Instructor Edward Shear

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA - DAVIS

Summer Session 1 2016 PHI 128 (001) 53688

Student Evaluation of Teaching



| Enrollment 28 % responding 100 | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|-----|-----|----|
| | 5 % | 4 % | 3 % | 2 % | 1 % | \bar{x} | SD | М | N |
| Please indicate the overall educational value of the course. (excellent I very good I satisfactory I fair I poor) | 15 54% | 10 36% | 0 0% | 3 11% | 0 0% | 4.3 | 0.9 | 5.0 | 28 |
| Overall Quality of the Course | 14 50% | 10 36% | 1 4% | 2 7% | 1 4% | 4.2 | 1.0 | 4.5 | 28 |
| Overall Quality of the Discussion | 17 61% | 4 14% | 5 18% | 1 4% | 1 4% | 4.3 | 1.1 | 5.0 | 28 |
| Please indicate the overall teaching effectiveness of the instructor. (excellent I very good I satisfactory I fair I poor) | 12 43% | 12 43% | 1 4% | 2 7% | 1 4% | 4.1 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 28 |
| Instructor's Mastery of the Subject Matter | 21 75% | 7 25% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.8 | 0.4 | 5.0 | 28 |
| Instructor's Accessibility and Willingness to Help Students | 24 86% | 3 11% | 1 4% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.8 | 0.5 | 5.0 | 28 |
| Instructor's Clarity | 11 39% | 6 21% | 8 29% | 0 0% | 3 11% | 3.8 | 1.3 | 4.0 | 28 |
| Instructor's Ability to Stimulate Interest in Subject | 14 50% | 7 25% | 3 11% | 1 4% | 3 11% | 4.0 | 1.3 | 4.5 | 28 |

Comments about Instructor-Feedback is HIGHLY Appreciated!

some parts of notes could include more than one example to show similar situations

By far one of the best professors I've had in the philosophy department. He's genuinely very sweet and passionate. I think a lot of professors can learn a thing or two from him and his humbleness:)

More notes and examples and definition

Ted is a great person and he really cares about his students and the material, which makes a meaningful difference in a student's education. He was always available to students with questions both in office hours and after class. I wished more professors embodied those important qualities. He always came to class prepared and on time, and made learning difficult material possible for all. His class is one of my most favorite classes ever taken at UCD.

Great professor, knows his stuff.

He knows the end goal and what he wants us to know, but sometimes it gets cluttered in his explanation.

Keeping the discussion a bit more narrow will help a new student follow the train of thought.

I really believe that Professor Shear should be a staple in the Philosophy department here at UC Davis!

He is amazing and makes a topic often people misunderstand very fun, and clear. He gives great examples and is open to students asking questions when unclear. The flow of the class and how transition in topics related were very well presented. Great course and amazing professor. Going to miss this class very much.

Ted gives many scenarios that help clarify the difficult concepts that we have to grasp.

Instructor really engages his students in learning the material during lecture. Although this may be detrimental for those who do no attend lecture, it is also an added benefit and incentive to attended it. He makes the class material very intriguing and intellectually stimulating.

I feel like the class needs a little more structure. The class notes were all over the place, and the online notes were not very helpful. The wording on the midterms was VERY confusing, especially for students who's first language is not English. Also I found it unfair to have a midterm & paper due around the same time. Some students are taking more than 1 or 2 summer courses, and it was really difficult getting all that work done during a short amount of time.

I liked it!

Made the course fun.

The material was confusing for those students who were not Philosophy majors, but Ted attempted to work with those students to help them to understand.

Ted has mastered the subject of rationality and it shows in lecture. Sometimes his explanations can be a bit confusing but he is always willing to clarify.

Great course and great professor. Professor Shear has an enthusiasim on teaching and the subject of the course. However, what he was delivering was way too vague and abstract. Things we learn are hardly applicable in real life. He made this class into a statistic and probablity math class, which most of the students do not enjoy. Assignments and take home midterms that were given were not the material that he taught in class nor from any handout.

All in all, great professor for what he knows of, but not so great on delivering course material to the students.

Ted Shear is a great instructor. His teaching style is clear and concise in explanation of the rationality concepts.

The only aspect of the class I did not like was the lack of a textbook. While the posted class notes online were useful, they did not provide enough. It would have been helpful to have both a standard required textbook and the posted class notes.

If I didn't need to take 3 classes this summer session I would have attended more, as this was by far my most interesting class. I took a critical thinking class in community college that covered basic topics of what we did in this class, and that class was one of my favorites from back then. I think philosophy in general is a very interesting topic, but when it is taught it requires a good teacher to make it interesting for the class. I think that you had a strong effect on why the class was interesting. I feel like I learned a lot and it was interesting to listen and answer questions during class.

My only criticism is that I would like some of the online material to be a bit clearer, or transcribed in some way because the source material is a lot harder to understand compared to how it is presented in class. Granted, this was mainly an issue because of my attendance since I had to catch up using online material, so it may not be a completely valid criticism. Thanks for the class.

The course is very complex and I found it to be more of a challenge than I had originally planned for. However, Ted is very knowledgeable about the subject and his enthusiasm for it definitely helps with most aspects of the course. However, Ted's clarity in lecture may be lost when he is trying to explain a very complex idea. Regardless, he was very happy to lend assistance when he was approached and he was more than happy to provide further explanations to concepts that I did not understand the first time. Overall, he is an excellent teacher.

The questions for the practice problems in class and the second midterm at times/certain questions were ambiguous or unclear.

As someone who has only taken philosophy 07, I was extremely worried I would fall behind in class since it was an upper division course. However, the professor made the course easy to follow and understand. The lectures followed by the quizzes really helped me understand the concepts a lot better. Plus, the professor was always available after class. During office hours he was helpful whenever I had questions. It was a very interesting course!

Was available to meet out of office hours.

Ted is an absolutely amazing instructor. He is attentive to the needs of students. He makes sure students are equipped with all the materials needed to master the subject, he is readily available by email when needed, and he takes great care to explain concepts with clarity.

Very scattered teaching methods. Subject matter was presented in a confusing manner. Should stick to a syllabus. Often I had no idea what the professor was talking about. The class had little participation, and his answering of questions only confused me more. Please have more interaction/ discussion. More small group activity that is checked up on by professor.

| Term | Eval Opened | CRN | Subject | Course | Section | Enrollment | % Response |
|-----------------------|-------------------|-------|---------|--------|---------|------------|------------|
| Summer Session 1 2016 | 7/27/2016 4:00 PM | 53688 | PHI | 128 | 001 | 28 | 100 |

Summary of Student Evaluations of Instructors and Courses SUMMER SESSION ONE 2015

Name of Instructor: TED SHEAR

Total Enrollment:

18

Course Number:

PHI 05-01

Total # of Responses:

12

Course: CRITICAL REASONING

% of responses to

66.67%

enrollment:

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|----|-----------|-----------|-------|--------|-------|----------|
| n= | 2 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 16.67% | 58.33% | 8.33% | 16.67% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Overall quality of the course:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|----|-----------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|----------|
| n= | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 25.00% | 41.67% | 25.00% | 8.33% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| INSTRUCTOR: Ted | Shear | | - |
|-----------------|-------|----------------------|----|
| Course: PH1-005 | | Quarter/Year: SUMWEY | 15 |

Please evaluate the instructor and the course in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| INSTRUC | TOR: | Ted | Shear. | | | | | _ |
|---------|-------|-----|--------|-----|-------------|--------|---|---|
| Course: | PHI-U | 05 | | Qua | arter/Year: | summer | 1 | _ |

Please evaluate the instructor and the course in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

INSTRUCTOR: Ted Shear

Course: PHI 005

Quarter/Year: SUMMUR SUSION I 2015

Please evaluate the instructor and the course in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| INSTRUCTOR: | TED | SHEER | | | |
|-------------|-----|-------|---------------|--------|------|
| Course: PH | 15 | | Quarter/Year: | SUMMER | 2012 |

Please evaluate the instructor and the course in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

- didn't feel like probability was effective; hard to understand but overall enjoyed the class.
- always answered emails / questions
- knew materials

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR :

POOR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| INSTRUCTOR: Ted Sheat | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Course: 9H1-005 | Quarter/Year: Summer 2015 |

Please evaluate the instructor and the course in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

Nice person, it's a fun class.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the instructor

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

INSTRUCTOR:

TED SHEAR

Course:

PHI 05

Quarter/Year: SSI /15

Please evaluate the instructor and the course in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

really enjoyed tectures, was very helpful on things also.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the instructor

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT

YERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| INSTRUCTOR: Ted. Shea | 1 |
|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Course: PHI 5 | Quarter/Year: SSI 15 |

Please evaluate the instructor and the course in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

- The instructor was very effective in his lessons

- was easy to contact
- always made himself available to
help out

Overall teaching effectiveness of the instructor

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| INSTRUCTOR: | Ted | Shear | | - |
|--------------|-----|-------|---------------------------|------|
| Course: PH I | 5 | | Quarter/Year: Sum 1 / Jus | nior |

Please evaluate the instructor and the course in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

I think Ted is a great teacher and understands his students' needs. Sometimes things are a little unclear but that may partially be because this is a philosophy course. However, he does tend to surrender when a student tries to prove him wrong. I wish he would stick w/ his original answer in this case b/c it can get confusing. Passionale & overall great teadur!

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| INSTRUCTOR: | Ted | Shear | | |
|---------------|-----|-------|-------------------|--|
| Course: PHI 5 | | | Quarter/Year: (C) | |

Please evaluate the instructor and the course in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

He is organized and knowledgable however

Come of the material could have been

Void more clarification. Ms & sometimes misunderstood

Students questions \$ up overall, good.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD



FAIR

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| INSTRUCTOR: Ted Shear | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|----|
| Course: PHT 5 | Quarter/Year: Summer 1 | 15 |

Please evaluate the instructor and the course in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

- Did a wonderful Job explaining
- wish he had posted the notes
a little bit faster.

-> Other than that I thoroughly
enjoyed his class

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| INSTRUCTOR: Tel | Shear | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Course: PHIZ - 005 | Quarter/Year: Summer Session 1 | 5 |

Please evaluate the instructor and the course in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

This course was really good.

If I learned a lot and
the class and well organized
and easy to follow.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| INSTRUCTOR: | | Shear | | | |
|-------------|---|-------|---------------|-----|-------|
| Course: PHI | _ | | Quarter/Year: | SSI | 18015 |

Please evaluate the instructor and the course in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD



FAIR

Instructor Edward Shear

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA - DAVIS

Summer Session 1 2014 PHI 001 (001) 53629

Student Evaluation of Teaching



| Enrollment 27 % responding 74 | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|------|-----------|-----|-----|----|
| | 5 % | 4 % | 3 % | 2 % | 1 % | \bar{x} | SD | М | N |
| Please indicate the overall educational value of the course. (excellent I very good I satisfactory I fair I poor) | 9 45% | 6 30% | 4 20% | 1 5% | 0 0% | 4.2 | 0.9 | 4.0 | 20 |
| Overall Quality of the Course | 7 35% | 6 30% | 4 20% | 3 15% | 0 0% | 3.9 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 20 |
| Please indicate the overall teaching effectiveness of the instructor. (excellent I very good I satisfactory I fair I poor) | 7 35% | 7 35% | 5 25% | 1 5% | 0 0% | 4.0 | 0.9 | 4.0 | 20 |
| Instructor's Mastery of the Subject Matter | 12 60% | 3 15% | 3 15% | 2 10% | 0 0% | 4.3 | 1.0 | 5.0 | 20 |
| Instructor's Accessibility and Willingness to Help Students | 15 75% | 2 10% | 1 5% | 2 10% | 0 0% | 4.5 | 1.0 | 5.0 | 20 |
| Instructor's Clarity | 5 25% | 10 50% | 3 15% | 2 10% | 0 0% | 3.9 | 0.9 | 4.0 | 20 |
| Instructor's Ability to Stimulate Interest in Philosophy | 9 45% | 4 20% | 5 25% | 2 10% | 0 0% | 4.0 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 20 |

Additional Comments About the Course

I think this course can help any student in any courses as it can help students to think critically on the subjects they are studying. Also this class can help students provide an insight about the complexity of the world.

Thorough course for an intro to philosophy.

The course was somewhat enlightening on ways to think of the world. It helps to give new perspectives on things.

Additional Comments About the Instructor

Ted is very enthusiastic to students' questions and always encourages us to think!

Professor Ted Shear provided a great intro regarding what is philosophy is really about. He is very patient and understanding towards his students. Also the examples or simplification Professor Ted used in class is very helpful and makes it easy to grasp certain subjects in Philosophy 001.

Ted did a exceptional job in planning the course out. He was able to successfully challenge me academically and I'm now much more interested in philosophy after taking the course.

The instructors knowledge on the subject was very impressive. No matter how many questions were asked in a way that would seem provoking, he held his composure and answered them to the best of his ability. He was also very enthusiastic during his lecture and helped to spark interest in the class. However, I feel his use of highly intricate formulas made the lectures a little challenging to follow. Sometimes I felt completely lost. Maybe if he can lecture with a little more simplicity, perhaps it would go smoother. After all, it is an introductory class.

Shear's work as an instructor for this course was amazing. His ability to teach the subject to us in class proved to be very fluid and simple, taking things like paradoxes that were very complicated to read through and difficult to understand and making them seem like perfect common sense by explaining it himself. Also, the atmosphere he created in the classroom was very open and made it much easier to speak up and comment on the discussion topic than I've felt in other classes. In fact, I've probably never raised my hand so many times before in any class than I have in this one.

| Term | Eval Opened | CRN | Subject | Course | Section | Learning Activity | Enrollment | % Response |
|--------------------------|--------------------|-------|---------|--------|---------|-------------------|------------|---------------|
| Summer Session 1 2014 | 7/25/2014 12:00 AM | 53629 | PHI | 001 | 001 | Lecture | 27 | 74 |

Instructor Edward Shear

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA - DAVIS

Spring Quarter 2014 Selected Evaluations* (2)

Student Evaluation of Teaching



| Enrollment 70 % responding 70% | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|--------|--------|-------|-----------|-----|---|----|
| | 5 % | 4 % | 3 % | 2 % | 1 % | \bar{x} | SD | М | N |
| Please indicate the overall educational value of the course. (excellent I very good I satisfactory I fair I poor) | 21 43% | 8 16% | 11 22% | 6 12% | 3 6% | 3.8 | 1.3 | 4 | 49 |
| Overall Quality of the Course | 20 41% | 7 14% | 7 14% | 11 22% | 4 8% | 3.6 | 1.4 | 4 | 49 |
| Please indicate the overall teaching effectiveness of the instructor. (excellent I very good I satisfactory I fair I poor) | 18 37% | 8 16% | 11 22% | 8 16% | 4 8% | 3.6 | 1.3 | 4 | 49 |
| Instructor's Mastery of the Subject Matter | 28 57% | 8 16% | 8 16% | 3 6% | 2 4% | 4.2 | 1.1 | 5 | 49 |
| Instructor's Accessibility and Willingness to Help Students | 25 56% | 4 9% | 8 18% | 6 13% | 2 4% | 4 | 1.3 | 5 | 45 |
| Instructor's Clarity | 19 39% | 4 8% | 12 24% | 9 18% | 5 10% | 3.5 | 1.4 | 3 | 49 |
| Instructor's Ability to Stimulate Interest in Subject | 17 35% | 5 10% | 6 13% | 12 25% | 8 17% | 3.2 | 1.5 | 3 | 48 |
| Overall Teaching Effectiveness of the Instructor | 17 35% | 8 17% | 8 17% | 12 25% | 3 6% | 3.5 | 1.4 | 4 | 48 |

Additional Comments About the Course

I do not understand why Communication majors are required to take this course. It is full of Computer Science kids and is rather impossible. I suggest considering a different logical course if you to continue to have this requirement.

N/a

It's an interesting subject, but it takes time to understand. Class was cancelled too much to fully learn what we should have, and paid to learn.

The material was very hard to learn. The only notes only helped with sometimes. There were no extra exams we can practice with. Also no recorded lecture to go back to. Assignments were not handed back, so students had no idea what they missed.

Pretty valuable stuff!

A very good complement to engineering courses.

This course introduces tools that can be used in everyday life. I strongly believe that my critical thinking skills have improved after taking this course.

The material was presented too quickly, without enough time to have a concrete understanding of it before taking the quizzes. Too many classes were cancelled, which made me feel as if was at a disadvantage when it came to understanding the material.

Interesting material

I didn't like the group quiz aspect of the course. More often than not I did the entire quiz by myself and someone copied down all of my work onto one sheet to turn in. Other than that, the assignments were challenging and furthered my understanding of the material and the midterm was really challenging as well.

poor

Additional Comments About the Instructor

He was extremely unhelpful, anything I learned I taught myself

N/a

Shear knows the material, there's no doubt about that. However the way in which he teaches the material is at his own preference. I personally feel since he does know the material shouldn't he first be able to explain how to solve problems in simple language that everyone can understand. Then use the logic terms to apply to the respective ideas, that way as time goes on the student can associate the simple explanations with the conventions in logic. Since Shear didn't take the time to do this as the class progressed, for me personally the subject itself was less interesting. That is to point out that at the beginning of the class he did a great job making it interesting since he actually took the time to explain the material clearly. In conclusion, I would suggest he treat every section in the class as if its still a foreign language.

Ted cancelled class for about 2 weeks worth of lecture and he had his TA take over for at least 3 lectures. This is very unprofessional. I paid to take this class. I'm extremely unsatisfied with his professionalism and availability. His TA, Tyrus, seemed to be a better instructor and more available, approachable, and better at clarifying any misunderstandings. I'm sure Ted would have been good had he not missed about half of the guarter.

I had a very hard time understand the professor and his notes. I tried to read the book and still was not able to clarify any material

Ted's lectures/over all course structure was clear and organized. Expectation was challenging yet within a reasonable framework. Def. was able to spark interest in Philosophy!

A great Teacher, sometimes he moves fast, but It comes together through homework and the quizzes, where he lets us learn from one another without a heavy penalty if we make mistakes.

The instructor provided the class with great resources, as well as the willingness to help everyone learn the material. Above all, the instructor is a very intelligent individual. I would definitely recommend him to incoming students.

It would be helpful if the instructor tries to present the material in a different way when a student does not understand it the first time.

Teds awesome. Clear and helpful

N/A

Ted has been very kind throughout the class. He wants to see his students succeed. He is very clear in lecture and shows a very detailed understanding of the subject. If you have any more questions please e-mail Jad Souki at irsouki@ucdavis.edu. Id be happy to answer any more questions.

Professor Shear had mastery over the material, but he still moved through the material at a pace that was appropriate for us. He never got tired of repeating himself if we needed it. He presented the material in a manner that helped us learn and retain the information.

My only complaint in this class was that he missed 6 days of instruction. Three of those days were taught by the T.A., but I still wish he had been there because there were some discrepancies between the way Tyrus taught the information and the way that Ted wanted us to do it on the exams.

When given the quizzes, I felt like it wasn't really fair for the last 2 quizzes, we didn't really go over them and we were given tough problems to do. We were just barely exposed to it and the quiz wasn't hard but just required a lot of time because we just end up rushing and not finishing it. (last 2 quizzes may have required a little more time)

Cancelled class a lot which made it hard to keep up

Ted is very clear when lecturing, and once he develops more confidence as a lecture I think he'll be a great professor. Every time I went to his office he was extremely helpful and he made sure I understood the material when I left. Overall, a great professor and I would definitely take a course from him again.

| Term | CRN | Subject | Course | Section | Learning Activity | Enrollment | % Response |
|---------------------|-------|---------|--------|---------|-------------------|------------|------------|
| Spring Quarter 2014 | 35121 | PHI | 012 | A01 | Lecture | 33 | 66 |
| Spring Quarter 2014 | 35122 | PHI | 012 | A02 | Lecture | 37 | 72 |

Summary of Student Evaluations of Instructors and Courses SUMMER SESSION | 2013

Name of Instructor:

Ted Shear

Total Enrollment:

17

Course Number:

PHI 012

Total # of Responses:

15

Course:

Introduction to Symbolic Logic

% of responses to enrollment:

88.24%

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor:

| 0101411 | Ordinal tenering entertheries of the monactor. | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|--|-----------|-------|-------|-------|----------|--|--|--|--|
| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply | | | | |
| n= | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| %= | 73.33% | 26.67% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | | | | |

Overall quality of the course:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|----|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|----------|
| n= | 8 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 53.33% | 46.67% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| <u>INSTRUC</u> 1 | ror: | Tea | Shear | | | _ |
|------------------|---------|-----|-------|---------------|--------|-----|
| Course: | PHI 012 | | | Quarter/Year: | Sommer | 113 |

Please evaluate the instructor and the course in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

I enjoyed a lot of things shout this canse. The material was interesting and was not very difficult to learn. The instruction was best extremely helpful and was enthusiastic about the subject matter. He was known ledgeable and thorough when explaining the subject material and I to duck not feel as if I gamed no uneweedge about philosophy.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

EXCELLENT (VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT (VERY GOOD) GOOD FAIR POOR

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| INSTRUCTOR: | Ted Shear | | | |
|-------------|------------|---------------|-----|------|
| Course: Phi | losophy 12 | Quarter/Year: | 551 | 2013 |

Please evaluate <u>the instructor and the course</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

Prof Ted was the most chill, young, and enthusiastic prof I've ever have. He knows his students to really grasp the material covered in class. As a philosophet, he challenges us on reasoning and throws cool situational events that may or may not relate to the subject.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| INSTRUCTOR: | Ted | Shear | | | |
|-------------|-----|-------|---------------|--------|-------|
| Course: Phi | 012 | | Quarter/Year: | Summer | 12013 |

Please evaluate the instructor and the course in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

the material was tought in a well throught out manner. I liked that he relied mostly an workey out material ourselves with his guidence. It helped long the classroom together as well as helped me grasp the subject matter. He was very accessarily to all students dury class as well as after class dury office hours. This time shows his commitment to the students as well as his lare of teaching. I also liked that when he helped had out on difficult problems, he would make sure I undershood the streeteyes behind the cancepts, and next just rely on the fact that the problem was assured.

I thoroughly an joyed the class

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| INSTRUCTOR: Ted, Shear | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|------|
| Course: Phi 12 | Quarter/Year: Summer Session | 1/13 |

Please evaluate the instructor and the course in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

Ted was very helpful and did his best to make sure everyone understood what he was talking about. When asked for extra help, he took the time to walk everyone through step by step and made them do the work so that they could understand.

The only problem, if that, was that sometimes he would come to class w/ problems that everen't solved already and would make things a tad confusing sometimes. Other than that he was great.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| INSTRUCTOR: Ted Shear | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Course: PHI 012 | Quarter/Year: Some I 2013 |

Please evaluate the instructor and the course in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

noticial that should throughout the course. Good division of lecture group work broke up the sore of the last with pare of class or willing to half lunch with pare needed it. Lecture oracionally mendered into discression of classic periodores peter, which while information of classic performance, but has referred, did not benefit should perform the world of class ships information of the instance of th

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| INSTRUCTO | OR: Ted shear | | | _ |
|-----------|---------------|---------------|----------|---|
| Course: | PHI DI2 | Quarter/Year: | SS1 2013 | |

Please evaluate the instructor and the course in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

THIS was a fun class be I got to take it with the best person ever.

I enjoyed the professor's teaching style and liked that he was very chill and relaxed and went through things step by step.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

(Ted) STUDENT EVALUATIONS

INSTRUCTOR: EDWARD SHEAR

Course: PHI 012 Quarter/Year: SSI 2013

Please evaluate <u>the instructor and the course</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

Professor is very nice Lapproachable & encourages students to work together.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT (VERY GOOD) GOOD FAIR POOR

| STUDENT EVALUA | ATIONS A D | |
|------------------|---------------|----------------|
| INSTRUCTOR: (CI) | 414 | |
| Course: PHI 012 | Quarter/Year: | Summer session |

Please evaluate <u>the instructor and the course</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

Ted was always in a good mood and brought enthusiasm every day. I enjoyed every class and learned the material with minimal effort, because of his effective teaching Style. He is the best graduate student feacher I have had at Davis. I have ho complaints and feel lucky to have him as my logic professor.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOL

FAIR

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| INSTRUCTOR: Ted Shear | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Course: PHI 012 | Quarter/Year: Sumer Sessual 2013 |

Please evaluate the instructor and the course in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

Loved the warse. Fair grading and very
effective in producing results in my case. Got
me intended in taking more logic warses. Ewit,
one of, it not the best philosophy instructing I
have had in my entire time at Daws. Very organish
class with no scerpises, Very willing to help inless
students asked for more associal. Musking or
the subject meetler without question. I would
tuhe any further cours of French to be toget
by Ted Sheer.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

(EXCELLENT)

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| <u>INSTRUC</u> | TOR: | TED | SHEAR | | | | |
|----------------|---------|-----|-------|---------------|-----|------|--|
| Course: | PHI 012 | | | Quarter/Year: | SSI | 20/3 | |

Please evaluate the instructor and the course in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

THE INSTRUCTOR WAS PRETTY SEA CLEAR ON THE TOPICS THAT TAUGHTS IT WAS CLEAR THAT HE KNEW THE MATERIAL VERY WELL. HE WAS VERY ACCESSIBLE & HESTI HELPFUL PURING OFFICE HOURS. EVEN THOUGH THIS CLASS DID NOT CTIMULATE MY ST INTEREST IN PHILOSOPHY, IT WAS A VERY EDUCATIONAL CLASS.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| INSTRUCTOR: led Shear | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|
| Course: Philosophy 12 | Quarter/Year: 551 | |

Please evaluate <u>the instructor and the course</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

Ted organized the class, day to day and week to week very well. He really showed his mastery of subject and was able to answer the simpliest questions an easier terms. He was always available to help the Student, even if they could not get to his office hours. This class was very difficult for me and ted made it a lot better! Go TED!

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

EXCELLENT \\

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| | OTODEN | LVALOATIO | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| INSTRUCTOR: | TED SI | HEAR | | | |
| Course: | H1012 | Qua | arter/Year: | SSI | 2013 |
| also use the reve clarity, organization help students, and this evaluation in Philosophy Depa | the instructor and the reserved side. Be sure to on, mastery of the set ability to stimulate to the person designtment, Room 1240 till not be read until t | o include the fol ubject matter, a your interest in nated by your i Social Science | llowing in yo accessibility n philosoph nstructor or as and Huma | our remar , willingne y. Pleas return it t anities Bu | ks: ess to e turn to the uilding. |
| GINAG | dear in in | struction | & tal | | |
| reas | onable expe | ctations. | for do | 156 | |
| | ful to stuc | | | | 5 |
| | ided in-class | | | | |
| | unce proble | | | | |
| | ablished g | | | | |
| _ | oys! | , | , | 1 | |
| 4 cle | larly knew u | inat he i | was tal | king | |
| | all, enjoyal | ale class! | World | r€cov | nnend |
| , | effectiveness of the | Instructor | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | F | AIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of | the course | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | F | AIR | POOR |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| INSTRUCTOR: Edward | Shear |
|---|--|
| Course: PHI 112 | Quarter/Year: Symmer 2013 |
| also use the reverse side. Be su clarity, organization, mastery of the help students, and ability to stimuthis evaluation in to the person dephilosophy Department, Room 1: | re to include the following in your remarks: he subject matter, accessibility, willingness to ulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn esignated by your instructor or return it to the 240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. ntil final grades have been turned into the |
| registrar. This is my 3vd ti | me having Ted in the classroom |
| and he is always as student is ever con | me having Ted in the classroom source of assisstance. If a fused all they have tordo is |
| set up an appoin- | tionen or Gu to his office |
| about this and | have yet to hear a complaint |

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| INSTRUCTOR: | Ted | Shear | | | |
|-------------|-----|-------|---------------|-----|------|
| Course: PHI | 12 | | Quarter/Year: | SSI | 2013 |

Please evaluate the instructor and the course in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the

registrar.

Philosophy can be a confusing I tough subject, but Ted aid a great job in breaking it down for students. He tried to be clear when explaining, went over material multiple times so students could grasp the information, and always went around helping Students individually as well as making sure the Students were doing the problems correctly. Ted has definitely mastered the subject, and shows his knowledge through his teaching. He made the class of fun learning experience. Classes were well-planned out and grading was fair. He also encouraged students to work with one another and help each other out. Ted is overall an amazing instructor and I would definitely recommend of these to take this course with him!

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
|--------------------|-------------------|------|------|------|
| Overall quality of | the course | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| INSTRUCTOR: | Ted Shear | | | |
|--------------|-----------|---------------|--------|-----------|
| Course: Phil | 12 | Quarter/Year: | Summer | Session 1 |

Please evaluate <u>the instructor and the course</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the Philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the registrar.

I really liked how you taught this course. I found it very clear and organized. You definitely guen willing to help and clarify things.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR

Overall quality of the course

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

POOR

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA - DAVIS

Student Evaluation of Teaching



Winter Quarter 2016 PHI 101 (A01) 36111

| Enrollment 30 % responding 50 | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|------|-----------|-----|-----|----|
| | 5 % | 4 % | 3 % | 2 % | 1 % | \bar{x} | SD | М | N |
| Please indicate the overall educational value of the course. (excellent I very good I satisfactory I fair I poor) | 5 33% | 7 47% | 2 13% | 1 7% | 0 0% | 4.1 | 0.9 | 4.0 | 15 |
| Overall Quality of the Course | 2 13% | 7 47% | 5 33% | 1 7% | 0 0% | 3.7 | 8.0 | 4.0 | 15 |
| Overall Quality of the Discussion | 3 21% | 8 57% | 1 7% | 2 14% | 0 0% | 3.9 | 0.9 | 4.0 | 14 |
| Please indicate the overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant. (excellent I very good I satisfactory I fair I poor) | 7 47% | 7 47% | 1 7% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.4 | 0.6 | 4.0 | 15 |
| Teaching Assistant's Preparation and Organization for Discussion | 10 67% | 1 7% | 4 27% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.4 | 0.9 | 5.0 | 15 |
| Teaching Assistant's Mastery of the Subject Matter | 9 60% | 4 27% | 2 13% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.5 | 0.7 | 5.0 | 15 |
| Teaching Assistant's Accessibility and Willingness to Help Students | 9 64% | 4 29% | 1 7% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.6 | 0.6 | 5.0 | 14 |
| Teaching Assistant's Clarity | 8 53% | 3 20% | 4 27% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.3 | 0.9 | 5.0 | 15 |
| Teaching Assistant's Ability to Stimulate Interest in Subject | 6 40% | 4 27% | 4 27% | 1 7% | 0 0% | 4.0 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 15 |
| Rate your Overall Attendance to Discussion Section | 11 73% | 3 20% | 1 7% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.7 | 0.6 | 5.0 | 15 |

The best TA I've had so far at Davis. Smart, friendly, made discussion section interesting and really helped me master the material.

He is able to relate well with the students and is very willing to help struggling individuals in a way that best caters to their needs and learning styles. Very helpful and a great instructor

Good TA who's willing to help his students. Knows the material very well and is able to present that that material in laymans terms.

Ted was always helpful during office hours and always had a task prepared for discussion. It wasn't always the most interesting but that might just be due to the nature of metaphysics. He seems very intelligent about metaphysics and I think it was worthwhile to go to discussion for the most part.

| Term | Eval Opened | CRN | Subject | Course | Section | Enrollment | % Response |
|---------------------|------------------|-------|---------|--------|---------|------------|------------|
| Winter Quarter 2016 | 3/7/2016 8:00 PM | 36111 | PHI | 101 | A01 | 30 | 50 |

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA - DAVIS

Winter Quarter 2016 PHI 101 (A02) 36112

Student Evaluation of Teaching



| Enrollment 28 % responding 50 | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|------|-----------|-----|-----|----|
| | 5 % | 4 % | 3 % | 2 % | 1 % | \bar{x} | SD | М | N |
| Please indicate the overall educational value of the course. (excellent I very good I satisfactory I fair I poor) | 8 57% | 3 21% | 3 21% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.4 | 0.8 | 5.0 | 14 |
| Overall Quality of the Course | 9 64% | 2 14% | 3 21% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.4 | 0.8 | 5.0 | 14 |
| Overall Quality of the Discussion | 8 57% | 4 29% | 0 0% | 2 14% | 0 0% | 4.3 | 1.0 | 5.0 | 14 |
| Please indicate the overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant. (excellent I very good I satisfactory I fair I poor) | 4 57% | 3 43% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.6 | 0.5 | 5.0 | 7 |
| Teaching Assistant's Preparation and Organization for Discussion | 3 43% | 3 43% | 1 14% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.3 | 0.7 | 4.0 | 7 |
| Teaching Assistant's Mastery of the Subject Matter | 3 43% | 3 43% | 1 14% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.3 | 0.7 | 4.0 | 7 |
| Teaching Assistant's Accessibility and Willingness to Help Students | 3 43% | 3 43% | 1 14% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.3 | 0.7 | 4.0 | 7 |
| Teaching Assistant's Clarity | 2 29% | 4 57% | 1 14% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.1 | 0.6 | 4.0 | 7 |
| Teaching Assistant's Ability to Stimulate Interest in Subject | 3 43% | 3 43% | 1 14% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.3 | 0.7 | 4.0 | 7 |
| Rate your Overall Attendance to Discussion Section | 4 57% | 2 29% | 1 14% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.4 | 0.7 | 5.0 | 7 |

Edward is interesting, clear, and great at helping students and clarifying concepts. One aspect that could be worked on, however, is organization and time-efficiency of the discussion. Often he spends too much time on one person's question that is not relevant to the subject or upcoming exam. Wonderful TA, but would suggest being a little more efficient in discussion.

Approachable and enjoyable discussions

| Term | Eval Opened | CRN | Subject | Course | Section | Enrollment | % Response |
|---------------------|------------------|-------|---------|--------|---------|------------|------------|
| Winter Quarter 2016 | 3/7/2016 8:00 PM | 36112 | PHI | 101 | A02 | 28 | 50 |

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA - DAVIS

Student Evaluation of Teaching



Spring Quarter 2016 PHI 001 (A05) 55684

| Enrollment 25 % responding 40 | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|-----|-----|----|
| | 5 % | 4 % | 3 % | 2 % | 1 % | \bar{x} | SD | М | N |
| Please indicate the overall educational value of the course. (excellent I very good I satisfactory I fair I poor) | 5 50% | 4 40% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 1 10% | 4.2 | 1.2 | 4.5 | 10 |
| Overall Quality of the Course | 5 50% | 2 20% | 1 10% | 1 10% | 1 10% | 3.9 | 1.4 | 4.5 | 10 |
| Overall Quality of the Discussion | 4 40% | 5 50% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 1 10% | 4.1 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 10 |
| Please indicate the overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant. (excellent I very good I satisfactory I fair I poor) | 8 80% | 1 10% | 1 10% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.7 | 0.6 | 5.0 | 10 |
| Teaching Assistant's Preparation and Organization for Discussion | 5 50% | 3 30% | 1 10% | 1 10% | 0 0% | 4.2 | 1.0 | 4.5 | 10 |
| Teaching Assistant's Mastery of the Subject Matter | 7 70% | 2 20% | 0 0% | 1 10% | 0 0% | 4.5 | 0.9 | 5.0 | 10 |
| Teaching Assistant's Accessibility and Willingness to Help Students | 8 80% | 1 10% | 0 0% | 1 10% | 0 0% | 4.6 | 0.9 | 5.0 | 10 |
| Teaching Assistant's Clarity | 6 60% | 2 20% | 1 10% | 1 10% | 0 0% | 4.3 | 1.0 | 5.0 | 10 |
| Teaching Assistant's Ability to Stimulate Interest in Subject | 7 70% | 2 20% | 0 0% | 1 10% | 0 0% | 4.5 | 0.9 | 5.0 | 10 |
| Rate your Overall Attendance to Discussion Section | 6 60% | 4 40% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.6 | 0.5 | 5.0 | 10 |

Always answered questions during discussion. Tried to make things clear and easier to understand.

Teaching assistant is great

| Term | Eval Opened | CRN | Subject | Course | Section | Enrollment | % Response |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------|---------|--------|---------|------------|------------|
| Spring Quarter 2016 | 5/26/2016 2:00 PM | 55684 | PHI | 001 | A05 | 25 | 40 |

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA - DAVIS

Spring Quarter 2016 PHI 001 (A06) 55685

Student Evaluation of Teaching



| Enrollment 7 % responding 42 | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|------|-----------|-----|-----|---|
| | 5 % | 4 % | 3 % | 2 % | 1 % | \bar{x} | SD | М | N |
| Please indicate the overall educational value of the course. (excellent I very good I satisfactory I fair I poor) | 0 0% | 2 67% | 0 0% | 1 33% | 0 0% | 3.3 | 0.9 | 4.0 | 3 |
| Overall Quality of the Course | 0 0% | 2 67% | 0 0% | 1 33% | 0 0% | 3.3 | 0.9 | 4.0 | 3 |
| Overall Quality of the Discussion | 1 33% | 1 33% | 0 0% | 1 33% | 0 0% | 3.7 | 1.2 | 4.0 | 3 |
| Please indicate the overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant. (excellent I very good I satisfactory I fair I poor) | 2 67% | 1 33% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.7 | 0.5 | 5.0 | 3 |
| Teaching Assistant's Preparation and Organization for Discussion | 2 67% | 1 33% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.7 | 0.5 | 5.0 | 3 |
| Teaching Assistant's Mastery of the Subject Matter | 2 67% | 1 33% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.7 | 0.5 | 5.0 | 3 |
| Teaching Assistant's Accessibility and Willingness to Help Students | 2 67% | 1 33% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.7 | 0.5 | 5.0 | 3 |
| Teaching Assistant's Clarity | 1 33% | 2 67% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.3 | 0.5 | 4.0 | 3 |
| Teaching Assistant's Ability to Stimulate Interest in Subject | 2 67% | 1 33% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.7 | 0.5 | 5.0 | 3 |
| Rate your Overall Attendance to Discussion Section | 1 33% | 1 33% | 1 33% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.0 | 0.8 | 4.0 | 3 |

Edward is a very good TA with excellent knowledge of the subject and he accepts all students opinions and answers. One of the best TA's I've had.

| Term | Eval Opened | CRN | Subject | Course | Section | Enrollment | % Response |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------|---------|--------|---------|------------|------------|
| Spring Quarter 2016 | 5/26/2016 2:00 PM | 55685 | PHI | 001 | A06 | 7 | 42 |

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA - DAVIS

Student Evaluation of Teaching



Fall Quarter 2016 PHI 102 (A01) 53857

| Enrollment 17 % responding 58 | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|------|-----------|-----|-----|----|
| | 5 % | 4 % | 3 % | 2 % | 1 % | \bar{x} | SD | М | N |
| Please indicate the overall educational value of the course. (excellent I very good I satisfactory I fair I poor) | 3 30% | 4 40% | 3 30% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.0 | 0.8 | 4.0 | 10 |
| Overall Quality of the Course | 3 30% | 3 30% | 4 40% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 3.9 | 0.8 | 4.0 | 10 |
| Overall Quality of the Discussion | 4 40% | 2 20% | 3 30% | 1 10% | 0 0% | 3.9 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 10 |
| Please indicate the overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant. (excellent I very good I satisfactory I fair I poor) | 6 60% | 1 10% | 3 30% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.3 | 0.9 | 5.0 | 10 |
| Teaching Assistant's Preparation and Organization for Discussion | 5 50% | 2 20% | 1 10% | 2 20% | 0 0% | 4.0 | 1.2 | 4.5 | 10 |
| Teaching Assistant's Mastery of the Subject Matter | 7 70% | 2 20% | 1 10% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.6 | 0.7 | 5.0 | 10 |
| Teaching Assistant's Accessibility and Willingness to Help Students | 9 90% | 1 10% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.9 | 0.3 | 5.0 | 10 |
| Teaching Assistant's Clarity | 5 50% | 2 20% | 3 30% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.2 | 0.9 | 4.5 | 10 |
| Teaching Assistant's Ability to Stimulate Interest in Subject | 5 50% | 2 20% | 1 10% | 2 20% | 0 0% | 4.0 | 1.2 | 4.5 | 10 |
| Rate your Overall Attendance to Discussion Section | 8 80% | 1 10% | 1 10% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.7 | 0.6 | 5.0 | 10 |

Sometimes discussion was low in student participation. Leading the discussion was beneficial especially with hard to understand concepts.

Ted is in one word amazing. His knowledge of the subject is clear and that was clear in his discussion. He didn't fail to explain the material in alternate ways so that students could gain a better understanding of the material. Ted made himself avaible to students and clearly displayed a concern for their success. He was willing to work with students and ensure that they understood the material. Ted was an invaluable asset to my success and I can only imagine that he was the same for many others.

Be a more organized with your papers so you do not spend discussion time searching for the single page that you need.

Sometimes a little too unstructured

| Term | Eval Opened | CRN | Subject | Course | Section | Enrollment | % Response |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|---------|--------|---------|------------|------------|
| Fall Quarter 2016 | 11/30/2016 3:00 PM | 53857 | PHI | 102 | A01 | 17 | 58 |

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA - DAVIS

Student Evaluation of Teaching



Fall Quarter 2016 PHI 102 (A02) 53858

| Enrollment 17 % responding 76 | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|-----|-----|----|
| | 5 % | 4 % | 3 % | 2 % | 1 % | \bar{x} | SD | М | N |
| Please indicate the overall educational value of the course. (excellent I very good I satisfactory I fair I poor) | 3 23% | 5 38% | 3 23% | 1 8% | 1 8% | 3.6 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 13 |
| Overall Quality of the Course | 3 23% | 5 38% | 2 15% | 1 8% | 2 15% | 3.5 | 1.3 | 4.0 | 13 |
| Overall Quality of the Discussion | 6 46% | 3 23% | 2 15% | 2 15% | 0 0% | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 13 |
| Please indicate the overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant. (excellent I very good I satisfactory I fair I poor) | 9 69% | 3 23% | 1 8% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.6 | 0.6 | 5.0 | 13 |
| Teaching Assistant's Preparation and Organization for Discussion | 6 46% | 4 31% | 1 8% | 2 15% | 0 0% | 4.1 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 13 |
| Teaching Assistant's Mastery of the Subject Matter | 8 62% | 3 23% | 2 15% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.5 | 0.7 | 5.0 | 13 |
| Teaching Assistant's Accessibility and Willingness to Help Students | 8 62% | 3 23% | 2 15% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.5 | 0.7 | 5.0 | 13 |
| Teaching Assistant's Clarity | 7 54% | 4 31% | 1 8% | 1 8% | 0 0% | 4.3 | 0.9 | 5.0 | 13 |
| Teaching Assistant's Ability to Stimulate Interest in Subject | 5 38% | 5 38% | 2 15% | 1 8% | 0 0% | 4.1 | 0.9 | 4.0 | 13 |
| Rate your Overall Attendance to Discussion Section | 5 42% | 5 42% | 2 17% | 0 0% | 0 0% | 4.3 | 0.7 | 4.0 | 12 |

I wish Ted was my professor instead of Hanti

TA and professor work very well with each other, complimenting both lecture and discussion.

helpful and knowledgeable

Ted was really good about clearing up some of the more confusing matters from lecture, and making sure that students were prepared for the midterm and final. I found that Hanti's slides were often difficult to comprehend, but Ted was very good at clearing up the information.

N/A

Really nice and cool TA. Discussions were cool but I would have liked my fellow students to have participated more

| Term | Eval Opened | CRN | Subject | Course | Section | Enrollment | % Response |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------|---------|--------|---------|------------|------------|
| Fall Quarter 2016 | 11/30/2016 3:00 PM | 53858 | PHI | 102 | A02 | 17 | 76 |

Summary of Student Evaluations of Instructors and Courses WINTER QUARTER 2014

Name of Instructor: Ted Shear

Total Enrollment:

19

Course Number:

PHI 013G-002

Total # of Responses:

13

Course:

Minds, Brains, & Computers

% of responses to Enrl:

68.42%

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|----|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|----------|
| n= | 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| %= | 69.23% | 7.69% | 0.00% | 7.69% | 7.69% | 7.69% |

Overall quality of the course:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|----|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|----------|
| n= | 5 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| %= | 38.46% | 38.46% | 0.00% | 7.69% | 7.69% | 7.69% |

Frequency of attendance at discussion:

| | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | No Reply |
|----|--------|--------|-----------|--------|-------|----------|
| n= | 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 76.92% | 23.08% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| Teaching Assistant: | | Ted | Shear | Quarter/Year: Winter 2014 | | | | |
|---------------------|-------|-----|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Course: | PHI B | | | Section/Time: 3:10 pm 4pm | | | | |
| DI | | | | Letter alternation profile in the energy | | | | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted explains the answers to my questions and my classmates' questions in detail and cleanly.

His is available during his general, set office hours, and he treats his students' questions with respect and eggerness.

When he describes concepts, he shows complete mastery of the subject. I feel interested in philosophy when ted explains concepts.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT (VER)

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| Teaching Assista | int: Ted Shear | | Quarter/Year: 1 | Winter Quarter 12014 |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| Course: | Phi 13 | Section | n/Time: wed | ./2 |
| below. You may remarks: clarity, of help students, an evaluation in to the Department, Roo not be read until the | the Teaching Assist also use the reverse organization, mastery display to stimulate you person designated in 1240 Social Science final grades have been the transfer of the tr | side. Be sure to ind of the subject matte your interest in philo by your instructor of ces and Humanities on turned into the Of | clude the following accessibility accessibility accessibility accessibility accession return it to the Building. This accession of the Region accession acce | ing in your , willingness to e turn this e philosophy evaluation will strar. |
| | | | | |
| | er | | | ¥ |
| ic . | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | 6 | | 36 |
| Overail teaching e | effectiveness of the te | eaching assistant | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of t | the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you | attend your discussi | on section? | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

| | STUDENT EVALU | ATIONS | Winter | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Teaching Assistant: Ted | Shear | Quarter/Year: | SOTTING 14 | | | | | | |
| Course: Phi 13 | | Section/Time: Wea | 1 (23:00 mg | | | | | | |
| , | Assistant and the | | in the snace | | | | | | |
| Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to | | | | | | | | | |
| help students, and ability to stir | nulate your interest | in philosophy. Pleas | se turn this | | | | | | |
| evaluation in to the person des Department, Room 1240 Socia | ignated by your inst I Sciences and Hum | ructor or return it to th nanities Building. Thi | ne philosophy s evaluation will | | | | | | |
| not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar. Ted is a great TA. He's always in a great mood, even when he's sick, and I always enjoy whing to discussion as the topics are almost always entertaining and relevant | | | | | | | | | |
| led is a gr | eat 1A | . He's a | lways in | | | | | | |
| a acoust most | 01000 | show he' | S Sick | | | | | | |
| 1/1/1/10000 | 20201 | ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | 1 0- | | | | | | |
| and I always | enjoy | Coming | to gizonszion | | | | | | |
| as the topics | are almos | of alutions | entertaining | | | | | | |
| and relevant | | $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{I}}$ | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 報 | | | | | | | |
| | | | * | | | | | | |
| Overall teaching effectiveness | of the teaching ass | istant | | | | | | | |
| (EXCELLENT) VERY GOO | OD GOOD | FAIR | POOR | | | | | | |
| Overall quality of the discussion | on | | | | | | | | |
| EXCELLENT VERY GOO | OD GOOD | FAIR | POOR | | | | | | |
| How often did you attend your | liscussion section? | | | | | | | | |

SOMETIMES

ALWAYS

OFTEN

RARELY

NEVER

| STUDENT EVALUATIONS | | | | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------------|--|------------------|--|--|--|
| Teaching Assistant: Ted Shea | Quarter | /Year: | White | 2014 | | | |
| Course: Phi 13 | Section/Time: | wed | nesday | | | | |
| Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant a below. You may also use the reverse side remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the help students, and ability to stimulate your evaluation in to the person designated by y Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences a not be read until final grades have been turn | Be sure to include the subject matter, acceinterest in philosophy. our instructor or returned Humanities Buildin | e followessibility Pleas It to the | ring in you r, willingne e turn this e philosop s evaluation | r ss to hy | | | |

· Very helpful.
Good @ explaining.

· Fair grader

· Friendly Leasy & approach.

| ~ | | • | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|--------------|--------|-------|
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of the | he discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you | attend your discuss | ion section? | | |
| ALWAYS) | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| 310 | DERT ETREOM | .0110 | |
|--|--|--|---|
| Teaching Assistant: | euv | Quarter/Year: | mounter 5014 |
| Course: PHI 13 | <u>S</u> | ection/Time: | d 3:00 pm |
| Please evaluate the Teaching Ass below. You may also use the reversements: clarity, organization, master help students, and ability to stimulate evaluation in to the person designate Department, Room 1240 Social Scients be read until final grades have be | se side. Be sure to ery of the subject note te your interest in p ted by your instruct ences and Human | o include the follow natter, accessibility philosophy. Please tor or return it to the ities Building. This | ing in your , willingness to e turn this e philosophy evaluation will |
| bood job stimulating | k aliseussio | n & markin | 4 |
| some me moderator | sol -convin | eind conto | 2508 |
| concepts. | | | |
| .48 | | | |
| Extremely relptul | in office h | wours! | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | 41 |
| Overall teaching effectiveness of the | e teaching assist | ant | |
| EXCELLENT VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |

ALWAYS) OFTEN

How often did you attend your discussion section?

SOMETIMES

RARELY

NEVER

| | STUDE | ENT EVALUA | ATIONS | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| Teaching Assistant: | Ted shear | r | Quarter/Year: | Winter 2014 |
| Course: PH, 13 | | | Section/Time: Wed. | 3 pm |
| Please evaluate the 1 below. You may also remarks: clarity, organ help students, and ab evaluation in to the per Department, Room 12 not be read until final | use the reverse a nization, mastery ility to stimulate y erson designated 240 Social Science | side. Be sure of the subject our interest in by your instruces and Huma | e to include the follow t matter, accessibility n philosophy. Pleas uctor or return it to th anities Building. This | ring in your y, willingness to e turn this e philosophy s evaluation will |
| | A was Enough | | of the subject | |
| appropriate | responses | to all | questions or Rec |) by students |
| ¥. | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | Ē | × |
| Overall teaching effect | tiveness of the te | aching assi | stant | |
| EXCELLENT VI | ERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of the d | liscussion | | | ν |
| EXCELLENT | ERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you atte | end your discussi | on section? | | |

SOMETIMES RARELY

NEVER

OFTEN

ALWAYS

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| Teaching Assistant: Ted Shear | Quarter/Year: Winter 2014 |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course: PHI13 | Section/Time: Wednesday 3-4 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted is always very helpful and plessont. He helps us generate thoughthel dissussions and definitely knows his state.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

Teaching Assistant: Ted Shear Quarter/Year: Winter 2014

Course: Philosophy 13 Section/Time: Wed 3:10-4:00

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall, I believe that Ted is a great TA. He is very approachable and willing to kelp, He really knows the material and cloes his best to make sure the material and cloes his best to make sure that everyone understands. To be honest, if students that everyone understand Ithink it is their from section don't understand Ithink it is their from section don't understand I had trouble fault for not asking questions. I had trouble understanding how to write the paper for the understanding how to do improve. I what I had to do to improve. I have nothing negitive to say about Ted.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| 4.322 | • |
|---|---|
| Teaching Assistant: Ted Shear | Quarter Year: WINKY 2014 |
| Course: Philosophy 13 | Section/Time: Nedresday 3:10 |
| Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the below. You may also use the reverse side. Be surremarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject help students, and ability to stimulate your interest evaluation in to the person designated by your inst. Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Hunnot be read until final grades have been turned into Ted was extremely clear, demonstrated perfect the command of the subject and accessible to students and Depinitely Stimulated My | re to include the following in your ect matter, accessibility, willingness to in philosophy. Please turn this ructor or return it to the philosophy nanities Building. This evaluation will |
| | |

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

| | STUDE | ENT EVALUATIONS | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching Assistar | nt: Ted Shear | Q | uarter/Year: | Wa 2014 |
| Course: PH | | | <u>/Тіте</u> : | |
| Please evaluate the below. You may a remarks: clarity, o help students, and evaluation in to the Department, Room not be read until fi | he Teaching Assistants use the reverse strains use the reverse straining mastery ability to stimulate ye person designated in 1240 Social Science hal grades have bee | side. Be sure to incloof the subject matter of the subject matter our interest in philos by your instructor or ces and Humanities I n turned into the Offi | ude the following accessibility, cophy. Please return it to the Building. This ice of the Registre. | ng in your willingness to turn this philosophy evaluation will strar. |
| Amesome | TAL Ve | ig clear | and or | gahized. |
| He wa | as very h | elpful an | d ac | cessible. |
| Helpful | in disso | B. discus | sions a | ind |
| • | hars. Th | | | |
| my n | terest in | Philosophy | 1 | |
| | | tr. | | Ψ. |
| Overall teaching e | ffectiveness of the te | eaching assistant | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of the | ne discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you | attend your discussi | on section? | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| | | ENT EVALUATIONS | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|-------|
| Teaching Assistar | nt: Ted Sh | ear o | uarter/Year: \ | unter | 14 |
| Course: PH | 113 | Section | | | |
| below. You may a remarks: clarity, o help students, and evaluation in to the Department, Room not be read until fi | also use the reverse rganization, mastery d ability to stimulate y e person designated m 1240 Social Science inal grades have bee | ant and the discuss side. Be sure to include of the subject matter your interest in philosophy your instructor or ces and Humanities En turned into the Office Material The Condition of the point of th | ide the following accessibility, ophy. Please return it to the Building. This ce of the Regis | ng in your willingness turn this philosophy evaluation v strar. | ∕vill |
| | | | | | |
| Overall teaching ef | fectiveness of the te | eaching assistant | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | 32 |
| Overall quality of the | ne discussion | 0 | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | |
| How often did you | attend your discussi | on section? | | | |

SOMETIMES

RARELY

NEVER

OFTEN

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| STUDENT EVALUATIONS | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Teaching Assistan | it: Ted She | a(| Quarter/Year: | Winter 2014 | | |
| Course: Phil | 13 | <u>Se</u> | ction/Time: | | | |
| below. You may a remarks: clarity, or help students, and evaluation in to the Department, Roon | ne Teaching Assist also use the reverse rganization, mastery ability to stimulate e person designated in 1240 Social Scien mal grades have bee | side. Be sure to of the subject m your interest in play by your instructory ces and Humanit | include the following atter, accessibility, allosophy. Please or or return it to the lies Building. This | ng in your willingness to turn this philosophy evaluation vill | | |
| | | | | things; often | | |
| times he | would have | e to thin | t about t | he questions by | | |
| answering & | as of unsure. | Bu+ 1 0 | do think | he is really | | |
| Chill B+ | personable. | He mak | e the envi | ron ment | | |
| (anfortable. | 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| ω | | V | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | (A | | 5.1 | | |
| Overall teaching of | fectiveness of the t | aachinn accieta | nf | | | |
| _ | | - | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | | |
| Overall quality of th | ne discussion | | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | (FAIR) | POOR | | |
| How often did you : | attend vour discuss | ion section? | | | | |

SOMETIMES

ALWAYS

NEVER

RARELY

| | | | | Бера | riment of Fi | Illosophy | | | | |
|------|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|---------------------------|-----|
| | | | | | | ŲATIONS | | | 1 | .1 |
| | Teachi | ing Assistar | nt: Ted | Sh | ear | | uarter/Ye | ar: Wint | rev | 4 |
| | Course | : Phil | 13 | | | Section | ı/Time: | | | |
| | Please below. remark help str evaluat Depart | evaluate <u>t</u> You may a s: clarity, o udents, and tion in to th ment, Roor | he Teaching also use the reganization, made ability to stime person design 1240 Social nal grades ha | everse s nastery d nulate yo gnated t Science | ide. Be sof the sub our interest oy your intes and Hu | ure to incl ject matte st in philos structor or imanities | ude the fo r, accessit sophy. Pl return it to Building. | llowing in yo pility, willingn ease turn thi p the philoso This evaluati | ur less to s phy | |
| | _ | | ing, he | | | | | | to u | nd |
| | | | smart o | | | | | | | |
| (S | a V | Cl. | He | (01 | at r | 1 10 | +0 | DUC | 5 00 | 15 |
| | | , | | | | | | | | |
| se C | ause | e the | mater | ia | pro | pably | Can | 16 50 | nati | ЛГa |
| | hin | | | | | | | | | |
| L | don | 7 4 | now I | f | I | can | Sau | Mat | I | /4 |
| an. | yth | ing | in de | 50 | ussi'a | on. | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 19 | | | | |
| 2 | Overall | teaching e | ffectiveness o | f the tea | aching as | ssistant | | | | |
| I | EXCEL | LENT | VERY GOO | D G | GOOD | | FAIR | POOF | | |
| (| Overall | quality of t | he discussio | n | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

ALWAYS

EXCELLENT

OFTEN

How often did you attend your discussion section?

VERY GOOD

SOMETIMES

GOOD

RARELY

FAIR)

NEVER

POOR

Summary of Student Evaluations of Instructors and Courses WINTER QUARTER 2014

Name of Instructor: Ted Shear

Total Enrollment:

11

Course Number:

PHI 013G-001

Total # of Responses:

9

Course: Minds, Brains, & Computers

% of responses to Enrl:

81.82%

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply | |
|----|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|----------|--|
| n= | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| %= | 55.56% | 44.44% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | |

Overall quality of the course:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|----|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|----------|
| n= | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 44.44% | 55.56% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Frequency of attendance at discussion:

| Always | | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | No Reply | |
|--------|--------|--------|-----------|--------|-------|----------|--|
| n= | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| %= | 66.67% | 33.33% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| STODENT EVALUATIONS | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|--------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|
| Teaching Assistan | nt: TED | Qı | uarter/Year: | winter / 2014 | | | | |
| Course: PHI | -0(3 | Section/ | Time: | | | | | |
| Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar. | | | | | | | | |
| Also, I a | assistant help Aten visit his many advice | me to understand | nd the Class | | | | | |
| Overall teaching et | fectiveness of the te | aching assistant | | | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | | | | |
| Overall quality of th | ne discussion | | | | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | | | | |
| low often did you | attend your discussion | on section? | | | | | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER | | | | |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| STOBERT EVALUATIONS | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Teaching Assistant: Ted Show | Quarter/Year: W&14 | | | | | | |
| Course: PHI 013 | Section/Time: R 12.10-1.00 | | | | | | |
| Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar. Very good examples. The way a hard class and clarified a little however used symbols I didn't understand. I wish we could have gone our the fath a little hurs. The | | | | | | | |
| | 20 | | | | | | |
| n | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | ē a | | | | | | |
| | * 44 | | | | | | |
| Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching as | SISTANT | | | | | | |
| EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD | FAIR POOR | | | | | | |
| Overall quality of the discussion | | | | | | | |
| EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD | FAIR POOR | | | | | | |
| How often did you attend your discussion section | ? | | | | | | |

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| Teaching Assistant: Ted | Shear | Quarter/Ye | ear: | Winter 2014 |
|-------------------------|-------|---------------|------|-------------|
| Course: PHI 13 + 6 | | Section/Time: | R | 12:10-1 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

I really liked how open the discussions were for what we had questions about and wanted to go over. Ted knew what he was talking about, really wanted to talk about what we found interesting, and was very available for help. He was clear and the only thing Dat would have been helpful is if we talked about what was on the online exams. However, I what was on the online exams. However, I really appreciated that this discussion was based off more interest and learning for the sake of that vather than grades/exams.

| Overall teaching | Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------|--------|-------|--|--|--|
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | | | |
| Overall quality | of the discussion | | | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | | | |
| How often did you attend your discussion section? | | | | | | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER | | | |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| Teaching Assistant: | Edward | Shew | Quarter/ | Year: Winter 2014 | |
|---------------------|--------|------|---------------|-------------------|--|
| Course: Phil 13 | | | Section/Time: | Phil 3 Th | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted is really good at understanding problems and explaining them with clavity. He is some what organized, but he always make time to help everyone, stulys after class and after office hours. He really cares about the students.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| | | -1 | | | 4 4 | a |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|---------------------------------|
| | Teaching Assistant: | Ted Sheo | Qı | uarter/Year: | winter | |
| | Course: PHI | | Section/ | Time: R | 12:10- | 1:00 |
| _ | Please evaluate the below. You may also remarks: clarity, orga help students, and at evaluation in to the propertment, Room 1 not be read until final he was always definite may always | o use the reverse sinization, mastery of control of the ping of th | nt and the discussicide. Be sure to include the subject matter, our interest in philosopy your instructor or less and Humanities Be turned into the Office Clear. | on section in de the followir accessibility, ophy. Please return it to the uilding. This exe of the Regis | the space ig in your willingness to turn this philosophy evaluation will trar. | <u>D</u> . |
| _ | hugley sti | imulated | me later | est in | Philoso | Phy |
| | | | nys that co | | | |
| | -organization | ugh the | free for a | n' desi | gn of | , gisassi |
| | Frob | rel could | how, so | a lot een be L say | of sile ther f | me that illed. I for org. |
| ز | Overall teaching effect | | _ | | B0.0B | |
| | EXCELLENT V | ERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | |
| | Overall quality of the | discussion | | | | |
| | EXCELLENT V | ERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | |
| | How often did you atte | end your discussion | n section? | | | |
| / | ALWAYS O | FTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER | |
| | | | | | | |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted | Shear | Quarter/Year: Winter /2014 | |
|---------------------|-----|-------|---|---|
| Course: PHI 13 | | | Section/Time: 001 / Thurs. 12: (0 - 1 p | m |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted is a very organized and knowledgable TA on philosophy. Extremely helpful and friendly he gives a comfortable environment to learn 171.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| Teaching Assistant: Ted | Shecrey | Quarter/Year: Winter ZOIL |
|-------------------------|---------|--------------------------------|
| Course: PHI 13 | | Section/Time: \$ 12:10 - 13:00 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

TA clearly mastery of the subject matter. Section was very nelytul in violantendity the course metrical.

The was willing to denote time to some over complex metrical with students after class. Greating was very feet.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| | | | | | | TATE OF | | |
|---|-----------|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------|-----------|------|--|
| Teaching Assis | stant: | Ted Shear | | Quarter/ | Year: | Winter | 2014 | |
| Course: P | HI. | 13 | | Section/Time: | R | 12:10-1:0 | 20 | |
| Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar. | | | | | | | | |
| Clear | and | definately | transferble | on subject | L nei | ter. | | |
| | | | - | • | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 61 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | i i | | | | |
| | | | | | | | 見 | |
| Overall teaching | g effecti | iveness of the t | teaching assis | stant | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VE | ERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIF | ₹ | POOR | | |
| Overall quality of | of the d | iscussion | | | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VE | ERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIF | ١. | POOR | | |
| How often did yo | ou attei | nd your discuss | sion section? | | | | | |
| ALWAYS | OF | TEN | SOMETIME | S RAR | ELY | NEVER | | |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| Teaching Assistant: | Tad Sherr | Quarter/Year: 10 20 4 |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|
| Course: Phi | | Section/Time: 74 12-1 |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Convered anything we caked about freedly guy. I take chearly, reviewed which we worked, extuctly aperted discussion, latter would lake make

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
|------------------------|----------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| Overall quality of the | ne discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD = | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you | attend your discussi | on section? | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

Instructor Edward Shear

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA - DAVIS

Spring Quarter 2014 PHI 012 (A01) 35121

Student Evaluation of Teaching



| Enrollment 33 % responding 66 | Excellent | xcellent Very Good | | Fair | Poor | | | | |
|--|-----------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|-----|-----|----|
| | 5 % | 4 % | 3 % | 2 % | 1 % | \bar{x} | SD | М | N |
| Please indicate the overall educational value of the course. (excellent I very good I satisfactory I fair I poor) | 9 41% | 3 14% | 5 23% | 3 14% | 2 9% | 3.6 | 1.4 | 4.0 | 22 |
| Overall Quality of the Course | 9 41% | 3 14% | 3 14% | 5 23% | 2 9% | 3.5 | 1.4 | 4.0 | 22 |
| Please indicate the overall teaching effectiveness of the instructor. (excellent I very good I satisfactory I fair I poor) | 8 36% | 4 18% | 5 23% | 2 9% | 3 14% | 3.5 | 1.4 | 4.0 | 22 |
| Instructor's Mastery of the Subject Matter | 13 59% | 3 14% | 2 9% | 2 9% | 2 9% | 4.0 | 1.4 | 5.0 | 22 |
| Instructor's Accessibility and Willingness to Help Students | 11 58% | 2 11% | 2 11% | 2 11% | 2 11% | 3.9 | 1.4 | 5.0 | 19 |
| Instructor's Clarity | 8 36% | 4 18% | 3 14% | 4 18% | 3 14% | 3.5 | 1.5 | 4.0 | 22 |
| Instructor's Ability to Stimulate Interest in Subject | 7 32% | 3 14% | 2 9% | 7 32% | 3 14% | 3.2 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 22 |
| Overall Teaching Effectiveness of the Instructor | 7 32% | 5 23% | 1 5% | 7 32% | 2 9% | 3.4 | 1.4 | 4.0 | 22 |

Additional Comments About the Course

I do not understand why Communication majors are required to take this course. It is full of Computer Science kids and is rather impossible. I suggest considering a different logical course if you to continue to have this requirement.

N/a

It's an interesting subject, but it takes time to understand. Class was cancelled too much to fully learn what we should have, and paid to learn.

The material was very hard to learn. The only notes only helped with sometimes. There were no extra exams we can practice with. Also no recorded lecture to go back to. Assignments were not handed back, so students had no idea what they missed.

Pretty valuable stuff!

A very good complement to engineering courses.

Additional Comments About the Instructor

He was extremely unhelpful, anything I learned I taught myself

N/a

Shear knows the material, there's no doubt about that. However the way in which he teaches the material is at his own preference. I personally feel since he does know the material shouldn't he first be able to explain how to solve problems in simple language that everyone can understand. Then use the logic terms to apply to the respective ideas, that way as time goes on the student can associate the simple explanations with the conventions in logic. Since Shear didn't take the time to do this as the class progressed, for me personally the subject itself was less interesting. That is to point out that at the beginning of the class he did a great job making it interesting since he actually took the time to explain the material clearly. In conclusion, I would suggest he treat every section in the class as if its still a foreign language.

Ted cancelled class for about 2 weeks worth of lecture and he had his TA take over for at least 3 lectures. This is very unprofessional. I paid to take this class. I'm extremely unsatisfied with his professionalism and availability. His TA, Tyrus, seemed to be a better instructor and more available, approachable, and better at clarifying any misunderstandings. I'm sure Ted would have been good had he not missed about half of the quarter.

I had a very hard time understand the professor and his notes. I tried to read the book and still was not able to clarify any material

Ted's lectures/over all course structure was clear and organized. Expectation was challenging yet within a reasonable framework. Def. was able to spark interest in Philosophy!

| Term | Eval Opened | CRN | Subject | Course | Section | Learning Activity | Enrollment | % Response |
|---------------------|--------------------|-------|---------|--------|---------|-------------------|------------|---------------|
| Spring Quarter 2014 | 5/29/2014 12:00 AM | 35121 | PHI | 012 | A01 | Lecture | 33 | 66 |

Instructor Edward Shear

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA - DAVIS

Spring Quarter 2014 PHI 012 (A02) 35122

Student Evaluation of Teaching



| Enrollment 37 % responding 72 | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|-----|-----|----|
| | 5 % | 4 % | 3 % | 2 % | 1 % | \bar{x} | SD | М | N |
| Please indicate the overall educational value of the course. (excellent I very good I satisfactory I fair I poor) | 12 44% | 5 19% | 6 22% | 3 11% | 1 4% | 3.9 | 1.2 | 4.0 | 27 |
| Overall Quality of the Course | 11 41% | 4 15% | 4 15% | 6 22% | 2 7% | 3.6 | 1.4 | 4.0 | 27 |
| Please indicate the overall teaching effectiveness of the instructor. (excellent I very good I satisfactory I fair I poor) | 10 37% | 4 15% | 6 22% | 6 22% | 1 4% | 3.6 | 1.3 | 4.0 | 27 |
| Instructor's Mastery of the Subject Matter | 15 56% | 5 19% | 6 22% | 1 4% | 0 0% | 4.3 | 0.9 | 5.0 | 27 |
| Instructor's Accessibility and Willingness to Help Students | 14 54% | 2 8% | 6 23% | 4 15% | 0 0% | 4.0 | 1.2 | 5.0 | 26 |
| Instructor's Clarity | 11 41% | 0 0% | 9 33% | 5 19% | 2 7% | 3.5 | 1.4 | 3.0 | 27 |
| Instructor's Ability to Stimulate Interest in Subject | 10 38% | 2 8% | 4 15% | 5 19% | 5 19% | 3.3 | 1.6 | 3.0 | 26 |
| Overall Teaching Effectiveness of the Instructor | 10 38% | 3 12% | 7 27% | 5 19% | 1 4% | 3.6 | 1.3 | 3.5 | 26 |

Additional Comments About the Course

This course introduces tools that can be used in everyday life. I strongly believe that my critical thinking skills have improved after taking this course.

The material was presented too quickly, without enough time to have a concrete understanding of it before taking the quizzes. Too many classes were cancelled, which made me feel as if I was at a disadvantage when it came to understanding the material.

Interesting material

I didn't like the group quiz aspect of the course. More often than not I did the entire quiz by myself and someone copied down all of my work onto one sheet to turn in. Other than that, the assignments were challenging and furthered my understanding of the material and the midterm was really challenging as well.

poor

Additional Comments About the Instructor

A great Teacher, sometimes he moves fast, but It comes together through homework and the quizzes, where he lets us learn from one another without a heavy penalty if we make mistakes.

The instructor provided the class with great resources, as well as the willingness to help everyone learn the material. Above all, the instructor is a very intelligent individual. I would definitely recommend him to incoming students.

It would be helpful if the instructor tries to present the material in a different way when a student does not understand it the first time.

Teds awesome. Clear and helpful

N/A

Ted has been very kind throughout the class. He wants to see his students succeed. He is very clear in lecture and shows a very detailed understanding of the subject. If you have any more questions please e-mail Jad Souki at jrsouki@ucdavis.edu. Id be happy to answer any more questions.

Professor Shear had mastery over the material, but he still moved through the material at a pace that was appropriate for us. He never got tired of repeating himself if we needed it. He presented the material in a manner that helped us learn and retain the information.

My only complaint in this class was that he missed 6 days of instruction. Three of those days were taught by the T.A., but I still wish he had been there because there were some discrepancies between the way Tyrus taught the information and the way that Ted wanted us to do it on the exams.

When given the quizzes, I felt like it wasn't really fair for the last 2 quizzes, we didn't really go over them and we were given tough problems to do. We were just barely exposed to it and the quiz wasn't hard but just required a lot of time because we just end up rushing and not finishing it. (last 2 quizzes may have required a little more time)

Cancelled class a lot which made it hard to keep up

Ted is very clear when lecturing, and once he develops more confidence as a lecture I think he'll be a great professor. Every time I went to his office he was extremely helpful and he made sure I understood the material when I left. Overall, a great professor and I would definitely take a course from him again.

| Term | Eval Opened | CRN | Subject | Course | Section | Learning Activity | Enrollment | % Response |
|---------------------|--------------------|-------|---------|--------|---------|-------------------|------------|---------------|
| Spring Quarter 2014 | 5/29/2014 12:00 AM | 35122 | PHI | 012 | A02 | Lecture | 37 | 72 |

Summary of Student Evaluations of Instructors and Courses WINTER QUARTER 2013

Name of Instructor: Ted Shear Total Enrollment:

Course Number: PHI 101 A04 Total # of Responses: 3

14

Course: Metaphysics % of responses to Enri: 21.43%

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|----|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|----------|
| n= | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 66.67% | 33.33% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Overall quality of the course:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|----|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|----------|
| n= | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 66.67% | 33.33% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Frequency of attendance at discussion:

| | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | No Reply |
|------------|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|----------|
| n= | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % = | 66.67% | 0.00% | 33.33% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter Quarter 2013

| Teaching Assistant: Ted Shea | | <u>.</u> | | |
|---|---|--|---|-----------------|
| Course: Phyli Wy Metaphy 5123 | <u> </u> | Section/time: 84/ | 17:00pm | <u></u> - |
| Please evaluate the Teaching Assist below. You may also use the reverse remarks: clarity, organization, master help students, and ability to stimulate evaluation in to the person designated Department, Room 1240 Social Scien not be read until final grades have be | e side. Be sure y of the subject your interest in d by your instru- nces and Huma | to include the follow matter, accessibility philosophy. Pleas ctor or return it to the nities Building. This | ving in your y, willingness to se turn this ne philosophy s evaluation will | and the same of |
| He was very attentive of | his Story | Para de 17 | | |
| not be read until final grades have be He was very attentive for | | THE CORSINOR | s and Whole | - hells stage |
| न्यांत ह | b | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Overall teaching effectiveness of the | teaching assis | tant | | |
| EXCELLENT VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | |
| Overall quality of the discussion | | | | |
| EXCELLENT VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | |
| How often did you attend your discuss | sion section | | | |

SOMETIMES

ALWAYS

OFTEN

RARELY

NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter Quarter 2013

CHEND

| Teaching Assistant: TED STIETLE | |
|---|---|
| Course: PHI 107. | Section/time: 04 TH & |
| Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the below. You may also use the reverse side. Be remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the sure help students, and ability to stimulate your interverse evaluation in to the person designated by your in Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Honor be read until final grades have been turned | e sure to include the following in your ubject matter, accessibility, willingness to rest in philosophy. Please turn this instructor or return it to the philosophy Humanities Building. This evaluation will |
| Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching and EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD | |
| Overall quality of the discussion | |

How often did you attend your discussion section

EXCELLENT

ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter Quarter 2013

| <u>Teachin</u> | g Assista | <u>nt</u> : | TeD Shear | <u>.</u> | |
|----------------|-------------------|-------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| Course: | PHI | 101 | | Section/time: 4 | |
| Please 6 | evaluate <u>t</u> | he Tea | ching Assistant and th | e discussion section in the spa | ice |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Excellent TA

overall no real weaknesses

10 composints

· would give outstanding TA award

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

Summary of Student Evaluations of Instructors and Courses WINTER QUARTER 2013

Name of Instructor:Ted ShearTotal Enrollment:26Course Number:PHI 101 A03Total # of Responses:16Course:Metaphysics% of responses to Enrl:61.54%

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|----|-----------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|----------|
| n= | 11 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 68.75% | 18.75% | 12.50% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Overall quality of the course:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|----|-----------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|----------|
| n= | 9 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 56.25% | 25.00% | 12.50% | 6.25% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Frequency of attendance at discussion:

| | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | No Reply |
|----|--------|--------|-----------|--------|-------|----------|
| n= | 11 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| %≃ | 68.75% | 25.00% | 0.00% | 6.25% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter Quarter 2013

| winter Quarter | r 2013 |
|--|---|
| Teaching Assistant: Ted Shear | |
| Course: Philosophy 101. | Section/time: 03 Thursday 6:10 |
| Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the below. You may also use the reverse side. Be suremarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject help students, and ability to stimulate your interest evaluation in to the person designated by your inst Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humon to be read until final grades have been turned into the mouse what he stalking about the s | re to include the following in your ect matter, accessibility, willingness to t in philosophy. Please turn this tructor or return it to the philosophy manities Building. This evaluation will of the Office of the Registrar |
| | |

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter Quarter 2013

| | The same of | 4 | itel Qualtel 20 | 10 | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|------------------------------|
| Teaching A | Assistant: Ted | SHeo | <u>'(</u> | <u>x</u> | A > | |
| Course: | 1711 | 01 | <u>.</u> | Section/time: | 0 5 | |
| below. You remarks: cl help studer evaluation i Departmen | luate <u>the Teachi</u> I may also use the arity, organizationts, and ability to in to the person of t, Room 1240 So I until final grades | ne reverse s n, mastery stimulate y designated ocial Scienc | side. Be sure to of the subject r our interest in p by your instructes ses and Human | o include the natter, access philosophy. I tor or return it ities Building. | following in you sibility, willingne Please turn this to the philosop This evaluatio | r ess to ohy n will |
| Tol | Was | art 6 | xcellent | TA, S | uper me | le |
| TC9 | I until final grade: . Was in for Me. So | da | nd he | upful | W/ Pap | ers. |
| | Co | dece | incolated by | d and | relato | ble |
| | 50 | WELO. | 111040 |) | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Overall tead | ching effectivene | ss of the te | aching assista | ant | | |
| EXCELLEN | T VERY G | GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | |
| Overall qual | ity of the discus | sion | | | | |
| EXCELLEN. | T VERY G | OOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | |
| How often d | id you attend you | ur discussio | on section | | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | | SOMETIMES | RARE | LY NEVER | |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter Quarter 2013

| <u>Teaching</u> | Assistant: | Ted | Shear | <u>×</u> | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|----------------------|-----------------|---|
| Course: | PMI 101 | | | Section/time: | #3 | |
| Please e | valuate the Tea | achina A | ssistant and | the discussion secti | on in the space | e |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR Overall quality of the discussion EXCELLENT **VERY GOOD FAIR POOR** GOOD How often did you attend your discussion section ALWAYS OFTEN **SOMETIMES** RARELY **NEVER**

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter Quarter 2013

-- 1

| Teaching Assistant: | led Shear | <u>a</u> | | |
|---------------------|------------|---------------|------------|--|
| Course: PHT | <u>lo1</u> | Section/time: | <i>o</i> 3 | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

Overall quality of the discussion

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT (VERY GOOD) GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter Quarter 2013

Teaching Assistant: Ted Shear.

| Course: Dhilo | sophy 101 | <u>.</u> <u>s</u> | ection/time: (| 13 |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| Please evaluate below. You may remarks: clarity, help students, an evaluation in to the Department, Roomot be read until | the Teaching Assi also use the reverse organization, maste and ability to stimulat the person designate om 1240 Social Sciential grades have b | istant and the discuse side. Be sure to itery of the subject made your interest in philed by your instructor ences and Humanities een turned into the Conference of the American Section (1997). | ussion section nclude the follo tter, accessibili ilosophy. Plea or return it to t es Building. Th Office of the Re | in the space wing in your ty, willingness to se turn this he philosophy is evaluation will |
| Overall teaching e | effectiveness of the VERY GOOD | teaching assistan | t FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of t | the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you | attend your discus | ssion section | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS
Winter Quarter 2013

| Teaching Assistant | : led Si | hear. | _ | 3 | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| Course: Phi | 101 | Section | on/time: O | 13 | | |
| below. You may all remarks: clarity, org help students, and evaluation in to the Department, Room not be read until fin | so use the reverse siganization, mastery of ability to stimulate you person designated by 1240 Social Science all grades have beer | nt and the discussion. Be sure to include the subject matter, bur interest in philosopy your instructor or less and Humanities Be turned into the Office | de the following accessibility, ophy. Please return it to the uilding. This can be of the Regis | ng in your willingness to turn this philosophy evaluation will | | |
| Ted n Nefinite the class to disc | ly fried his sopics. | s best to I always e made hi | o holp is look welf r | 1. he user led forware aduly avo | | |
| Overall teaching eff | ectiveness of the tea | aching assistant | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | | |
| Overall quality of the discussion | | | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | | |
| How often did you a | attend your discussion | n section | | | | |
| ALWAYS) | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER | | |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter Quarter 2013

| Teaching Assistar | nt: Ted Shed | x | ke . | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|---------------|---------|--|--|
| Course: Pul. | 101 | <u>.</u> <u>Sec</u> | tion/time: 65 | 3 | | |
| Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar. | | | | | | |
| | od ta. | | p was r | rereded | | |
| Mas Cled | w 4 orgo | CULCCA | | | | |
| Made dis | cussions f | Tun, | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| * | | | | | | |
| | | | | * | | |
| Overall teaching e | ffectiveness of the to | eaching assistant | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | | |
| Overall quality of the | he discussion | | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | | |
| How often did you | attend your discuss | ion section | | | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER | | |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter Quarter 2013

| | **** | 110, 4441101 20 | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| Teaching Assistan | t: TED SHEAR | | | |
| Course: PHI L | 0) | | Section/time: Ø3 | <u>.</u> |
| below. You may a remarks: clarity, or help students, and evaluation in to the Department, Room not be read until fir | le Teaching Assist Iso use the reverse ganization, mastery ability to stimulate y e person designated 1240 Social Sciencial grades have bee | side. Be sure to of the subject n your interest in p by your instruc- ces and Human on turned into the | o include the followin natter, accessibility, ohilosophy. Please tor or return it to the ities Building. This e Office of the Regi | ng in your willingness to turn this philosophy evaluation will strar. |
| Ted was able. | to very clearly | y explain o | ell of the idea | n s arguements |
| presented in | lections. It | me a new | Dund fore of | logie |
| because of | | Thanks | // | |
| | | | 0 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Overall teaching ef | fectiveness of the to | eaching assista | ant | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of th | e discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you a | attend your discussi | ion section | | |

SOMETIMES

RARELY

NEVER

ALWAYS

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter Quarter 2013

| Teaching Assista | ant: Ted Shea | ır . | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| Course: Phi | (01 | <u>. Secti</u> | on/time: 03 | |
| below. You may remarks: clarity, help students, ar evaluation in to the Department, Roo not be read until | the Teaching Assistants also use the reverse organization, mastery and ability to stimulate yhe person designated om 1240 Social Science final grades have bee | side. Be sure to inclue of the subject matter four interest in philos by your instructor or sea and Humanities En turned into the Office. | ude the following accessibility ophy. Please return it to the Building. This ce of the Regi | ing in your , willingness to e turn this e philosophy evaluation will strar. |
| Very ap | proachable t | easy to ask | questions | to. |
| | at stimulating | | within 4 | the class |
| to talk/ | debate about ons. A 1447e | the issues. | | |
| DIPERALL + | antastic of | | ated at | lot of for |
| O VOI -O · | Q 100110 a | made se | ction a | co of for |
| | | | | |
| Overall teaching | effectiveness of the te | aching assistant | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| overall quality of | the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| low often did you | ı attend your discussio | on section | | |
| (LWAYS) | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter Quarter 2013

| Teaching Assistant: TED STIE | 0/2 | | | | | |
|--|------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Course: PHI 101 | Section/time: 03 | | | | | |
| Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space | | | | | | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

THE T.A. FOR THIS SECTION WAS VERY GOOD. ANSWERED QUESTIANS WELL, AND MODE SECTION A JOY TO ATTEND. I WISH HIM WELL IN HIS FUTURE ENDERVORF.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------|-------|
| Overall quality of | the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you | attend your discus | sion section | a n | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter Quarter 2013

| Teaching Assistant: 100 Ont.00 | |
|--|---|
| Course: PN (0) | Section/time: 03 |
| Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the below. You may also use the reverse side. Be somewhat clarity, organization, mastery of the subjict help students, and ability to stimulate your interest evaluation in to the person designated by your interest person person designated by your | ure to include the following in your ject matter, accessibility, willingness to st in philosophy. Please turn this structor or return it to the philosophy imanities Building. This evaluation will to the Office of the Registrar. |
| Ted is very knowledgable of I found it easy to co | and very helpful. |
| I found it easy to co | mmunicate with |
| him and it was easy to | meet up to |
| office hours. Ted only | actes on Harrice |
| when he's teaching, but | other triari trees |
| he was very helpfal. | |

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter Quarter 2013

| Teaching Assistant: | lex | Shar | · | |
|---------------------|-----|------|-----------------|----|
| Course: PHI 101 | | | . Section/time: | 03 |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Great TA, clearly lenew the material, make topics from leading more clear; and his largy to help with honourark.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT (VERY GOOD) GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS OFTEN. SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter Quarter 2013

| Teaching Assist | ant: Ted Shear | / | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| Course: PH | | | tion/time: 03 | 1R6-7 |
| Please evaluate below. You may remarks: clarity, help students, a evaluation in to to Department, Ronot be read until | the Teaching Assista y also use the reverse organization, mastery nd ability to stimulate y the person designated om 1240 Social Science final grades have bee | ant and the discusside. Be sure to income of the subject matter our interest in philo by your instructor of eas and Humanities in turned into the Of | sion section in lude the follower, accessibility sophy. Please return it to the Building. This lice of the Reg | n the space ring in your ry, willingness to e turn this e philosophy sevaluation will istrar. |
| & stim | ys a master | al Mu sy | bject bot | clien |
| Not almo | As a masker | 0,1000 | 7 | |
| or most | Lopics. | | | |
| | | | | E. |
| Overall teaching | effectiveness of the te | aching assistant | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of | the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| low often did yo | u attend your discussion | on section | | |
| LWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter Quarter 2013

| Teaching Assista | nt: TED SHE | AR | <u></u> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| Course: Metaphy | sics 101 phil | <u>Se</u> | ction/time: Ø | 3 |
| below. You may remarks: clarity, or help students, and evaluation in to the Department, Room not be read until for | also use the reverse organization, masted diability to stimulate die person designate m 1240 Social Scie dinal grades have be | stant and the discusses side. Be sure to in ry of the subject matter your interest in phile ed by your instructor of ences and Humanities een turned into the O | clude the follow ter, accessibility osophy. Pleas or return it to the Building. This ffice of the Reg | ving in your v, willingness to e turn this e philosophy s evaluation will jistrar. |
| · Very knowledge · Very helpful, · Eager to assi · One of the L | ble. always able to p ist, great attitud pest T.A.'s I | resent ideas t arg | uements clea ed @ VC Da | rly vis phil. Department. |
| | | • | | ' 1 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Overall teaching e | ffectiveness of the | teaching assistant | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of t | he discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you attend your discussion section | | | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter Quarter 2013

| <u>Teachir</u> | ıg Assistar | ITED SHEAR | R | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| | Phil 1 | | <u></u> | Section/time: 03 | R 6:10 - 7 px |
| below. remarks help stu evaluati Departn | You may a clarity, or dents, and on in to the nent, Roon | also use the reverse rganization, mastery I ability to stimulate e person designated n 1240 Social Scien | side. Be sure y of the subject your interest in d by your instru ices and Huma | scussion section in to include the follow matter, accessibility philosophy. Pleas ctor or return it to the nities Building. This he Office of the Reg | ving in your v, willingness to e turn this e philosophy s evaluation will |
| Teo hu | o did a | laterte jus | es atia. | It was clear | r that |
| | | | | I was more | |
| | | | | crtuide of d | |
| | _ | | | mility & Ding | |
| to | telp | that suph me | e from dro | pping the en | Me. |
| | | | | doing great | |
| | | | | have had Te | |
| | t.a. | | | | |
| | | | | THANKS | ! |
| Overall t | eaching ef | fectiveness of the t | eaching assis | tant | |
| EXCELL | ENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall o | uality of th | ne discussion | | | |
| EXCELL | ENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| low ofte | n did you | attend vour discuss | ion section | | |

SOMETIMES

NEVER

RARELY

ALWAYS

OFTEN

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter Quarter 2013

| Teaching Assistant: | led Thee | <u>r .</u> |
|---------------------|--------------|------------------|
| Course; PHI 101 | Metaphysics. | Section/time: 03 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Though Ted was not my TA, the few times I interacted with him after class, and in office hours and one discussion show his time mastery of the subject and effective teaching style. Great TA.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

Summary of Student Evaluations of Instructors and Courses **SPRING QUARTER 2013**

Name of Instructor: Edward Shear

Total Enrollment:

27

Course Number:

PHI 001 A08

Total # of Responses:

15

Course: Introduction to Philosophy

% of responses to Enrl

55.56%

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|----|-----------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|----------|
| n= | 5 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 33.33% | 53.33% | 13.33% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Overall quality of the course:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|----|-----------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|----------|
| n= | 3 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 20.00% | 46.67% | 26.67% | 6.67% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Frequency of attendance at discussion:

| | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | No Reply |
|----|--------|--------|-----------|--------|-------|----------|
| n= | 8 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 53.33% | 40.00% | 6.67% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| | 3101 | PENT LVALOR | 110110 | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching Assistan | t: Ted Shea | r | Quarter/Year: | Spring 201 | 3 |
| Course: Pha | 1 | | Section/Time: 7 | ed, 6-7 | |
| below. You may a remarks: clarity, or help students, and evaluation in to the Department, Roon | llso use the reverse ganization, master ability to stimulate person designate n 1240 Social Scier | e side. Be sure y of the subjec your interest in d by your instrunces and Huma | liscussion section to include the follo t matter, accessibili philosophy. Plea actor or return it to tanities Building. The | wing in your ty, willingness to se turn this he philosophy is evaluation will | 7 |
| Clear, | organized, | definitely | knw the | | |
| | | | to explosion | *** | |
| wid | h good ena | uples. | | | |
| | · | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | a | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Overall teaching et | fectiveness of the | teaching assi | stant | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | |
| Overall quality of th | ne discussion | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | |
| How often did you | attend your discus | sion section? | | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIME | ES RARELY | NEVER | |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| - | 10.0 | Shan = | | Soda 9 |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| Teaching Assis | tant: | 3/160 | Quarter/ | Year: |
| Course: | 1050phy | _ | Section/Time: | A07610 |
| below. You ma remarks: clarity, help students, a evaluation in to Department, Ro not be read unti | y also use the r , organization, n and ability to stir the person desi oom 1240 Socia I final grades ha | everse side. Be s nastery of the sub nulate your intere ignated by your in I Sciences and He ave been turned in | sure to include the bject matter, acce st in philosophy. Istructor or return umanities Building Into the Office of the | it to the philosophy g. This evaluation will he Registrar. |
| He is | a nice | TA, very | approce | table. |
| Bul | | Do not | minte | discussion |
| -60 | -labors | are ne | cessary | |
| 3 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | n |
| | | | | |
| | | | | 9 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Overall teaching | effectiveness | of the teaching a | ssistant | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOO | OD GOOD | FAIF | R POOR |
| Overall quality o | f the discussion | n | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOO | OD GOOD | FAII | R POOR |
| How often did yo | ou attend your o | discussion section | 1? | |

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| Teaching Assistant: Ted Shear | Quarter/Year: Spring / 2013 |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course: PHI | Section/Time: 6:10-7:00 PM A07 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| STUDENT EVA | LUATIONS | |
|--|--|---|
| Teaching Assistant: Tod Shear | Quarter/Year: | pring/2 |
| Course: Philosophy 001 | Section/Time: 6.10 | 1-7 pm |
| Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the below. You may also use the reverse side. Be remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the sulfine help students, and ability to stimulate your interest evaluation in to the person designated by your in Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Honor be read until final grades have been turned in the person designated by your in Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Honor be read until final grades have been turned in the person designated by your in Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Honor be read until final grades have been turned in the person designated by your in Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Honor be read until final grades have been turned in the person designated by your in Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Honor be read until final grades have been turned in the person designated by your in Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Honor be read until final grades have been turned in the person designated by your in Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Honor be read until final grades have been turned in the person designated by your in Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Honor be read until final grades have been turned in the person designated by your in the person d | sure to include the followir bject matter, accessibility, est in philosophy. Please instructor or return it to the lumanities Building. This e | ng in your willingness to turn this philosophy evaluation wil |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching a | ıssistant | |
| EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of the discussion | | |
| EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you attend your discussion section | n? | |

SOMETIMES

NEVER

RARELY *

ALWAYS

OFTEN

| | | 3100 | ENI EVALUATI | DN2 | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|------------|
| Teaching Ass | istant: Te | id St | rear | Quarter/Year: | Spring 201 | 3 |
| | | | | | Ded: (0:10-7:0 | |
| Please evaluated below. You marks: claritely students, evaluation in the Department, F | ate the Teach hay also use the ty, organization and ability to so the person of Room 1240 Sc | ing Assist ne reverse n, mastery stimulate designated ocial Scien | ant and the disc side. Be sure to of the subject mayour interest in play by your instructories and Humanitien turned into the | include the followatter, accessibility illosophy. Pleas or return it to this Building. This | in the space ving in your y, willingness to se turn this te philosophy s evaluation will | f |
| Ted a | xs clear | حدك | 23×23€. | He scene | 2 to enjoy | |
| tive 1 | retenz (| c-7 | g() coss (0,2 | were, som | all interesti | ^ _ |
| ent usel | àl. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Overall tagehin | a offortive v | | | я | | |
| Overall teachin | ig ellectivenes | ss or the te | eaching assistar | ıt | | |
| EXCELLENT | (VERY G | GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | |
| Overall quality | of the discus | sion | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY G | OOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | |
| How often did y | ou attend yου | ır discussi | on section? | | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN |) | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER | |

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| Teaching Assistant: Ted Sheok | Quarter/Year: Spring 2013 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course: PH 1 001 | Section/Time: AOI 6:10 PM |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------|----------|-------|
| Overall quality of | of the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did y | ou attend your discus | sion section? | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY = | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| Teaching Assistant: <u>Teaching Assistant</u> : | 1 Snear | Quarter/Year: | Spring/2013 |
|---|---------|-------------------|-------------|
| Course: Phi Ol | | Section/Time: 103 | 6:10-7:00 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| Teaching Assista | int: Ted sne | ear | Quarter/Year: | Spring 2013 | i |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| Course: Phi I | | <u>Se</u> | ction/Time:6 | - 7 PM | |
| below. You may remarks: clarity, of help students, an evaluation in to the Department, Roo | also use the revolution and ability to stimulate person designated in 1240 Social S | erse side. Be sure to stery of the subject m late your interest in pl lated by your instructo iciences and Humanit be been turned into the | include the follow atter, accessibilith hilosophy. Pleas or or return it to thiles Building. Thi | wing in your y, willingness to se turn this ne philosophy s evaluation wil | |
| | | ply in our | ustion av | ed mad | 4 |
| under str | and arbiti | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Ü | | | | | |
| Overall teaching o | effectiveness of t | the teaching assista | nt | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | | FAIR | POOR | |
| Overall quality of | the discussion | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | |
| How often did you | u attend your dis | cussion section? | | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER | |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| Teaching | g Assistant: Ted She | ar | Quarter/Year: S | 1er 11/2013 |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Course: | | | ction/Time: A67 | Ů. |
| Please e below. Y remarks help stud evaluation Departm | evaluate the Teaching As You may also use the rev I clarity, organization, ma dents, and ability to stimu on in to the person design tent, Room 1240 Social Sead until final grades have | erse side. Be sure to estery of the subject malate your interest in pl nated by your instructo Sciences and Humanit | include the following atter, accessibility, allosophy. Please or or return it to the lies Building. This | ng in your willingness to turn this philosophy evaluation will |
| | | | | |
| | | а | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | , | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Overall to | eaching effectiveness of | the teaching assista | nt | |
| EXCELL | | <u>-</u> | FAIR - | POOR |
| | uality of the discussion | | , , , , , , | |
| EXCELL | / | | FAIR | POOR |
| | n did you attend your dis | | 4 4 22.4 | |
| ALWAY |) | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| Teaching Assistant: Ted Sheav | Quarter/Year: S13 |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course: PHI 004 | Section/Time: Wed 6:10 -7:00 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the **teaching assistant** EXCELLEN VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR Overall quality of the discussion VERY GOOD **EXCELLENT** GOOD FAIR **POOR** How often did you attend your discussion section? YLWAYS **OFTEN** SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

| | STUDE | ENT EVALUA | TIONS | |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| Teaching Assistar | nt: Ted Shea | Υ | Quarter/Year: | Spring 13 |
| Course: PHI | | | Section/Time: The | M Wed. |
| below. You may a remarks: clarity, o help students, and evaluation in to the Department, Room not be read until fi | also use the reverse s rganization, mastery I ability to stimulate y e person designated n 1240 Social Sciend nal grades have beel | side. Be sure of the subject our interest in by your instru es and Huma n turned into | liscussion section in to include the follow the matter, accessibility in philosophy. Please actor or return it to the anities Building. This the Office of the Regions. | ing in your , willingness to e turn this e philosophy evaluation will istrar. |
| , clear | , organi | zed, | bussian | ate |
| WBOL | 300 30 | _ | | |
| | | | have o | riscossed |
| practice | L QUIZZ | 52 W | ne | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Overall teaching e | ffectiveness of the te | aching assi | stant | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of t | he discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you | attend your discussi | on section? | | |

SOMETIMES

RARELY NEVER

OFTEN

ALWAYS

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| Teaching Assista | int: Fed Show | | Quarter/Year: | Spring 2013 |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| Course: Philos | sophy 1 | Secti | ion/Time: | |
| below. You may remarks: clarity, of help students, an evaluation in to the Department, Roo | the Teaching Assistance also use the reverse organization, mastery displayed ability to stimulate the person designated in 1240 Social Scientifical grades have been seen as a contract of the | side. Be sure to in of the subject mat your interest in phil I by your instructor ces and Humanitie | nclude the follow ter, accessibility losophy. Please or return it to the s Building. This | ing in your , willingness to e turn this e philosophy evaluation will |
| Good TA | final grades have been was allow He discos | Clocar a | A to the second | |
| | ē. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | 12 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Overall teaching e | effectiveness of the t | eaching assistant | t | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of | the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you | ı attend your discuss | ion section? | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY = | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| Teaching Ass | sistant: Ted Shear | | uarter/Year: | 813 |
|----------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Course: PH | | | /Time: 6:10 | |
| Please evaluation in Department, | ate the Teaching Assistance at the Teaching Assistance and also use the reverse so ity, organization, mastery of and ability to stimulate you to the person designated by Room 1240 Social Science at the timal grades have been | int and the discussible. Be sure to inclose the subject matte our interest in philose by your instructor or es and Humanities | ion section in ude the following r, accessibility, sophy. Please return it to the Building. This | the space ng in your willingness to turn this philosophy evaluation will |
| Good | & Enthusiastic, & wasinterested | seemed live | che reall | y did |
| Care | & wasinterested | 1 Inthema | iteria (| |
| | | | | |
| | | ψ | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Overall teach | ing effectiveness of the te | aching assistant | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality | y of the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |

SOMETIMES

NEVER

RARELY

How often did you attend your discussion section?

ALWAYS

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| OTOBERT ZIABO | 71110110 |
|--|--|
| Teaching Assistant: Teal Suar Course: Plulosophy 1 | Quarter/Year: Some 2013 Section/Time: Wed 6 1 pm |
| Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sur remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subjection. | re to include the following in your |

help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy. Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted was the ideal philosophy TA.
the really words an effort to everage
us and be available to greations.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

ALWAYS



SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| Teaching Assistant: Ted Shear | | Quarter/Year: Se / 2013 | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------|---|--|--|--|
| Course: | PHI 001 | Section/Time: Webraslay 6:10 - 7:00 | | | |
| DI | | Carrel 4ta a diagona in a canada mana a canada mana a canada manada manada manada manada manada manada manada m | | | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT **VERY GOOD** GOOD FAIR POOR Overall quality of the discussion FAIR EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD POOR How often did you attend your discussion section? ALWAYS SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER OFTEN

Summary of Student Evaluations of Instructors and Courses WINTER QUARTER 2012

Name of Instructor: Ted Shear

Total Enrollment:

28

Course Number:

PHI 101 A02

Total # of Responses:

14

Course:

Theory of Knowledge

% of responses to Enri

50.00%

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|----|-----------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|----------|
| n= | 9 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 64.29% | 21.43% | 14.29% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Overall quality of the course:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|----|-----------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|----------|
| n= | 7 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 50.00% | 21.43% | 28.57% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Frequency of attendance at discussion:

| | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | No Reply |
|----|--------|--------|-----------|--------|-------|----------|
| n= | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 85.71% | 14.29% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: Ted Shear | E A A 1 | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| Course: PHI 101 | Section/time: AO \ | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted strick me as very knowledgable; he was always willing and able to Explain correspond adopth and address individual concerns in section. He made himself available outside of class for students, led involved and interesting alisables outside of class for students, led involved and interesting of object. I would be more than happy to attend a discussion led by Ted in the Viture

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: Ted | Shear | • | 0 | |
|-------------------------|-------|---------------|------------|--|
| Course: PHI 101 | | Section/time: | 7:10 - Opm | |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted is an excellent feaching assistant. He is able to provide sufficient examples of at the arguments that were presented by the instructor. He's clear and concise and shows a deep understanding of metaphysics. However, when it comes down to help he pretty much disrourages one from pursuing a paper topic.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
|--------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|-------|
| Overall quality of | the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you | ı attend your discus | sion section | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted shear | | - 6 |
|---------------------|-----------|--------------------|---------|
| Course: Phi [0] | | Section/time: A 01 | TUES 70 |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

clarity-excellent!!

organitation-great
accessibility-very helpful e-mail responses
mastery-thanks for sharing your research with us! It's very inspiring and
Mastery-thanks for sharing your research in clistus sion. Please
I've never had a TA share their research in clistus sion. Please
email us the topic again + good luck!
ability to stimulate interest-superb!! This course has inspired me to
minor in philosophy now "Thank you for your patience,
easy going attitude, + sense of humor.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT **VERY GOOD** GOOD FAIR POOR Overall quality of the discussion VERY GOOD **FAIR** POOR EXCELLENT GOOD How often did you attend your discussion section RARELY NEVER ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIMES

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted | Shell | |
|---------------------|-----|-------|--------------------|
| Course: [] 1 10 1 | AOL | • | Section/time: 1.10 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Always willing to inswer questions and Presented nuterial in a way which made it easier to under stand.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted Shear | | 1.01 |
|---------------------|-----------|---------------|------|
| Course: Phil 10/ | | Section/time: | NOT |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted was very clear and organized. He was extremely knowledgable. Overall it now a great experience. My only complaint is that the grading seemed a bit too kawh. This probably had more to do with the mitructor than Tel

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: Ted Shear | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course: Philosophy 101 . | Section/time: A 0 2-/ ? -8 |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

He is willing to answer questions. Class was open to discussion. Sometimes unclear, but clausies if someone asked. He is accessible after class and office hours. Subject matter is pretty difficult and difficult to simplify, so it is not suprising that it is at times confusing.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted Shear | | ~ ~ |
|---------------------|-----------|--------------------|---------|
| Course: PHI 101 | 24 | Section/time: 7485 | 1-8 pm. |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted is great. The was available to help me with 2 essays the always explained difficult concepts clearly. Good classroom skills, land, clear voice and friendly.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted | | |
|---------------------|-----|-----------------------|---|
| Course: 19 | | Section/time: 1 /. 00 | 9 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

He should give more tips for the quiting, midterm or paper.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | TED | <u>.</u> | | |
|----------------------------|-----|---------------|-----|------------|
| Course: PITTIV | | Section/time: | TUE | 1910 -1000 |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted is an amazing. TA always trying to stir discussion and rengage the class. His good looks are pretty distracting, though, when I get older, we will much again and he will be my future musband

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | TED | SHEAR | |
|---------------------|-----|-------|---------------------|
| Course: PHI IOI | | | Section/time: Aol . |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

TED WAS DEEY KNOWING OF THE MANDER AND SHOWED

ENTHUSIAS IN THE SUBJECT WHICH MADE CLASS

CLEHR AND INTERESTING

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted | Shear | | 4 | |
|---------------------|-----|----------|---------------|-----|--|
| Course: PHI 1 | 01 | <u> </u> | Section/time: | A01 | |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Tech | shear | . + 7 0 | |
|---------------------|------|-------|--------------------------|--|
| Course: Phi. | 101 | * | Section/time: Vo. (- Op~ | |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

I think that the T.A. demonstrated a lot of knowledge & enthusiam in regards to the class.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | TED Shear | | | |
|---------------------|------------------|---------------|-----|--|
| Course: Phil | 101 - wetapayons | Section/time: | Apl | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Great +Ab Hard grader for This class. Thanks

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistan | II TED Sne | <u>Section</u> | on/time: | 01 | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| below. You may a remarks: clarity, or help students, and evaluation in to the Department, Room not be read until fir | e Teaching Assistates lso use the reverse seganization, mastery ability to stimulate yearson designated in 1240 Social Science hal grades have been | side. Be sure to inclut of the subject matter our interest in philoso by your instructor or es and Humanities E In turned into the Office | ide the following accessibility, ophy. Please return it to the Building. This ce of the Regi | ing in your willingness to turn this philosophy evaluation will strar. | | | |
| | tle was a | | | | | | |
| to ha | semized, ic ond we re had a | 7/4 Had | was | so willing | | | |
| to help | hid studen | ls. / emaile | d him and | I he gave | | | |
| one a tuori | augh reply. Hrant y | 1 am excite W , Te J | d for p | the gave | | | |
| Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant | | | | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | | | |
| Overall quality of th | ne discussion | | | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | | | |
| How often did you | attend your discussion | on section | | | | | |
| ALWAYS [1] | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER | | | |

Summary of Student Evaluations of Instructors and Courses WINTER QUARTER 2012

Name of Instructor: Ted Shear

Total Enrollment:

28

Course Number:

PHI 101 A01

Total # of Responses:

18

Course:

Theory of Knowledge

% of responses to Enri

64.29%

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|----|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|----------|
| n= | 11 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 61.11% | 33.33% | 5.56% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Overall quality of the course:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|----|-----------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|----------|
| n= | 10 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 55.56% | 22.22% | 22.22% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Frequency of attendance at discussion:

| | Always O | | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | No Reply | |
|----|----------|--------|-----------|--------|-------|----------|--|
| n= | 13 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| %= | 72.22% | 22.22% | 5.56% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted | Shear | E | | |
|---------------------|-----|--------------|---------------|-----|--|
| Course: Phi 101 | | <u>04</u> ,3 | Section/time: | Aol | |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted was very clear and organized. He was always willing and orbit to argue questions is help students. He lupt us interested for the most part, I was overall excellent.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching / | Assistant: | Ted Shear | | | |
|------------|------------|-----------|---------------|-----|--|
| Course: | PHI 101 | | Section/time: | AOL | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Nice guy , tough, grader

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT (VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | TED SHEAR | | |
|---------------------|-----------|------------------|--|
| Course: MI 101 | 74 | Section/time: AO | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Good lanowledge of subject matter, responsive to students' questions. Guld do a tetter job fostering class-wide doscussion

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching | Assistant: | Ted | SLEGIS | | 1.10 | 7:0000 | Tues |
|----------|------------|-----|--------|---------------|-------|--------|------|
| Course: | PL: 101 | A01 | | Section/time: | 8-10- | 7:00/~ | ines |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Tod shor Ba good TA. He Bleliki and oneness questions.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| | TED | CHEAR | A OT |
|---------------------|-----|---------|--------------|
| Teaching Assistant: | 100 | 3110711 | - 'mm |
| Course: PHIC | (6) | Section | n/time: F.OO |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

- Great T.A, enthusiastic and very approachable. - He's a kewl guy.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Ass | stant: _ | Ted | Shear | <u>.</u> | | | 8 76 c |
|--------------|----------|-----|-------|---------------|-----|---|----------|
| Course: PH | I 101 | | | Section/time: | ADI | 7 | 6:10 pm. |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

OFTEN

ALWAYS)

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Edward | Shear | | 1. | |
|---------------------|--------|-------|---------------|-----|-------|
| Course: Ptill | 101 | | Section/time: | 4-5 | 7 - 6 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

VERY HELPEUL TA, CLEAR * VERY COOL TA ENJOY DISCUSSION AND & GRade very Fair escays.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted Shear | | |
|---------------------|-----------|-------------------|--|
| Course: PHI 101 | • | Section/time: ADI | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

He was good. Seared side he know what he was a respond, but over sil what.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

Section/time:

FAIR

RARELY

POOR

NEVER

| Please evaluate the below. You may a remarks: clarity, or help students, and evaluation in to the Department, Room not be read until fire | also use the r ganization, r ability to stir person des n 1240 Socia | everse si nastery o nulate yo ignated b I Science | de. Be su f the subj ur interes y your ins s and Hu | ure to inclect matte t in philos tructor or manities l | ude the r, acce sophy. return Buildin | e follovessibilites Please it to the greater it | wing in your y, willingnes: se turn this ne philosoph s evaluation | s to |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|-------|
| Very engagin | g TA. | Very | know | Dyab | le o | ind | articul | ute. |
| Very engagin Always will tedious. | ing to | Slow | down | and | 90 (| W. | Matrial | Hal's |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | Đ. | | | | | | | |
| Overall teaching e | | | _ | sistant | | _ | 2002 | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GO | OD | GOOD | | FAII | K | POOR | |

GOOD

SOMETIMES

Overall quality of the discussion

VERY GOOD

How often did you attend your discussion section

OFTEN

EXCELLENT

ALWAYS

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching | Assista | nt: | Ted | Shear | | Α | |
|----------|---------|-----|-----|-------|---------------|-----|--|
| Course: | Phi | 101 | | * | Section/time: | AOL | |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: TED (EDWARD SHEAR) |) |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Course: PH1 (D) | Section/time: T V 10 - 7 PM |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

TED IS AWESOME! HE'S ALWAYS WILLING TO HELP ? VERY CLEAR IN HIS BREAK-DOWN OF THE MATERIAL.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: Ted Shear | 4.04 | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| Course: PHY 101 | Section/time: ATO | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Discussion > Lecture, much more focused

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: Ted Shear | | 1.10.7 01 |
|-------------------------------|---|-----------|
| Course: Metaphysics 101. | Section/time: \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ | 6:10-7 PM |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted the has been a very helpful and respectful TA. He responds to e-mails quickly.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

OFTEN

ALWAYS

| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | | | |
|--|---------------|------|------|------|--|--|--|
| Overall quality of t | he discussion | | | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | | | |
| How often did you attend your discussion section | | | | | | | |

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

Teaching Assistant: Ted Shear

Course: Philosophy 10 1 Metaphys 1 Section/time: 6:10 PM F

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

The best very knowledgedle & helpful durry discussion, Quite friendle opproachable, A++ & would (the oza TA ogan.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted | Shear | | |
|---------------------|-----|----------|---------------|--|
| Course: Philosophy | 101 | <u>.</u> | Section/time: | |
| | | | A | |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted | 5 hear | | | <u></u> | |
|---------------------|-----|--------|---------------|------|---------|--|
| Course: Phil lo | 1 | | Section/time: | Tue. | 610 | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

was knowledgable, answered Questions

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | TED SHEAR | | |
|---------------------|-----------|------------------|--|
| Course: THI 101 | * | Section/time: AD | |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Winter 2012

| Teaching Assistant | led Dreut | Section | n/time: Tuesd | au Gens |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| <u> </u> | · | | W same | |
| below. You may all remarks: clarity, org help students, and a evaluation in to the Department, Room | e Teaching Assistares ouse the reverse signization, mastery of ability to stimulate you person designated by 1240 Social Science al grades have been | ide. Be sure to include of the subject matter, our interest in philoso by your instructor or res and Humanities Bu | de the followin accessibility, a phy. Please return it to the uilding. This e | ng in your willingness to turn this philosophy evaluation will |
| Very ood prestly taught | good at me a me tran | respondi | les-10 | emal Haph |
| | | | | |
| Overall teaching eff | fectiveness of the tea | aching assistant | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of th | e discussion | ø | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you a | attend your discussion | on section | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

Summary of Student Evaluations of Instructors and Courses SPRING QUARTER 2012

Name of Instructor: Ted Shear

Total Enrollment:

27

Course Number:

PHI 015 A02

Total # of Responses:

19

Course:

Bioethics

% of responses to Enrl:

70.37%

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|----------|
| n= | 5 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 26.32% | 26.32% | 42.11% | 5.26% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Overall quality of the course:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------|--------|-------|----------|
| n= | 1 | 5 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 5.26% | 26.32% | 57.89% | 10.53% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Frequency of attendance at discussion:

| | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | No Reply |
|-----------|--------|--------|-----------|--------|-------|----------|
| n= | 5 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 26.32% | 42.11% | 31.58% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching | Assistant: Te | ol Shear | | 0.16 |
|----------|---------------|----------|---------------------|-----------|
| Course: | PHIL15 | | Section/time: Thuvs | 2:10-3:00 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Clority: Ted 1005 overall clear on concepts, but sometimes went on tangents that words inecessary I felt.

Organization: Good ordall. Again, some targets many home led to less arganization MOSEM: Vary Knowledgable

Acress: Grood

Willingress: Good

Interest: I always evilar philosophy classes, and he kept the interested

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assista | nt: Ted Sh | ear Secti | on/time: The | usday 2:10 |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| below. You may remarks: clarity, of help students, and evaluation in to the Department, Room not be read until f | the Teaching Assistate also use the reverse sorganization, mastery display ability to stimulate you person designated m 1240 Social Science inal grades have been | side. Be sure to incle of the subject matter our interest in philos by your instructor or es and Humanities In turned into the Offi | ude the follow r, accessibility ophy. Please return it to the Building. This ce of the Regi | ing in your , willingness to e turn this e philosophy evaluation will strar. |
| Philisoph | ical and | knew ter | t materi minologi | ial; very y ¿ concepts oo general |
| n philoso | phy over | the top | ics co | or general |
|) as the | what h | Jas regui | red or | expected appreciated on the he ossays. |
| little me | to ascist | ation of | topics ting t | on the |
| | effectiveness of the te | | | c 23, 1/3. |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of | the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | WERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you | ı attend your discussi | on section | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Shear, Ted | | | | 62000 |
|---------------------|------------|---------------|------|----------|--------|
| Course: PHIIS | | Section/time: | 002. | - I hurs | 6 7 by |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Wonderful Section. Discussion was always clear and well organized. Each class I would find numerous ideas to jot down, or questions raised that I might not have considered myself. The Stimulating enough for me to switch to being a PHI major.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | ted Shear | | - | |
|---------------------|-----------|---------------|-----|--|
| Course: PH1-15 | | Section/time: | 002 | |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

I did enjoy discussion as an additional outlet for discussing the difficult topics of the course. Sometimes I felt as if Ted rambled a bit or lost his train of thought which seems common when discussing philosophy. The organization could been a bit better as well. I also sometimes felt his personal beliefs came through a bit too strongly in discussion.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: Tea Sheet | ě. | A A \ |
|--|---------------------|----------------|
| Course: PH 15 | Section/time: | 007 |
| | | |
| Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the | e discussion sectio | n_in the space |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Marty: 4/5

Organization: Unt tre much troganice
mastery: 5/5, I trusted him
accessibility: NA
williagrass. NA
williagrass. NA
franciste: 4.5/5

Postrumate
glubotythy

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted | Sherr | | | 5.13 |
|---------------------|-----|-------|---------------|-----|-----------|
| Course: PhI - | 5 | | Section/time: | 002 | 5 B - 5 D |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted Shear | <u>.</u> | |
|---------------------|-----------|---------------|-----|
| Course: PHI IS | 5 | Section/time: | A02 |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Shear |
|-------|
| |

Course: PHI 15 . Section/time: A02 2:10-3

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

. There was a lot of group discussions that I liked.

I like the extension of other forms of philosophy that connect to what we're reading and how it is relevant.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOO

GOOD FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant Course: | Ted 1215 | Shear . Secti | ion/time: | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| Please evaluate the below. You may al remarks: clarity, orghelp students, and evaluation in to the Department, Room not be read until fin | so use the revers ganization, master ability to stimulate person designate 1240 Social Scie al grades have be | e side. Be sure to include a side. Be sure to include a sure to include a your interest in philosed by your instructor or inces and Humanities been turned into the Office. | ude the follow r, accessibility sophy. Please return it to the Building. This ice of the Reg | ing in your , willingness to e turn this e philosophy evaluation will istrar. |
| ABA borny | but might | grist be the f | we of th | eday. |
| Learned | a (01 | more The | class, 5 | . 0004 |
| | | 6047 1 t | | |
| But | for ere | el - pro-chable | 4 5 m/ | and very |
| Overall teaching eff | fectiveness of the | teaching assistant | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of th | e discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you a | attend your discus | ssion section | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | TEDSHEAR | | |
|---------------------|----------|------------------------|--------|
| Course: PHL 15 | | Section/time: THURDAYS | 1-20M. |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

THIS THE DISCUSSION; HOWEVER L'SOMETHNESS
FELT THAT YOUR LECTURES WERE DISORGANIZED
AND OFFICH SUPE-TRACKED, YOUR MISTERY OF
THE METERIAL WAS OBVIOUS BUT FOR AN INTRODUCTION COURSE, MAUBE SIMPLER TEXMS WOULD'US BEEN
MORE HELPFUL,

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | +BD | Shear | | | |
|---------------------|-----|-------|---------------|------|--|
| Course: Phi 15 | | 140 | Section/time: | 2:00 | |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

- PORTS take a bit away from
ORGANIZATION, but are thought practing
- good overall
- presented ways to see motorial

POOR

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | ed | Shear | |
|---------------------|----|-------|----------------------------------|
| Course: PHI 15 | | | Section/time: Thursday 2:10-3:00 |
| | | | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Clarity, organization, mastery of subject, occessibility, willingness to help students, and obility to stimulate interest were au excellent el enjoyed discussion and harned a lot. Sometimes he talked for a long time so there wasn't much time for dissussion among students. But class was still very helpful and informative.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

ALWAYS

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD FAIR POOR GOOD Overall quality of the discussion **VERY GOOD EXCELLENT** GOOD **FAIR POOR** How often did you attend your discussion section RARELY **NEVER OFTEN**

SOMETIMES

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted Shear | | 4 0 |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----|
| Course: Philosophy | 15 | . Section/time: | 2-3 |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

TA uses a lot of logic in discussion that may seem confusing or irrelevant to those unfamiliar with the material the often gues on sants, which makes it hard for students to give input an topic. Accepting to input, though. Somewhad helpful during office hums and email, but has hyper expectations them instructor.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: Ad Sea | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|
| Course: AMUSOPH 15 | Section/time: 607 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Stimulities, thinking out proudes an consument to share on thaths, over I out supplement to lader

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching | Assistant: | Ted | 2NEO15 | | | 1 | Library |
|----------|------------|------|--------|---------------|-----|-------|----------|
| Course: | PHILOSOPH | Y 15 | | Section/time: | A02 | 12:10 | Thursday |
| 7/ | | - | | | | | |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

- this was a very remarding discussion section
-conversations and discussions correlated well
with lectures with an opportunity to go more in
depth
-you are very insignific and nearing your thoughts
was interesting
- for future classes, you should make discussion section
mandatory.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching | Assistant: | EDWARD | SHEAR | | | |
|----------|------------|-------------|-------|---------------|------|--------------|
| | | BIDETHICS . | | Section/time: | AOI. | 1110-2:001MR |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

NEEDED TO BE MORE PREPARED. FOR DIRLUSTION RELITIONS, ORGANITED
BE MORE ARLE TO ENGRACE THE CHOUP AS A WHOLE
RESPOND TO EMMUS IN A MORE TIMELY MATTER

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted Shear | <u>.</u> | |
|---------------------|-----------|-------------------|---------------|
| Course: PHI IS | • | Section/time: 62- | Thurs 2-3 mm. |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

· work on presentation
· could pairing (stating at Bround/erratic hard gestures

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

NEVER

was there a sign in sheet for every discussion? = - I did not know this

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted Shear | | | |
|---------------------|-----------|---------------|-------|--------|
| Course: Phi 15 | | Section/time: | Thurs | 2:10-3 |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

The conscisions we had were interesting because of the topic but I wish we did more interactive activities since this is a discussion class.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

Summary of Student Evaluations of Instructors and Courses SPRING QUARTER 2012

Name of Instructor: Ted Shear

Total Enrollment:

29

Course Number:

PHI 015 A01

Total # of Responses:

18

Course:

Bioethics

% of responses to Enrl:

62.07%

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|----------|
| n= | 6 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 33.33% | 33.33% | 27.78% | 5.56% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Overall quality of the course:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|-----|-----------|-----------|---------|--------|--------|----------|
| n= | 6 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| %= | 33.33% | 27 78% | 33.33% | • | - | 0.00% |
| 70- | 33,337 | 21.70/ | 33,3370 | 0.0070 | 3.5070 | 0.0070 |

Frequency of attendance at discussion:

| | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | No Reply |
|----|--------|--------|-----------|--------|-------|----------|
| n= | 7 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 38.89% | 44.44% | 11.11% | 5.56% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: Ted Shear | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course: PHI 015 | Section/time: K 1.00 pm . |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

- Not very clear. His an interesting guy but often has points that we kind of out there.

- Organized just Fine.
- Knows everything.
- Easy L contact & approachable.
- Willing to help.
- Stimulahed my interest.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT YERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | ted shear | | |
|---------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Course: PHI 15 | | Section/time: | 2:10 pm - 3:00 pm. |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

The TA was very knowledgable on the subject matter and prouded many example to help quice students in understanding the material. There were a lot of thought experiments that helped stimulate discussion to. I think allowing students to discuss issues in groups would have encouraged more participation.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

VERY GOOD EXCELLENT GOOD FAIR POOR Overall quality of the discussion EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR How often did you attend your discussion section ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant Course: βμω ις | : Tel Show: | Section | n/time: Coo | 2. | | |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------|--|--|
| Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar. | | | | | | |
| Jet lea Students autiles | and helped to | Liscussion, really | y thioling about | of the | | |
| *** | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| ħ | | | | | | |
| Overall-teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant | | | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | | |
| Overall quality of the | e discussion | | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | | |
| How often did you a | uttend your discussio | n section | | | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER | | |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching | Assistant: | Ted Shear | • | | | |
|----------|------------|-----------|---------------|-------|-------|-------------|
| Course: | DN1 15 | | Section/time: | T | R | 10:30-11:50 |
| | | | | R dow | O)(iA | 1-40-2:00 |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Sometimes very borney or estplains not very clearly.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT V

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: Ted Shear | <u>*</u> | 1110 4 |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Course: PHI - Biothics. | Section/time: | 1:10 pm Thursdays |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Knows his stuff. Very good at explaining extremely dense/difficult material/ideas. Would love to take a class from him. Very approachable during office hours.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Edward Shear | | cookin AD1 /1 mg | |
|---------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------------|----|
| Course: PHI 15 | | Section/time: | section AOI/Ipm-2p | žή |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

ted is easer to help students & easing accentible during office his.

However, discussion @ times may teem somewhat disargunized / has no clear agenda thereor, he attempts to Stimulate discussion of Qs.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Edward | Shear | | 1 | |
|---------------------|--------|-------|---------------|------|--|
| Course: Phi 15 | | | Section/time: | p.m. | |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Mixed feelings about their T.A., he had a lot of things to say but many of them mere his own beased openions which I don't feel like helped us in any man. He is also a really bad speaker always stoned at the ground and mumbbled.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted | Shear | | 110000 |
|---------------------|-----|-------|---------------|---------------|
| Course: Ph. 15 | | | Section/time: | 1:10-5:00 BIN |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

At beginning of the quarter, a little disorganized with makinal presented (discussion impress. By the end of the quarks the discussions were very helpful & supplemental to recover

World like to rake TA again

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

Teaching Assistant: Ted Shears.
Course: PH/15.

| below. You may remarks: clarity, help students, as evaluation in to to Department, Rose | the Teaching Assistary also use the reverse sorganization, mastery on ability to stimulate you the person designated to make 1240 Social Science final grades have been | ide. Be sure to inclu of the subject matter, our interest in philoso oy your instructor or r es and Humanities B | de the following accessibility, sphy. Please return it to the uilding. This e | ng in your willingness to turn this philosophy evaluation will |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| Ted m | akes his po sion, lus dent to | int very c | lear d | luning leseys |
| fue Stu | dent to | get involu | e ai | d enga |
| | | | e | |
| Overall teaching | effectiveness of the te a | aching assistant | | |
| • | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| | f the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did yo | ou attend your discussion | on section | | |
| AI WAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARFLY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | | 69 | 5r | M | | |
|---------------------|----|----|----|---|---------------|--|
| Course: Ph; | 15 | | | | Section/time: | |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

· Very good @ stimulating discussion.
· Could benefit from more preparation
before discussion

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: Tad | Shear | | -1 | 1.1- |
|-------------------------|-------|---------------|------|------------|
| Course: PHI IS | | Section/time: | Thus | 1:10 -2:00 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

Overall quality of the discussion

VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

VERY GOOD

EXCELLENT

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | TOD | Shear | × | A1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | Lina | |
|---------------------|--------|-------|---------------|--|------|--|
| Course: | 2hi 15 | | Section/time: | 1/h1 15 | 1.00 | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

This is an intro to philosophy course. So maybe the dumb down the explanations so mose of us who are not good within thinkers can understand.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------|--------|-------|--|--|
| Overall quality of t | he discussion | | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | (GOOD) | FAIR | POOR | | |
| How often did you attend your discussion section | | | | | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER | | |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted | Shear | | |
|---------------------|-----|-------|---------------------|----------|
| Course: PHI 15 | | | Section/time: Thurs | 1:10-2pm |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted is very nice, smart, and helpful.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD

POOR FAIR

Overall quality of the discussion

VERY GOOD EXCELLENT

GOOD

FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted | Shears | |
|---------------------|-----|--------|-------------------------------|
| Course: Phi 15 | | | Section/time: Thursday - 2:10 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistan | | Shear | | Section/t | time: | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| Please evaluate the below. You may a remarks: clarity, or help students, and evaluation in to the Department, Room not be read until fit | he Teaching also use the r rganization, r d ability to stir e person des n 1240 Socia | reverse sidemastery of mulate you signated by all Sciences | e. Be sure the subject r interest in your instru and Huma | scussion to include matter, as philosoph ctor or ret nities Buil | section in the following the following coessibility, by. Please urn it to the ding. This | ng in your willingness to turn this philosophy evaluation will |
| Great Je | 6 1 Ju | st nec | ed to | unte | a bi | more |
| Great Je Clearly | & bigge | r, | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | 8 | | | | | |
| Overall teaching e | ffectiveness | of the teac | hing assis | tant | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GO | OD (| GOOD | F | AIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of t | he discussi o | on | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GO | OD (| GOOD | F | AIR | POOR |
| How often did you | attend your | discussion | section | | | |
| ALWAYS (| OFTEN |) 5 | SOMETIME | S R | RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant | Ted | . Section | on/time: Thuy | 5.1-2 | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------|--|--|--|
| Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar. You knew exactly what you were talking about and had full communated the subject sometimes may be it would be more organized. Everally, when your plants in the provided second in the p | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Overall teaching ef | fectiveness of the te | eaching assistant | | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | | | |
| Overall quality of th | e discussion | | | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | | | |
| How often did you a | attend your discuss | ion section | | | | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER | | | |

SOMETIMES

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | 120 | <u>.</u> | 5 |
|---------------------|-----|---------------|----------------|
| Course: Phi IS | • | Section/time: | Doesn't Matter |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Not Bad.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

NEVER

3 times

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Sheir | | | |
|---------------------|-------|-----------------|------|------|
| Course: PHI 15 | | Section/time: \ | 1.00 | om . |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Discussion section was organized and enveronement, we Needs improvement in student involvement, however, it is satisfactory. The knew the subject matter very well.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

Summary of Student Evaluations of Instructors and Courses FALL QUARTER 2012

Name of Instructor: Ted Shear

Total Enrollment:

23

Course Number:

PHI 016 A02

Total # of Responses:

19

Course: Introduction to Ethics & Political Philosohy

% of responses to Enrl:

82.61%

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|----|-----------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|----------|
| | | | | | | |
| n= | 3 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 15.79% | 52.63% | 31.58% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Overall quality of the course:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|----|-----------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|----------|
| n= | 4 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 21.05% | 42.11% | 31.58% | 5.26% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Frequency of attendance at discussion:

| | Always | Often | n Sometimes Rarely | | Never | No Reply | |
|----|--------|--------|--------------------|-------|-------|----------|--|
| n= | 12 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| %= | 63.16% | 31.58% | 0.00% | 5.26% | 0.00% | 0.00% | |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assista | 1- | Xr . | * | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| Course: PHI / | 16 | <u>.</u> <u>Sec</u> | ction/time: | 2-17.10-8 |
| Please evaluate the below. You may remarks: clarity, of help students, and evaluation in to the Department, Room not be read until for the partment of the partment, and the partment of the partment | the Teaching Assistance also use the reverse organization, master dependent about 1240 Social Sciential grades have been also about 1240 Social Sciential grades have 1240 Social Scie | e side. Be sure to increase and Humanities een turned into the O | ssion section clude the follower, accessibility osophy. Pleas or return it to the Building. This ffice of the Reg | in the space ving in your y, willingness to be turn this e philosophy is evaluation will pistrar. |
| Overall teaching e | effectiveness of the | teaching assistant | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of t | he discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you | attend your discus | sion section? | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching As | ssistant: Ted Sheaf | ~ | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| Course: Q | ii) b | <u>S</u> e | ection/time: Web | 7PM |
| below. You remarks: cla help student evaluation in Department, not be read to could but direction of the | may also use the reversity, organization, masters, and ability to stimulate to the person designate Room 1240 Social Scientil final grades have be organized. | istant and the discuse side. Be sure to itery of the subject made your interest in philed by your instructor | ussion section nclude the follow tter, accessibility losophy. Pleas or return it to the | in the space ving in your y, willingness to se turn this se philosophy s evaluation will |
| important of each discussion was lost. | | | | imulation asols Subject |
| Overall teach | ing effectiveness of the | teaching assistan | t | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall qualit | y of the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did | d you attend your discus | ssion section? | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Edward | Shear | <u>.</u> | | |
|---------------------|--------|-------|---------------|---------|--|
| Course: Philosoph | y 16 | | Section/time: | 710-800 | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

The discussions we had in section under Ted's direction were always engaging and often thought-provoking. He was always more than willing to answer questions, and his insight into the leadings were helpful. He was generally organized and he was the total cludys tried to make topics accessible and clear for the rest of us.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assist | ant: Ted Shear | ÷ | v | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|----|
| Course: PHI | 16 | | Section/time: AC | 12 | |
| Please evaluate below. You may remarks: clarity, help students, a evaluation in to Department, Ro not be read until | the Teaching Assist also use the reverse organization, master and ability to stimulate the person designate om 1240 Social Scie final grades have been as a linear and the person designate of the per | stant and the disc e side. Be sure to ry of the subject me e your interest in pl ed by your instructor nces and Humanit een turned into the | include the followatter, accessibility illosophy. Pleas or return it to the Building. This Office of the Reg | ving in your y, willingness to se turn this ne philosophy s evaluation wi gistrar. | II |
| | | | | | |
| Overall teaching | effectiveness of the | teaching assistaı | nt | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | |
| Overall quality of | the discussion | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | 'GOOD | FAIR | POOR | |
| How often did yo | u attend your discus | sion section? | | | |
| (ALWAYS) | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER | |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| <u>Teaching</u> | Assistant: | red | Shear | <u>^</u> | |
|-----------------|------------|-----|-------|---------------|--------------|
| Course: | PH1016 | | 749 | Section/time: | 7:10-7:50 pm |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

- · answered our Questions
- ·approachable
- · discussion was sometimes boning & hard to follow
- · sometimes not much discussion, just him speaking

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted Shear | | | |
|---------------------|-----------|---------------|--------|-----|
| Course: Phi 16 | | Section/time: | 7-8 PM | _ 3 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

he has mastery of subject matter
very accessible and willing to help

I was not guite contend with his ability to present
information clearly. I would understand what he
information clearly to but his presentation could be
was talking about but his presentation could be
more concise, however this was not a big fault
in his teaching.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
|--------------------|----------------------|---------------|--------|-------|
| Overall quality of | the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did yo | u attend your discus | sion section? | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistant: Tea | Shear | | |
|-------------------------|-------|-------------------|--|
| Course: PHI 15 | | Section/time: 402 | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR Overall quality of the discussion **EXCELLENT** VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR **POOR** How often did you attend your discussion section? ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | _ Ted | Shear | <u></u> | | |
|---------------------|-------|-------|---------------|---------------|--|
| Course: Philosoph | 016 | | Section/time: | 6:10pm-7:00pm | |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Mr. Shear was very helpful in explaining and in many cases, making more interesting, the topics covered in lecture. He had a great understanding & the concepts and put more complex information into simplex terms.

Discussion's were goal accented and organized.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching A | Assistant: (ed |) Edward | Thear. | | |
|------------|-----------------|----------|---------------|-------------|------|
| Course: | PHI 016 | | Section/time: | 7:10 - 8:00 | P.u. |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistan | t: Edward | Shear | | -1 |
|-------------------|-----------|-------|---------------|----------|
| Course: PH/ | 16 | | Section/time: | 79m/wed. |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT **VERY GOOD** GOOD FAIR POOR Overall quality of the discussion GOOD **EXCELLENT** VERY GOOD POOR FAIR How often did you attend your discussion section? ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER.

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistar | nt: Edward | Shear | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| Course: PH7 | - 16 | | Section/time: 7: | 0pm -8pm |
| Please evaluate to below. You may a remarks: clarity, o help students, and evaluation in to the Department, Room not be read until fi | he Teaching Assistation use the reverse rganization, mastery ability to stimulate e person designated in 1240 Social Sciential grades have been compared to the company of | tant and the disc side. Be sure to of the subject m your interest in p by your instruct ices and Humani on turned into the | cussion section in include the follow natter, accessibility thilosophy. Please or or return it to the ties Building. This e Office of the Regi | n the space ing in your , willingness to e turn this e philosophy evaluation will istrar. |
| | | | | |
| Overall teaching e | ffectiveness of the t | eaching assista | nt | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of the | ne discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you | attend your discuss | ion section? | | |
| AIWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | PARELV | NEVED |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching | Assistant: | TED | SHEAR | <u>*</u> | |
|----------|------------|-----|----------|-------------------------|---------|
| Course: | PHI.16 |) | <u>.</u> | Section/time: Wednesday | 7:10 pm |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistant: Ted Shear | . |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Course: Ohilosophical foundations of | Section/time: 2,7:10 |
| American Democracy | |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Clarity: "10

Organization: 7/10

Mastery: 9(8)/10

Orcessibility: IDK, too Lazy to find out

willing ness: 10/10

Interest: 10/10

| Overall teachin | g effectiveness of the | teaching assistant | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|--------------------|--------|-------|--|--|--|
| EXCELLENT | (VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | | | |
| Overall quality | of the discussion | | | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | | | |
| How often did you attend your discussion section? | | | | | | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER | | | |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| | | THE LOIL | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| Teaching Assist | ant: Ted She losophy 16 | | etion/time: A | 02 |
| | | - | | |
| remarks: clarity, help students, a evaluation in to to Department, Ronnot be read until | the Teaching Assis y also use the reverse organization, master nd ability to stimulate the person designated om 1240 Social Scien final grades have be | e side. Be sure to ind y of the subject matt your interest in philo d by your instructor of nees and Humanities en turned into the Of | clude the follower, accessibility is sophy. Pleasor return it to the Building. This fice of the Reg | wing in your y, willingness to se turn this ne philosophy s evaluation will gistrar. |
| Ted by | and organiza | than at in | LECUSCUS. | |
| The Thirty | good orgonia | Hor His | 136033706 | is and 15 |
| very willing | good organiza gy to help St mon intrig | rudents. TIIS | discussio | on really |
| made me | mon intrig | wed with i | Philosophy | y. Overall |
| ted was a | great TA | for the co | lass | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Overall teaching | effectiveness of the te | eaching assistant | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of | the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you | attend your discussi | ion section? | | |
| XLWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistar | nt: Ted Shed | NrN | <u>.</u> | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|----|
| Course: PHI | | £ | Section/time: | 2 7:10 PM. | |
| Please evaluate the below. You may a remarks: clarity, on help students, and evaluation in to the Department, Room not be read until fi | he Teaching Assistants use the reverse reganization, mastery ability to stimulate ye person designated in 1240 Social Science nal grades have bee | side. Be sure of the subject cour interest in by your instruces and Human turned into t | iscussion section to include the follow matter, accessibility philosophy. Pleastor or return it to inities Building. The Office of the Reference is the contract of the Reference in the Contract of the Co | in the space owing in your ity, willingness to ase turn this the philosophy is evaluation will egistrar. | 1, |
| Overall teaching e | ffectiveness of the te | eaching assis | tant | | |
| EXCELLENT | (VERY GOOD) | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | |
| Overall quality of the | | *** ** ** | ., | . = + | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | |

SOMETIMES

RARELY

NEVER

How often did you attend your discussion section?

OFTEN

ALWAYS

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | ed | <u> </u> | |
|---------------------|------|---------------|--|
| Course: H | 1016 | Section/time: | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant VERY GOOD EXCELLENT GOOD FAIR POOR Overall quality of the discussion VERY GOOD EXCELLENT GOOD FAIR **POOR** How often did you attend your discussion section? ALWAYS SOMETIMES RARELY OFTEN **NEVER**

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | led | Shear | <u> </u> | | |
|---------------------|-----|-------|---------------|-----|--|
| Course: Phi 16 | | | Section/time: | AOZ | |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

TA did a great job at facilitating discussion and evoking helpful thought. Answers question before they are asked and keeps discussion interesting. Perhaps cover more specific plass matter in discussion.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistant: 22 www | d Shear | <u>.</u> |
|----------------------------|---------|---------------------------------|
| Course: Philosophy 16 | | Section/time: Wednesday/7:10 pm |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Edward shear is clear in his descriptions and clarifications of course material, well-organized in his presentation, and knowledgable about the material. He is quick to reply to questions via email, enthusiastic, and provides examples that make the material interesting.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistant: Ted Syl | ear. | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|--------|---|
| Course: Phi 16 | . Section/time: | 7:10-8 | 9 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted seemed very willing to help students and stimulated intrest during discussions by challenging us. He seemed to have a very good under standing of what he was telling about and could usually marke himself very clear as to what he meant.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

Summary of Student Evaluations of Instructors and Courses FALL QUARTER 2012

Name of Instructor: Ted Shear

Total Enrollment:

27

Course Number:

PHI 016 A01

Total # of Responses:

25

Course:

Introduction to Ethics & Political Philosohy

% of responses to Enrl:

92.59%

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|----|-----------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|----------|
| n= | 6 | 9 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| %= | 24.00% | 36.00% | 36.00% | 4.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Overall quality of the course:

| | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor | No Reply |
|------------|-----------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|----------|
| n= | 4 | 11 | 9 | "1 | 0 | 0 |
| % = | 16.00% | 44.00% | 36.00% | 4.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Frequency of attendance at discussion:

| | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | No Reply |
|----|--------|--------|-----------|--------|-------|----------|
| n= | 16 | 8 | 1 | 0 | -0 | 0 |
| %= | 64.00% | 32.00% | 4.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assis | tant: Ted S | hear | <u> </u> | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|---------|
| | PHI 016 | <u>S</u> e | ection/time: 1? | 6:10-7 | <u></u> |
| below. You ma remarks: clarity, help students, a evaluation in to Department, Ronot be read until Clony of Clony of Prefered with wasten Very | the Teaching Assisty also use the reverse, organization, master and ability to stimulate the person designate from 1240 Social Scientifical grades have been described the Philoso Ted is a specific of the Friendly of the Sound of the strategy of the strat | se side. Be sure to in ry of the subject many of the subject many or instructor ences and Humanities en turned into the conficulties under the subject of th | nclude the follow ter, accessibility losophy. Please or return it to the se Building. This office of the Regular Same, Was Had bas but | ing in your, willingness to turn this philosophy evaluation will strar. | we |
| Overall teaching | effectiveness of the | teaching assistant | 192 | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | (GOOD) | FAIR | POOR | |
| Overall quality o | f the discussion | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | |
| How often did yo | ou attend your discus | ssion section? | | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER | |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| | | - • · - | | |
|--|-------------|------------------------|-------------------|---|
| Teaching Assistant: Edward | Show | | Wednesday | |
| Course: Phi OL | | Section/time: | 6:10-7 | |
| Please evaluate the Teaching A below. You may also use the revremarks: clarity, organization, ma | /erse side. | Be sure to include the | following in your | 0 |

help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will

not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Knows what he's talking about, very informative discussions, incredibly helpful with office hours, and organized. Great!

| Overall teaching effectiveness of th | ne teaching assistant |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

(ALWAYS) OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| | Eli | C | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| Teaching Assistan | t: _ Edward | Shece | | |
| Course: PHI | | • | Section/time: | 6:00-7:00 |
| | | | | |
| help students, and evaluation in to the | Iso use the reverse ganization, master ability to stimulate person designate 1240 Social Scie | e side. Be sure ry of the subject your interest in d by your instru nces and Huma | to include the matter, access philosophy. I ctor or return it nities Building. | following in your sibility, willingness to Please turn this to the philosophy This evaluation will |
| Facilitated | 0)009 | 5 (455/00) | lear and | organized, |
| Knew F | philosophy , | vell for | endly con | d accesible |
| Stimulated | intocst | in plit | 010 ph 6. | |
| made d | interest | os able | | |
| | | | | |
| Overall teaching eff | ectiveness of the | teaching assis | tant | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of th | e discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you a | attend your discus | sion section? | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIME | S RARE | LY NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | SHEAR | | |
|---------------------|-------|-------------------|--|
| Course: PHIL 16 | [2] | Section/time: AD\ | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

THE MOStory of the subject and three been better by as for the clarity, accressibility, of willingness to their the students, the was very good. Always melcomed questions of posed good examples / prompts.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------|--------|-------|
| Overall quality o | f the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did yo | ou attend your discus | ssion section? | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

(Edward)

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted Shear | <u>¥</u> | | |
|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------|---------|----------|
| Course: Philosophy 16 | | Section/time: Å02 | 610-700 | <u> </u> |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

thewas creating his explanations when students had nuestions.

The lack of time hard in the quality of his discussions.

The knows his material very well and is about teached as well.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

OFTEN

ALWAYS

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| | 1 5 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| Teaching Assist | ant: Ed Sheer | | | , | |
| Course: Phi | 016 | | Section/time: 4 | 18d 7:10-8.00 | |
| below. You may remarks: clarity, help students, as evaluation in to t Department, Roc | the Teaching Assi y also use the reverse organization, master and ability to stimulate the person designate om 1240 Social Sciential grades have b | se side. Be sure ery of the subject e your interest in ed by your instru ences and Huma | to include the follo matter, accessibil philosophy. Plea actor or return it to anities Building. Th | owing in your ity, willingness to ase turn this the philosophy his evaluation will | |
| | a very sood job i hly expla | | | - | |
| Overall teaching | effectiveness of the | teaching assis | stant | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | |
| Overall quality of the discussion | | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | |
| How often did yo | u attend your discus | ssion section? | | | |

SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

ALWAYS

OFTEN

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| | Assistan | <u>t: 16</u> | d 5 | hea | | 5 | n/time: W | 611 | 0-1 | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| Course: | A May | 150 | | | | Section | n/time: V | 0 11 | 1 | _ |
| below. Yremarks: help studevaluation Department of be re- | ou may a clarity, or lents, and in to the ent, Room ad until fir | lso use the ganization ability to be person on 1240 Sonal grade | ne rever n, mast stimula designa ocial Sci s have t | se side ery of t te your ted by ences been tu | e. Be sure he subject interest in your instru and Huma irned into t | to include matter, philoso ctor or r nities Ba he Offic | on section de the follow accessibility phy. Pleas return it to the uilding. Thi e of the Reg | wing in y y, willing se turn th ne philos s evalua gistrar. | our ness to nis ophy tion will | |
| Hes | dove | and | reali | 4 1 | nelpful | but | looks | rod | and | (|
| Son | netimes interes | . The | teache | un lis en e | loether | ot | looks Stimula | Fing | my | V |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall te | eaching ef | fectivene | ss of the | e teacl | ning assis | tant | | | | |
| EXCELLE | ENT | VERY (| GOOD | G | OOD | | FAIR | POO | R | |
| Overall qu | uality of th | e discus | sion | | | | | | | |
| EXCELLE | ENT | VERY C | GOOD | G | OOD | | FAIR | POOI | 3 | |
| How ofter | n did vou a | attend vo | ur dienu | eeinn e | section? | | | | | |

SOMETIMES

RARELY

NEVER

ALWAYS

OFTEN

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistant: Ted Shear | | |
|--|---|--|
| Course: PHI 110 | Section/time: | 6-7. |
| | ¥ | |
| Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sur remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subjected help students, and ability to stimulate your interest evaluation in to the person designated by your instructional Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanot be read until final grades have been turned into | e to include the following to matter, accessibility, in philosophy. Please ructor or return it to the panities Building. This | ng in your willingness to turn this philosophy evaluation will |
| Very clear and was | very know | Medicable |
| very clear and was on subject matter! | always wel | ley to |
| help students | | |
| | | |
| Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching ass | stant | |
| EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of the discussion | | |
| EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you attend your discussion section? | | |
| ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIM | ES RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Test | Show | | | |
|---------------------|------|------|---------------|----------|---|
| Course: Philosophy | 16 | | Section/time: | Section. |) |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Visiting his office hours are very helpful, and his discussion, here very engaling.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assista | nt: Ted She | 115 | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| Course: PHI | I OIG | <u>.</u> <u>s</u> | ection/time: 6:1 | 0-7:00 |
| below. You may remarks: clarity, of help students, and evaluation in to the Department, Roo | the Teaching Assistation also use the reverse organization, master distributed ability to stimulate the person designate m 1240 Social Sciential grades have be | e side. Be sure to in y of the subject ma your interest in phad by your instructor nces and Humanitie | include the follow atter, accessibility ilosophy. Pleas or return it to the es Building. This | ving in your v, willingness to e turn this e philosophy s evaluation wil |
| Overall, Ted | has been good | at onswerin | g questions | elearly, eff |
| and intelligen | has been good Hy. He has all | are a good t | 06 at gradi | ing papers (|
| and seems w | el organized. | V. J | Q | |
| | 1400 | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Overall teaching e | effectiveness of the | teaching assistan | t | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of t | he discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often đid you | attend your discuss | sion section? | | |
| ALWAVS | (OETEN | SOMETIMES | DADELV | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assis | tant: Ted Shear | <u> </u> | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Course: PH | 1 16 | Section | on/time: 1 | |
| Please evaluate below. You ma remarks: clarity, help students, a evaluation in to Department, Ro | e the Teaching Assista by also use the reverse so organization, mastery and ability to stimulate you the person designated from 1240 Social Science of final grades have been | ant and the discussi side. Be sure to inclu of the subject matter our interest in philoso by your instructor or ses and Humanities B | ion section in the following accessibility ophy. Please return it to the building. This | ing in your , willingness to e turn this e philosophy evaluation will |
| Overall teaching | effectiveness of the te | aching assistant | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality o | f the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did yo | ou attend your discussion | on section? | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

ALWAYS

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | <u>·</u> |
|--|---|
| Course: . | Section/time: |
| Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the diselow. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in evaluation in to the person designated by your instruct Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Human not be read until final grades have been turned into the second standard of the second standard standa | to include the following in your matter, accessibility, willingness to philosophy. Please turn this ctor or return it to the philosophy nities Building. This evaluation will |

| Overall teaching | effectiveness of the | e teaching assistant | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------|-------|
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of | the discussion | |) | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you | attend your discu | ssion section? | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | <u>.</u> | |
|---------------------|-------------------|--|
| Course: PHI 6 | Section/time: ACL | |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistar | nt: Theren | Shear | <u>.</u> | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Course: Phi. | lle | | Section/time: 6 | : 10 pm |
| Please evaluate the below. You may a remarks: clarity, o help students, and evaluation in to the Department, Roor | he Teaching Assalso use the rever rganization, mastal ability to stimulate person designate n 1240 Social Sci | se side. Be sure ery of the subject te your interest in ted by your instruc ences and Humar | scussion section to include the follow matter, accessibility philosophy. Pleasetor or return it to the hities Building. This he Office of the Reg | in the space ving in your /, willingness to e turn this e philosophy s evaluation will |
| | | | | |
| Overall teaching et | fectiveness of the | teaching assist | ant | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of the | ne discussion | | | |

GOOD

SOMETIMES

FAIR

RARELY

POOR

NEVER

EXCELLENT

ALWAYS

VERY GOOD

How often did you attend your discussion section?

OFTEN

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistant: Teaching Scourse: PH 1 0 6 | Section/time: Wed & 10p. |
|---|---|
| Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the dibelow. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in evaluation in to the person designated by your instruct Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Human not be read until final grades have been turned into the | to include the following in your matter, accessibility, willingness to philosophy. Please turn this ctor or return it to the philosophy nities Building. This evaluation will be Office of the Registrar. |
| ed is always on- | time and Cortial |
| ed is always on- uill help with any guesting of to access for questing afortable with the wrate | ons. Bright and |
| | |

| Overall teaching e | effectiveness of the | teaching assistar | nt | |
|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|------|------|
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of t | he discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you | attend your discus | sion section? | | |

SOMETIMES

RARELY

NEVER

OFTEN

ALWAYS

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching | ı Assistan | t: Ted | shear | | | | ~ |
|----------|------------|--------|-------|---------------|---|--------|----------|
| | Phil | | | Section/time: | W | 6:10 - | <u>'</u> |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Good Goy

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD (| GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------|--------|-------|
| Overall quality of | the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you | attend your discus | sion section? | | |
| ALWAYS (| OFTEN) | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistar | <u>ıt</u> : | Edward | Shear | | | 4 |
|-------------------|-------------|--------|-------|---------------|----|--------------|
| Course: PH | 16 | | i i | Section/time: | 01 | 6:10-7:00 PM |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

He scened to be aware of the meterial he was teaching but at times was hard to understand. The discussions were still stimulating and seemed willing to help. Grading was a bit hash.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching | g Assista | ant: Edward | Shear | | |
|----------|-----------|-------------|-------|------------------------|--|
| Course: | PHI | 16 | • | Section/time: 6 10 p.m | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Explained correpts and kinew what he was talking about the didn't really have strict organization, but that is his style and line was the freedom's facilitate discussion

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching / | Assistant: Te 🌜 | | |
|------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------|
| Course: | Phol6 | Section/time: We d | Viscussion |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT GOOD VERY GOOD FAIR POOR Overall quality of the **discussion** EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR **POOR** How often did you attend your discussion section? **ALWAYS** OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY **NEVER**

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | lea | <u>-</u> | | |
|---------------------|-----|---------------|------|--------|
| Course: PHI | Ь. | Section/time: | Wed. | 6-7pm. |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR **POOR** Overall quality of the discussion EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR How often did you attend your discussion section? **ALWAYS** OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY **NEVER**

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistant: | Edward | Shear | . | | |
|---------------------|--------|-------|---------------|--------|--|
| Course: PH1 16 | | | Section/time: | 6:10-7 | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Section/discusion was always interesting and clarified confusing material from lecture.

Although, there seemed to be a lack of communication/understanding between Ted and Johnnie.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

(ALWAYS) OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistant | Edward | Shear | | |
|--------------------|--------|-------|---------------------|----------|
| Course: Philosoph | 4 16 | | Section/time: 1 , (| 0'10pm . |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

- He was very accessible.

- He was willing to help students

- He was clear, and explained what was

not waterstood

- discussions were interesting.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

OFTEN

ALWAYS

| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | |
|---|----------------|------|------|------|--|
| Overall quality of | the discussion | | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | |
| How often did you attend your discussion section? | | | | | |

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assistant: led | Shear | <u>.</u> | | |
|-------------------------|----------|---------------|----|-----------|
| Course: PHI 16 | <u>.</u> | Section/time: | 01 | 6:10-7:00 |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted did a good job explaining principles and answering grestions the was helpful for essay's and was available to when needed.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching As | sistant: | Edward | (Ted) | Shear | | | |
|-------------|----------|--------|-------|-------|---------------|---|---------|
| Course: | PHI 16 | | * | | Section/time: | W | 6:10 -7 |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

bad - 5,00d

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section?

ALWAY)

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS FALL 2012

| Teaching Assist | tant: Ted Shear | V | : | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| Course: Phi | 16 | <u>.</u> <u>Sec</u> | tion/time: 6:19 | OPM |
| below. You may remarks: clarity, help students, a evaluation in to Department, Ro not be read until | the Teaching Assist y also use the reverse organization, mastery nd ability to stimulate the person designated om 1240 Social Scien final grades have bee | side. Be sure to inc of the subject matte your interest in philo I by your instructor o ces and Humanities on turned into the Of | clude the follower, accessibility sophy. Pleas return it to the Building. This fice of the Reg | ving in your /, willingness to the turn this the philosophy to evaluation will distrar. |
| | eable a appr | | , | 4 |
| to oursi | ner question | is and pro | omote of | 15CU49ion, |
| Could o | ise slightly n | here energy, | lenthusia | oism, |
| | , , | , | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Overall teaching | effectiveness of the to | aaching assistant | | |
| | | - | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of | the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did yo | u attend your discussi | ion section? | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | DADELA | NEVED |

Summary of Student Evaluations of Instructors and Courses SPRING QUARTER 2011

Name of Instructor:

Ted Shear

Total Enrollment:

30

Course Number:

PHI 5-A02

Total # of Responses:

23

Course:

Critical Reasoning

% of responses to Enri-

76.00%

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor:

Excellent Very Good Good

Poor

No Reply

n= %= 18

78.00%

4 17.00%

1 4.30%

Overall quality of the course:

Excellent Very Good Good

Fair

Poor

No Reply

n=

10

12

%=

43.50%

52.20%

4.30%

1

Frequency of attendance at discussion:

Always

Often

Sometimes Rarely

4.30%

1

Never

No Reply

n= %=

19 82.60%

3 13.00%

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: Fed Swear | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course: PMIOSOPM 5 | Section/time: AO2 MON 710 8:00 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted was really good at explaining the momenal during aboutsion.

Whatever I aldnit get during actuar, he made it all dear during sections.

He was great at replying back to e-mails and he dways made time-for me it I had to see him. He now also made alsoussion fun with his humour. So he made the momenal he were learning, easy to learn

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT (VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT (VERY GOOD) GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Edward Shear | Monday |
|---------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Course: Philosophi | 5 . | Section/time: 7-8 |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted did a great job at answering questions clearly with examples that made the material easy to grasp. His office hours were also very helpful in the sense that he took the time to answer all questions. He was also available. Through email.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

OFTEN

ALWAYS

| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------|------|------|
| Overall quality of | the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you | ı attend your discus | sion section | | |

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted | Shear | 90 | 1 | |
|---------------------|-------|----------|-----------------|------|--|
| Course: DhiloSop | shy 5 | <u> </u> | Section/time: 8 | 17pm | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted was a great TA who made it fun and worth while to come to discussion. He made the subject clear and made sure to fully answer every question that was asked

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Faward Shear | | | |
|---------------------|--------------|---------------|---|----------|
| Course: PHICOS | | Section/time: | M | 7:10-8pm |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

GROOT T.A. !!

I really enjoyed coming to discussion because he was very helpful with all the material and was always open to any question. His Dianations were clear and well organized. He made this class very interesting because he was excited to teach the material and also showed his interest in the subject and was very humorous at times. And he was always available when I emailed or needed to meet with him outside of his office hours.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
|------------------------|----------------------|--------------|------|------|
| Overall quality of the | ne discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you | attend your discus | sion section | | |

ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: TEO | SHEAR | | 11.71 | 7:10 0:10 |
|-------------------------|-------|---------------|--------|-----------|
| Course: PHI 5 | | Section/time: | MONDAL | 7.10-8 60 |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

HE WAS ALWAYS VERY CLEATE AND GAVED GOOD EXAMPLES,
AS WELL EVERY DISCUSSION WAS WELL PREPARED AND KNEW
EXACTLY HOW TO ANSWER AM THE MATERIAL. EVENTHOUGH I COULD
NOT ATTEND HIS OFFICE HOURS HE ALWAYS MEET WITH ME
WHEN HE COULD AND MADE PHILOSOPHY WITE RESTING
EVENTHOUGH I HATE IT CAUSE ITS DISGUSTING.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: Edward | Shear | |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------------|
| Course: PHI 5 | | Section/time: M 7:10 - 8 pm |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted was a very down to Earth T.A. who was quite open to helping out with questions people had. Obviously very knowledgeable though things could get a little confusing when he brought up the more advanced logic material.

Mumbled occasionally, but overally a good T.A.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

NEVER

(It was mandatory though)

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted | Shear | | to A | - 10 m | |
|---------------------|-----|-------|---------------|------|----------|-----|
| Course: PH1 - 5 | | | Section/time: | M | 7:10-8pm | Τ., |
| | | | | | , | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
|------------------------|----------------------|------------|--------|-------|
| Overall quality of the | ne discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you | attend your discussi | on section | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching | Assistant: | Ted | Shear | | 1. A | 1.11.0 | |
|----------|------------|-----|-------|---------------|------|--------|-----|
| Course: | Philosophy | 5 | | Section/time: | MON | 4.10-8 | pW. |
| | 0 \ 1 | | | | | | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

He is a really great TA. He is super clear on his expectations on homework & tosts. He & knows the subject matter very well and encourages students to ask questions. He is approachable & available, willing to help. He is clearly passionate about the subject and transposes that to the students. Fun & Friendly, he & is a great TA.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD FAIR GOOD

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD **FAIR**

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY **NEVER**

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | SHEAR | 340 | Λ | and the second second |
|---------------------|-------|---------------|-----|-----------------------|
| Course: PHI S | i | Section/time: | 112 | 1310 mont |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

TED WAS ALWAYS VERY ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT THE MATERIAL AND ABOUT HIS STUDENTS. HIS KNOWLEDGE OF THE COURSE WAS DEMONSTRATED ENERLY DISCUSSION AND HE COULDN'T ANSWER EVERY QUESTION ASKED. HE WAS ALWAYS RESPONSING TO EMAILS AND MARE SORE WE ALWAYS KNEW HOW TO REACH HIM.

POOR

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teach | ning Assistant: | TED | sbear |
|-------|-----------------|-----|-------|
| _ | 01- | | |

Course: Phil 5

Section/time: Nonclay @ 7:10 gm

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

- very willing to help clarity material to the class of presented/discussed material in ways students could understand it they had difficulty
- Willing to meet up with students if Office hours conflicted w/ their schedules.
- positive attitude 0

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: Ted | Shear | - 0. | s v | | |
|-------------------------|-------|---------------|--------|--------|----|
| Course: Ph. 5 | | Section/time: | Morray | 7:10-8 | PM |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted was always clear, organized, accessible, and willing to help. He seemed to be really educated on the subject matter and always stimulated class discussion and interest in philosophy. He made the class really fun, the was always telling jokes and making discussion section exciting.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: TED SHEAR | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Course: PHTL 5 | Section/time: MoN | 7:10 pm - RIMDI |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted was very clear, if the mere was something I didn't understand the first time he would notice and explain the concept again without me having to ask. He was very quick to respond to e-mails and cleaned up at lot of ideas during office Hours.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted | Shear | | 1110-8 | Monday |
|---------------------|-----|-------|---------------|--------|---------------|
| Course: Phi 5 | | • | Section/time: | 1.10 | , or or or or |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted was always on-time and prepared to help & charify and topics that had Questions. He seemed to always be available a communicated well via Email His knowledge of the subject was exceptand, often Snowing us different ways to do a certain exercise

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted | Snear |
|---------------------|-----|-------|
| | | |

Course: PH 5 . Section/time: M 100-8 00

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted did great to clarify any leave material the class needed neip with was always open to questions and always answered them. He also had examples prepared to show us in class for more practice. I was also able to go to Office wours where he was very also able to go to Office wours where he was very helpful and not only explained concepts, but had helpful and not only explained concepts, but had me explain them to him to be sure I knew the material. Expect TH!

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Edward, shear | • | 8 | |
|---------------------|---------------|---------------|-----|---------|
| Course: PHI 5 | | Section/time: | Mon | 7:00 pm |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

overall, Ted is an excellent TA. I have nothing but praise for his willingness to help us, his availability, his mostery of the subject matter and his enthusiasm with the course. Some of the discussions were well organized, while others could have used more of a guiding hand. In terms of clarity I would give him top marks!

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted | Sheat | | | , | |
|---------------------|-----|-------|---------------|-------|------|----|
| Course: PW | 05 | | Section/time: | A-03, | 7:10 | -8 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT **VERY GOOD** GOOD FAIR POOR Overall quality of the discussion EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR How often did you attend your discussion section ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: Ted | Shear | | |
|-------------------------|-------|-------------------------|------|
| Course: PHF 5 | | Section/time: T . T. 10 | - 50 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

very knowledgable. Always willing to answer our questions, provided material past what was done in class to help clarified.

Made me not care about having a 7 pm discussion on monday nights. (In a good way)

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------|-------|
| Overall quality of | of the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did yo | ou attend your discus | sion section | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |
| 01 | 1 1 1 1 | | | |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Tecl | Shear | | ر مر | |
|---------------------|------|-------|---------------------|------|---|
| Course: PHIS | | - | Section/time: Monda | 7-8 | - |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

the explained things very well. He would explain step by step and made sure everyone in the class understood the mode the classroom a comfortable and enjoyable environment, so it was easy to attend and and questions. He's an excellent TA.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
|--------------------|----------------|------|------|------|
| Overall quality of | the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| I I a a A a a Cal | . rr h P | | | 850 |

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: Tea | Shear | | |
|-------------------------|-------|-------------------------|--|
| Course: PH 05 | | Section/time: Men 7-8Pm | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

the explains things clearly from what we tearmed in Lecture. This makes himself available through email which is a very delephic way to as k questions. Very enthul shastic about the subject - makes it more interesting.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

withed 1

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Edward | Shear | | 4.10 | |
|---------------------|--------|-------|---------------|--------------|----|
| Course: Phi 5 | | 8 | Section/time: | Mon. 7:10 pm | 24 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Very clear, accessible, interesting.
I really appreciated this TA lecturing helpfully about moterial madvance.
Discussion was useful, which isn't the care w/many TAs!

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted Shear | 7 | 710-01 |
|---------------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|
| Course: Phil 5 | | Section/time: | f.10-8.00 |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

TH shear was very helpful in the section, he was able to make the section "Finish although it was in the night.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Edward Shear | • | |
|---------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| Course: PMI 5 | | Section/time: | Man 7:10-8 pm. |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Always answered students questions and was available during and outside of office hours. was helps and answers questions through emails. Very neight.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: TED SHEAR | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course: PHILOSOPHY 5 . | Section/time: MUNDAY /PM |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted was one of the more helpful This I have had the was very clear, organized, and obviously knew whathe was falking about very well. He was always willing to help and made me enjoy the course. At job.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT **VERY GOOD** GOOD FAIR POOR Overall quality of the discussion EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR How often did you attend your discussion section **ALWAYS** OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY **NEVER**

Summary of Student Evaluations of Instructors and Courses SPRING QUARTER 2011

Name of Instructor:

Ted Shear

Total Enrollment:

30

Course Number:

PHI 5-A01

Total # of Responses:

28

Course:

Critical Reasoning

% of responses to Enri:

93.00%

Overall teaching effectiveness of the Instructor:

32.10%

Excellent Very Good Good

Poor

No Reply

n= %= 9

7 25.00%

11 39.30%

1 3.60%

Overall quality of the course:

Excellent Very Good Good

Fair

Poor

No Reply

n≐

10

8

3

%=

25.00%

35.70%

28.60%

10.70%

Frequency of attendance at discussion:

Always

Often

Sometimes Rarely

1

Never

No Reply

n= %=

18 64.30%

32.10%

9

3.60%

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Opining 2011 |
|--|
| Teaching Assistant: Ted Shear Workers Section/time: 6:10-7 pm |
| Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to |
| help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will |
| not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar. |
| Clear that new here not been in class. He answer question clear and made scre to go through it |
| again until it was under stood feedback on the homework was helpful to understand |
| Mistakes |

| Overall teaching effectivenes | s of the teachin e | g assistant |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | TEO SHEAR | - FE | 00 | 1 | |
|---------------------|-----------|---------------|---------|--------|--------------|
| Course: PHI 60 5 | | Section/time: | 11/0/1. | 10.06. | <u>10 pm</u> |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Valy or banized Discussion CCASS.

HAS ANSWERS TO ME ALL OUR QUESTIONS.

VERY WILLIAM TO HELP.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Edward | Shear | | | 200 of 1925 - 2025 |
|---------------------|--------|-------|---------------|---|--------------------|
| Course: PH 5 | | | Section/time: | M | 6:10 -7 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Good TA, nelpful with homework + class info. He responded quickly and seemed confident. Discussion was sometimes unnecessary because it was often 2 and A and I had no questions.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: Te | d Shear | San San | | 10 -1 |
|------------------------|---------|---------------|-------|-------|
| Course: PHI5 | | Section/time: | M 6-7 | AOI. |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

helpful at answering questions knowledgable flexible w/office hours thelping students, even on weekends

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Edward | Shear | | | |
|---------------------|--------|-------|---------------|-----|---------|
| Course: PHI 5 | | 4 | Section/time: | MON | 6:10-7. |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Good knowledge of subject.

Available for help outside of class.

Enthws/astic.

very helpful and patrent.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VEF

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: Ted | Shear | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------|---------------|---|-----|--|
| Course: PHIS | | Section/time: | M | 6-7 | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

organization is along, profty average in eventhing, welling the to help student out.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FATR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

only missed I

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted Shear | | | |
|---------------------|-----------|---------------|--------|-----------|
| Course: PHI 5 | | Section/time: | Monday | 6:10-7:00 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

The arganization of the section was effective but the clarity of explaining some of the ideas could be clearer. Without writing on the charkboard it was hard to understand his train of thought.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR)

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN)

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: Ted | Sheer | | |
|-------------------------|-------|-----------------------|--|
| Course: Philos | | Section/time: M 6.10- | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space

below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Overall good job as a TA. He had a clear understanding of the waterial and made sure we understanding the was always willing to take the time to answer questions and was available for office hours.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
|--------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|-------|
| Overall quality of | the discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you | u attend your discus | sion section | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Faward | shear | * | 4.5. | |
|---------------------|--------|-------|---------------|------|--|
| Course: PHI 5 | | | Section/time: | AOI | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

- · very willing to help in office hours
- · gives good examples for certain topics I was confused about
- · helpful and understanding T.A. Thank You!

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | ed S | Max | . | ner voer | | |
|---------------------|------|-----|---------------|----------|--------|----|
| Course: VVI 5 | | | Section/time: | 6:10 | monday | ١. |
| The second | | | | | | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted is a really nice guy that is willing to spend time on a concept until we all seem to understand. He's definitely rulped me feel more confident about the material covered. Sometimes, he does get over-excited and refer to things beyond this class which can get confusing,

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERYGOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERYGOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Edward | Shear | | 30 ³ |
|---------------------|--------|-------|---------------|-----------------|
| Course: PHIL 5 | | | Section/time: | W 1300-1400 |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

The TA ares to class well or you'red. He is alway open for question that dwell on present or post subject mouthers.

His office hours make him my most available T. A and he takes his time exceptaining and assisting as much as he can.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: Ted Shear | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Course: PHT 005 | Section/time: M: 6-7pm | |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted understood the material very well and made it easier for me to understand most of the time. His explanations were sometimes a little word and difficult to understand the wording, but the overall material was understandable. He is a very good TA

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: Ted Sheav | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| Course: PM1050phy 5 | Section/time: M 6,10 |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

good at explaining things 2 vory helpful in answering questions. Also was interested in the subject monther which made it much easier to learn.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR Overall quality of the discussion EXCELLENT) VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR **POOR** How often did you attend your discussion section ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY **NEVER**

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted | Shear | | |
|---------------------|-----|-------|---------------|---------------|
| Course: Philosophy | 5 | | Section/time: | Monday, 6 pm. |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

I really liked Ted's enthusiasm for the material and the charismanc way we explained everything. He was really patient with questions and was forthcoming with information on papers and hw.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR Overall quality of the discussion EXCELLENT VERY GOOD (GOOD) FAIR POOR How often did you attend your discussion section ALWAYS RARELY OFTEN SOMETIMES **NEVER**

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assista | nt: Ted | 9 hear | <u>.</u> | 7110 |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| Course: PHI | 05 | <u>.</u> | Section/time: | 1710 pm |
| below. You may remarks: clarity, of help students, and evaluation in to the Department, Root | also use the re organization, m d ability to stim te person design m 1240 Social | Assistant and the deverse side. Be sure nastery of the subject nulate your interest in gnated by your instruction sciences and Huma ve been turned into the afform who great avallable, and | to include the for t matter, accessil n philosophy. Pluctor or return it t unities Building. | ollowing in your bility, willingness to ease turn this o the philosophy This evaluation will |
| Overall teaching e | ffectiveness of | the teaching assis | tant | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOO | D GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of the | he discussio n | ı | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOI | O GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you | attend your dis | scussion section | | |
| ALWAYS / | OFTEN | SOMETIME | S RAREL | Y NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted Shear | | |
|---------------------|-----------|------------------------|--|
| Course: PH 5 | | Section/time: M 6-7 pm | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Discussion seems irrelevant, it shouldn't be mandatory Class was easy and TA does an okay job explaining, but can get really boring.

POOR

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: Edward (Ted) She | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course: Philosophy 05. | Section/time: AOI: 6-7 Monday |
| | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted Shear is entremely helpful and especially in office hours where he clarified truth tables. He is very putient and made a difficult subject in Philosophy a whole lot easier. Ted is a very intelligent gry on the subject who is personable and approachable. Cheers, Ted, cheers,

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

OFTEN

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD **FAIR** GOOD POOR Overall quality of the discussion EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR How often did you attend your discussion section ALWAYS

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: Ted Shear | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course: PH 1005 | Section/time: Monday 6:10-7. |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to

help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted Scienced Very interested in helping us, encouraged us to come to office hours to was always awailable to answer questions. He knew a lot about the Tubect matter of guestions. He knew a lot about the Tubect matter of guestions. He knew a lot about the midtern to helped a lot feedback on homework the midtern to helped a lot feedback on homework a guest TA who was well-informed versel I Think he was a guest TA who was well-informed

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: Ted | Shear | | | , | |
|-------------------------|-------|---------------|-----|--------|--|
| Course: Phi OF | • | Section/time: | Mon | 6:10-7 | |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted teader and reinforces the subject very well, this attitude is always possible and that makes it easy to access him as he is also welling to help infantite of class. He bluows the subject matter and has should show a factor preathy.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

(VERY GOOD)

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Edward | shear | | |
|---------------------|--------|-------|---------------|---------|
| Course: philosoph | Ly 5 | | Section/time: | mon 6-7 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted is a great TA overall. His explanations were always clear. He is attentive to all students, answers all questions. Could be a bit more organized with a lecture/discussion plan, No real complaints though, great job!

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Edward | Sheas | | | |
|---------------------|--------|-------|---------------|-----|--|
| Course: Phi 005 | | | Section/time: | 101 | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Good knowledge of modernals, spent most time in discussion on issues students chose.

You say um a lot white talking. Still perfectly understandable, but would probably be letter if you were conscious if it and so tried to get better at it.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: Edward Shear | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|-----|--|
| Course: Phi 05 | Section/time: M | 6-7 | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

The is outgoing, knows the material and is very clear about it. Simplifies the material and is always available/hilling to give a helping hand.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistar | nt: Tea Sh | ear_ | Section/time: | day 0:10-7 |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| below. You may a remarks: clarity, o help students, and evaluation in to the Department, Room | also use the rever rganization, mast d ability to stimula e person designa m 1240 Social Sc | rse side. Be sure the subject the subject in the su | scussion section to include the follow matter, accessibility philosophy. Pleas stor or return it to the hities Building. This is Office of the Regular Control o | ving in your y, willingness to se turn this se philosophy sevaluation will |
| explained We comp | retery ur | well ; ideration was | agoo jee would ma mat was | ke sute |
| | | | | |
| Overall teaching ef | fectiveness of the | e teaching assista | ant | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| Overall quality of th | e discussion | | | |
| EXCELLENT | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| How often did you a | attend your discu | ssion section | | |
| ALWAYS | OFTEN | SOMETIMES | RARELY | NEVER |

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Ted | Sherr | 543 | |
|---------------------|-----|-------|----------------------|--------|
| Course: PHI 5 | | 16 | Section/time: Monday | 6-7pm. |
| | | | 1 | |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

Ted was a very good TA in the sense of willing to help students.
However, at times I felt he was unprepared to had a hard time getting his parts records. I know that he is a busy great student, but maybe he could're constructed a place, for disc. He was pretty good at the subject matter the wasn't as organized.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS

OFTEN

SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Edward Ted | Shear | |
|---------------------|------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Course: Phil 05 | | | Section/time: 6pm - 7pm |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

ted was very willing to help try to clarify to topics for
the students, but I feel like sometimes he just couldn't explain
it at a more simplified form. Reference of the superior of the content of the

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: Ted Shear | | === |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|-----|
| Course: Phi (x5 | Section/time: Monday | 6-4 |

Please evaluate the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

The discussion sections were particularly helphal when we taked about his problems and reproming Assignments. It was obvious Ted knew a grood deal of philosophy and was always willing to help. It could have been made more interesting by posing interesting questions of perhaps debating them. Hove class involvement would have been good — the more you true about it, the more it sticks!

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: 16d | Shear | | 2.30 | .1 |
|-------------------------|-------|---------------|------|-----|
| Course: PM 5 | | Section/time: | 6:10 | Tom |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

- Farry clear

- not very interesting but the Formal logic was

- not very interesting but the Formal logic was

- fairly or garrisad.

- well versed in material.

- very accessible

- very accessible

- very willing to help.

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR *

POOR

Overall quality of the discussion

EXCELLENT

VERY GOOD

GOOD

FAIR

POOR

How often did you attend your discussion section

ALWAYS



SOMETIMES

RARELY

STUDENT EVALUATIONS Spring 2011

| Teaching Assistant: | Edward Shear | | |
|---------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--|
| Course: PHI 05 | | Section/time: M 6-7pm | |

Please evaluate <u>the Teaching Assistant and the discussion section</u> in the space below. You may also use the reverse side. Be sure to include the following in your remarks: clarity, organization, mastery of the subject matter, accessibility, willingness to help students, and ability to stimulate your interest in philosophy. Please turn this evaluation in to the person designated by your instructor or return it to the philosophy Department, Room 1240 Social Sciences and Humanities Building. This evaluation will not be read until final grades have been turned into the Office of the Registrar.

· He encouraged students to see him in office hours for help.

· He is clear on explaining and answering student's opoustions

· Mastery of the subject matter: He always managed to correct himself. in discussion

Overall teaching effectiveness of the teaching assistant

EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD FAIR POOR Overall quality of the discussion EXCELLENT VERY GOOD GOOD **FAIR POOR** How often did you attend your discussion section ALWAYS OFTEN SOMETIMES RARELY NEVER