



Emily








Last Modified: 08/27/2015
Filter By: Report Subgroup

1. What section are you in?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	1 Fri 10:05 Anna		0	0%
2	2 Fri 10:05 Ryan		0	0%
3	3 Fri 10:05 Annie		0	0%
4	4 Fri 1:40 Anna		0	0%
5	5 Thurs 9:00 Tiffany		0	0%
6	6 Thurs 9:00 Shelly		0	0%
7	7 Thurs 9:00 Andrew		0	0%
8	8 Thurs 12:30 Tiffany		0	0%
9	9 Thurs 12:30 Halina		0	0%
10	10 Thurs 12:30 Erin		0	0%
11	11 Thurs 4:00 Tzu-Tong		0	0%
12	12 Thurs 4:00 Halina		0	0%
13	13 Weds 10:05 Anna		0	0%
14	14 Weds 10:05 Ryan		0	0%
15	15 Weds 10:05 Annie		0	0%
16	16 Weds 1:40 Anna		0	0%
17	17 Weds 1:40 Halina		0	0%
18	18 Weds 1:40 Sheena		0	0%
19	19 Tues 9:00 Julie		0	0%
20	20 Tues 9:00 Emily		13	57%
22	22 Tues 12:30 Tiffany		0	0%
23	23 Tues 12:30 Emily		10	43%
24	24 Tues 12:30 Rose		0	0%
25	25 Tues 4:00 Tiffany		0	0%
26	26 Tues 4:00 Nick		0	0%
27	27 Tues 4:00 Rose		0	0%
31	31 Fri 1:40 Halina		0	0%
32	32 Fri 1:40 Sheena		0	0%
33	33 Thurs 4:00 Andrew		0	0%
	Total		23	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	20
Max Value	23
Mean	21.30
Variance	2.31
Standard Deviation	1.52
Total Responses	23

2. Please select all of the circles that apply to you:

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Freshman		0	0%
2	Sophomore		20	87%
3	Junior		3	13%
4	Senior		0	0%
5	Took AP Bio in high school		14	61%
6	pre-health professional		14	61%
7	Pratt		4	17%
8	Trinity, likely bio major		7	30%
9	Trinity, non-bio major		11	48%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	2
Max Value	9
Total Responses	23

4. Please list one or more specific things your TA did well to help you learn biology.

Text Response

My TA was incredible and made my lab experience very enjoyable. As the first lab of the week, we occasionally had a few bumps (presentations would format incorrectly, or exercises weren't totally clear and the computer program was difficult to figure out). But regardless, Emily did a great job. She was accessible and promoted socializing by having partner pairing activities, which I really appreciated.

Super friendly and open to questions, and explained things very well.

Was accessible, Always connected the lab exercise to what we learned in lecture, always was willing to explain difficult concepts in clear ways

Explained every concept very clearly and well. Clearly was knowledgeable of every topic. At the same time, wasn't verbose and rarely lost my interest. Conveyed essentials clearly and effectively without taking too much time.

Emily was always able to answer my questions about biology in a helpful way, and would always start the lab period by putting us into partners based on the topics we'd cover that week.

Very responsive; always willing to help and to persist in explanation until understood

Emily never rushed through the material and answered every question with honesty and care. Everyone was always on the same page, which is something that definitely does not happen in all labs. She was enthusiastic too, which helped so much with having to come in at 9am.

she encouraged us to work with other people and learn from each other

She was really good at explaining concepts and was really enthusiastic about teaching even though it was early in the morning.

used relevant examples

She reinforced concepts from lecture through lab material and made the connections very explicit.

Emily was very helpful and accessible. She explained overall concepts well, but let us try and figure it out on our own during lab, and then was available to answer our specific questions when we had them.

Emily was very clear in her presentation of information. She was also very approachable and followed through on our questions after class.

She was really good at directing our investigation, for example when we were looking at traits in the macroevolution section. She would guide us to come to a conclusion.

Created a relaxed environment, but still helped us learn. Very kind.

She was approachable, and I think that's one of the most important qualities a TA should have. In the past I had TAs that were rude and unapproachable, and I never felt comfortable coming to them for help. Emily made it so that I wouldn't fear asking questions, which made me understand the material better.

She was enthusiastic and extremely receptive to our questions and comments.

Answered questions well

Was sure to apply topics in lab to concepts being taught in class.

Great at working through examples and helping us understand by explaining and re-explaining in different ways if necessary

Best bio TA I have ever had. She gave the best, clear explanations of tough concepts that were not thoroughly reviewed in lecture.

Emily was great at explaining concepts from lab and lecture and connecting them to real-life applications.

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	22

5. Please list one or more specific things your TA could improve upon to better help you learn biology.

Text Response

Not Emily in particular, but having either more detailed instructions for the TAs or using simpler technology. Between the smart boards and complex computer programs, there are always a few technical difficulties waiting to emerge. Not that this is really something that can be fixed, there's always going to be minor issues!

nothing - she was AWESOME

Could ask more in-class questions,

Nothing.

I think Emily could make her presentations much shorter in order to consolidate information presented. We would basically go over the lab handout which we would have already read in preparation for the class. Thus it made little sense to review it.

She really did a great job... I don't know if I would change anything!

n/a

don't spend too much time on basic concepts

have a shaper grasp of questions from lectures

Not much

I wouldn't change much! She's great! She specializes in animal behavior and doesn't know tons about some other aspects of the class, so I guess she can always improve by just TAing again and learning more. She always used good logic and was helpful when she didn't know though!

Nothing.. she as honestly great!

NA- everything seemed good to me.

Perhaps give more feedback on assignments.

She was great. Can't think of anything.

Honestly- nothing!

Not sure

Go through the major questions in each lab in slightly more detail, especially if they relate well to class lectures.

Emily was awesome

Be Charles Darwin? Honestly she was perfect.

I personally wished that she reviewed lecture topics more.

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	21

6. Further comments about your TA:

Text Response
She was awesome, and I hope I get to meet her dog at some point (because we've heard such fun things about him!)
Could not imagine having a better all-around Bio 202 TA. Friendly, approachable, knowledgable, relaxed, and a great teacher.
emily is a very helpful and engaged TA
She was great!
very passionate and made a 9am lab very enjoyable
Great job!
Didn't think sometimes requiring random lab partners increased my learning or participation.
I'm so happy I had such an understanding TA. She really tried to help and engage everyone in the class. Emily is really one of a kind.
SHE ROCKS
Great job.
Emily was a wonderful teacher and always willing to help inside and outside of class!






Statistic	Value
Total Responses	11

7. This exercise increased my interest in the biology topics presented in the lab.

#	Question	Not so much 1	2	Some 3	4	Very much 5	Total Responses	Mean
1	7 Evidence for Evolution (carnivorous plants)	4	2	10	4	2	22	2.91
2	1 Transmission Genetics (VGL problems for Mendelian genetics)	3	2	13	4	1	23	2.91
3	2 Domesticating Dogs (dog coat SNPs)	2	1	13	4	3	23	3.22
4	4 PTC Genotyping (genotyping ability to taste PTC)	1	4	9	8	1	23	3.17
5	3 Quantitative Genetics (Bugsville)	4	4	8	4	3	23	2.91
6	14 Human Evolution	1	5	8	7	2	23	3.17
7	5 Natural Selection (beans in rocks)	7	2	5	4	5	23	2.91
8	6 Population Genetics (Allele A1 exercise)	2	7	5	6	3	23	3.04
9	8 Molecular Evolution & Bioinformatics (MK/dN/dS/pi tests on Drosophila genes)	3	6	7	6	1	23	2.83
10	9 Natural Selection in Fruit Flies (eye color selective sweep)	2	3	11	5	2	23	3.09
11	10 Mating Behavior & Speciation (fly mating)	3	5	8	4	2	22	2.86
12	11 Speciation (Mimulus flower traits)	2	2	9	7	3	23	3.30
13	12 Domesticating Dogs (phylogenetics)	2	2	9	7	3	23	3.30
14	13 Macroevolution (mammal skulls)	1	3	11	6	2	23	3.22




Statistic	7 Evidence for Evolution (carnivorous plants)	1 Transmission Genetics (VGL problems for Mendelian genetics)	2 Domesticating Dogs (dog coat SNPs)	4 PTC Genotyping (genotyping ability to taste PTC)	3 Quantitative Genetics (Bugsville)	14 Human Evolution	5 Natural Selection (beans in rocks)	6 Population Genetics (Allele A1 exercise)	8 Molecular Evolution & Bioinformatics (MK/dN/dS/pi tests on Drosophila genes)	9 Natural Selection in Fruit Flies (eye color selective sweep)	10 Mating Behavior & Speciation (fly mating)	11 Speciation (Mimulus flower traits)	12 Domesticating Dogs (phylogenetics)	13 Macroevolution (mammal skulls)
Min Value	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Max Value	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mean	2.91	2.91	3.22	3.17	2.91	3.17	2.91	3.04	2.83	3.09	2.86	3.30	3.30	3.22
Variance	1.42	0.99	1.09	0.88	1.63	1.06	2.45	1.50	1.24	1.08	1.36	1.22	1.22	0.91
Standard Deviation	1.19	1.00	1.04	0.94	1.28	1.03	1.56	1.22	1.11	1.04	1.17	1.11	1.11	0.95
Total Responses	22	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	22	23	23	23

9. Which lab exercise did you find most difficult or challenging?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	7 Evidence for Evolution (carnivorous plants)		0	0%
2	1 Transmission Genetics (VGL problems for Mendelian genetics)		5	22%
3	2 Domesticating Dogs (dog coat SNPs)		0	0%
4	4 PTC Genotyping (genotyping ability to taste PTC)		0	0%
5	3 Quantitative Genetics (Bugsville)		0	0%
6	14 Human Evolution		0	0%
7	5 Natural Selection (beans in rocks)		0	0%
8	6 Population Genetics (Allele A1 exercise)		3	13%
9	8 Molecular Evolution & Bioinformatics (MK/dN/dS/pi tests on Drosophila genes)		13	57%
10	9 Natural Selection in Fruit Flies (eye color selective sweep)		0	0%
11	10 Mating Behavior & Speciation (fly mating)		0	0%
12	11 Speciation (Mimulus flower traits)		0	0%
13	12 Domesticating Dogs (phylogenetics)		1	4%
14	13 Macroevolution (mammal skulls)		1	4%
	Total		23	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	2
Max Value	14
Mean	7.74
Variance	11.47
Standard Deviation	3.39
Total Responses	23

10. Overall, the lab component of Biology 202 enhanced my learning of course concepts:











#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	1 Not so much		0	0%
2	2		0	0%
3	3 Some		9	39%
4	4		10	43%
5	5 Very much		4	17%
	Total		23	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	3
Max Value	5
Mean	3.78
Variance	0.54
Standard Deviation	0.74
Total Responses	23

11. Further comments about the lab exercises:










Text Response	
<p>I was very interested by the fly mating, however, my flies did not choose to mate. They were of separate species, so I cataloged rejected advance after rejected advance for 45 minutes. Switching with my partner halfway through probably would have been better! I found the PTC lab the least useful because I'm already very familiar with PTC testing and know that I absolutely cannot taste it - so personally it wasn't super interesting, but was definitely valuable for people with less experience (it was my high schools favorite lab, done at least once or twice a year)</p>	
<p>The lab for this class was pretty dull. Emily was great and made it better, but some of these assignments were just so boring and really not helpful for the course. I liked when we got to actually observe examples of genetics and evolution in real life, like looking at the skulls, rather than just doing computer simulations (I found the simulations extremely unhelpful and boring)</p>	
<p>The allele program on the computer lab, as well as the lab that had us submit our genes to the data base, were more frustrating than helpful. The programs and genes often times didn't work, and getting it to work at home was very difficult.</p>	
Statistic	Value
Total Responses	3

12. Which lab exercise did you find most interesting?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	7 Evidence for Evolution (carnivorous plants)		0	0%
2	1 Transmission Genetics (VGL problems for Mendelian genetics)		1	4%
3	2 Domesticating Dogs (dog coat SNPs)		1	4%
4	4 PTC Genotyping (genotyping ability to taste PTC)		0	0%
5	3 Quantitative Genetics (Bugsville)		0	0%
6	14 Human Evolution		0	0%
7	5 Natural Selection (beans in rocks)		3	13%
8	6 Population Genetics (Allele A1 exercise)		2	9%
9	8 Molecular Evolution & Bioinformatics (MK/dN/dS/pi tests on Drosophila genes)		1	4%
10	9 Natural Selection in Fruit Flies (eye color selective sweep)		1	4%
11	10 Mating Behavior & Speciation (fly mating)		1	4%
12	11 Speciation (Mimulus flower traits)		2	9%
13	12 Domesticating Dogs (phylogenetics)		7	30%
14	13 Macroevolution (mammal skulls)		4	17%
	Total		23	








Statistic	Value
Min Value	2
Max Value	14
Mean	10.57
Variance	12.62
Standard Deviation	3.55
Total Responses	23

13. Which lab exercise did you find least interesting?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	7 Evidence for Evolution (carnivorous plants)		0	0%
2	1 Transmission Genetics (VGL problems for Mendelian genetics)		1	4%
3	2 Domesticating Dogs (dog coat SNPs)		0	0%
4	4 PTC Genotyping (genotyping ability to taste PTC)		1	4%
5	3 Quantitative Genetics (Bugsville)		5	22%
6	14 Human Evolution		0	0%
7	5 Natural Selection (beans in rocks)		2	9%
8	6 Population Genetics (Allele A1 exercise)		2	9%
9	8 Molecular Evolution & Bioinformatics (MK/dN/dS/pi tests on Drosophila genes)		4	17%
10	9 Natural Selection in Fruit Flies (eye color selective sweep)		0	0%
11	10 Mating Behavior & Speciation (fly mating)		2	9%
12	11 Speciation (Mimulus flower traits)		2	9%
13	12 Domesticating Dogs (phylogenetics)		0	0%
14	13 Macroevolution (mammal skulls)		4	17%
	Total		23	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	2
Max Value	14
Mean	8.65
Variance	13.06
Standard Deviation	3.61
Total Responses	23

14. Which lab exercise did you find most useful?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	7 Evidence for Evolution (carnivorous plants)		0	0%
2	1 Transmission Genetics (VGL problems for Mendelian genetics)		1	5%
3	2 Domesticating Dogs (dog coat SNPs)		1	5%
4	4 PTC Genotyping (genotyping ability to taste PTC)		0	0%
5	3 Quantitative Genetics (Bugsville)		2	9%
6	14 Human Evolution		0	0%
7	5 Natural Selection (beans in rocks)		1	5%
8	6 Population Genetics (Allele A1 exercise)		3	14%
9	8 Molecular Evolution & Bioinformatics (MK/dN/dS/pi tests onDrosophila genes)		10	45%
10	9 Natural Selection in Fruit Flies (eye color selective sweep)		0	0%
11	10 Mating Behavior & Speciation (fly mating)		0	0%
12	11 Speciation (Mimulus flower traits)		0	0%
13	12 Domesticating Dogs (phylogenetics)		4	18%
14	13 Macroevolution (mammal skulls)		0	0%
	Total		22	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	2
Max Value	13
Mean	8.55
Variance	8.74
Standard Deviation	2.96
Total Responses	22

15. Which lab exercise did you find least useful?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	7 Evidence for Evolution (carnivorous plants)		1	4%
2	1 Transmission Genetics (VGL problems for Mendelian genetics)		0	0%
3	2 Domesticating Dogs (dog coat SNPs)		0	0%
4	4 PTC Genotyping (genotyping ability to taste PTC)		4	17%
5	3 Quantitative Genetics (Bugsville)		0	0%
6	14 Human Evolution		3	13%
7	5 Natural Selection (beans in rocks)		7	30%
8	6 Population Genetics (Allele A1 exercise)		0	0%
9	8 Molecular Evolution & Bioinformatics (MK/dN/dS/pi tests on Drosophila genes)		0	0%
10	9 Natural Selection in Fruit Flies (eye color selective sweep)		1	4%
11	10 Mating Behavior & Speciation (fly mating)		2	9%
12	11 Speciation (Mimulus flower traits)		1	4%
13	12 Domesticating Dogs (phylogenetics)		0	0%
14	13 Macroevolution (mammal skulls)		4	17%
	Total		23	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	14
Mean	8.00
Variance	14.27
Standard Deviation	3.78
Total Responses	23