41.2%	58.8%
Strongly Agree	7	41.2%	100.0%
Median 4.00	Mean 4.24	Std. Dev. 0.7525	

I learned a lot in this discussion section/lab.

Response (n = 17)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Strongly disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%	0.0%
Neutral	2	11.8%	11.8%
Agree	7	41.2%	52.9%
Strongly Agree	8	47.1%	100.0%
Median 4.00	Mean 4.35	Std. Dev. 0.7019	

My overall rating of the TA is

Response (n = 17)	Frequency	Percent	Cumulation
Ineffective	0	0.0%	0.0%
Below average	0	0.0%	0.0%
Above average	1	5.9%	5.9%
Highly average	6	35.3%	41.2%
Effective	10	58.8%	100.0%
Median 5.00	Mean 4.53	Std. Dev. 0.6243	

Zachary Wallander

Teaching evaluations from Introduction to American Government and Politics (Spring 2013) leading discussion sections.

Student Open-Ended Responses:

Comments on the strong points of the Teaching Assistant's performance as a teacher, if any.

"Got class involved. Did a very good job."

"Fun, got to the point."

"He was very clear and was helpful when I had questions."

"I really liked his teaching style. Very helpful and nice. Knew all info. necessary to teach those who didn't know."

"He was well organized and prepared every class. Knew what he was talking about."

"Very prepared and professional. Had a good sense of humor and made discussion section fun. Appeared to genuinely care about the weekly topics discussed."

"Always well prepared, PowerPoints were clear and easy to understand, did well further explaining topics that were discussed in lecture."

"Zach was willing to answer questions to the best of his ability and always came prepared to teach. I feel as though he did an excellent job of explaining concepts more in depth from what we learned in lecture. He was also very fair with his grading system."

"He seemed well informed."

"He did a good job of going over the points in lecture that were not clear. His sense of humor is very enjoyable and livens up a class like polisci, so it makes things a bit more bearable. Of course, he seems very confident about knowledge of subject material and does a thorough job in answering questions and comments."

"Listened and gave good answers."

"He did everything real well, he was great! Really knew his stuff and was very nice!"

"He knew what he was talking about and made it understandable for me to comprehend."

“Zach was very patient with our lack of early-morning participation. He explained things clearly and gave room for discussion.”

“Definitely knowledgeable on the subject. Instead of cut-dry lecture, it was an enjoyable discussion.”

“Very organized for class and fit to teach. Cool teacher.”

“Good at keeping the class motivated. Funny but serious.”

“Always has a good attitude, and is a very effective teacher.”

“Ability to make things clear...to see both sides of issues.”

“Knowledgeable about the topic and presented it in an interesting manner.”

“Very knowledgeable and easy to understand (made discussion worthwhile!).”

“They came prepared with a lesson that helped clear things up from lecture. Gave info. that helped me prepare for the exams.”

“He was always well prepared and understood what he was talking about. I would recommend him to other students. He always asked if we had any questions. He explained the information well and involved the students.”

“Always prepared. Good sense of humor. Nice.”

“Knew what he was talking about. Kept it interesting. Laid back!”

“Zach was knowledgeable, helpful, and clearly devoted to helping us as students.”

“I think that he helped us learn and kept us interested which is important.”

“Brought out points from the lessons that would help us on the exam. Understood the subject he was teaching.”

“Easy to understand. Made class interesting.”

“Well organized, tried to get us involved in discussion as much as possible. Always came prepared.”

“Very prepared. Communicated the info. clearly so everyone could understand.”

“I thought he was great, probably one of the best TAs I have had so far.”

“Good making discussion even easier to understand.”

“He made coming to class enjoyable and made it a fun learning environment.”

Comments on the weak points of the Teaching Assistant’s performance as a teacher, if any.

“Wanted to many sources in paper.”

“Didn’t agree with his grading technique.”

“None.”

“Sometimes his writing was hard to read.”

“Sometimes discussions felt redundant but still informative.”

“I had no problems with his teaching.”

“I did not see any weak points during the semester.”

“Overall it was good, no weak points.”