










# Emily

Last Modified: 05/05/2014

Filter By: Report Subgroup

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

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Freshman		2	9%
2	Sophomore		18	78%
3	Junior		2	9%
4	Senior		1	4%
5	Took AP Bio in high school		13	57%
6	pre-health professional		10	43%
7	Pratt		5	22%
8	Trinity, likely bio major		8	35%
9	Trinity, non-bio major		10	43%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	9
Total Responses	23



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

**Text Response**

Made it fun!

Emily's enthusiasm and excitement made me interested in participating

Emily is great. She is good at explaining confusing concepts in clear and simple terms, is enthusiastic and engaging, and overall is a very capable teacher. I enjoyed having her as my TA and she enriched my learning.

Emily always had additional examples to explain concepts in lab. She often explained how concepts in lecture connected to lab topics, which increased my understanding of the material in both lab and lecture. She did a great job emphasizing the important points of each lab and leading discussion on why the results of our lab section didn't always match our expected results.

My TA was very receptive and eager to answer student questions. She was so helpful in not only addressing issues but also further engaging students in the subject matter, especially if something was challenging.

She really made the lab environment very pleasant. It was always nice coming to see her. I also think she did a great job of levelling with us. For example, sometimes when the labs were unclear or the slide show provided to her didn't do a great job of something, she would acknowledge it and fill in the gaps (when the slides were unclear, sometimes she'd have supplementary images she found herself, which was really nice).

She was very patient in explaining things in multiple different ways if we did not understand it the first time

her explanations were concise and often explained concepts better than in lecture

My TA was very helpful in explaining all the difficult concepts prior to the lab beginning

Read through the material very well. She knew what she was talking about. Also brought snacks.

**SHE WAS AWESOME AND TAUGHT ME SO MUCH!!! BEST TA I HAVE EVER HAD IN MY 4 YEARS AT DUKE!!!**

She provided graphics and organizational tools that was supplementary to the lab that helped explain the lecture material and lab material. She created a car metaphor/graphic to explain background selection, and selective sweeps.

Took the time to make extra presentations to help us understand the material

She explained things in new and creative ways and was always available over email if I had any questions. Best TA I have ever had by far.

Nearly every lab period Emily had her own powerpoint made in order to help us understand difficult concepts from lecture and those related to the lab. I thought they were incredibly helpful- especially her presentation on background selection and selective sweeps where she related them to racing cars.

She's perfect!

Emily is great! She has such a wonderful attitude, so I always looked forward to coming to class!

Emily was always really accessible when it came to answering question in lab, which helped with both the completion of labs and with comprehending lecture material. She was always also so enthusiastic about the material which was infectious and endearing. She helped us to be efficient and get out of lab as fast as possible.

Took time to make really helpful and detailed charts to help explain concepts related to quantitative traits. Explained why McDonald Kreitman tests work (didn't understand the reasoning behind it from lecture)

She was extremely prepared in her prelab talks/PowerPoints. She explained the topics in a very easy to learn fashion and was also eager and knowledgeable when helping us with problems during the lab.

My TA made herself availab to not only help with labs but also in-class problems. She was very helpful in me understanding the underlying concepts involved in the question and how to apply them and not just what the answer was supposed to be.

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	21

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

**Text Response**

Nothing

Nothing springs to mind. Emliy did a good job.

Challenge students to think more about how the conclusions of each lab could be extended to further experiments; she did this in some labs but it would be interesting to think about follow-up work for even more labs

In some of the labs, I would've liked to have more explicit connections to the lecture material addressed in the lab activities. This isn't something my TA did personally, I think it was more a flaw of the overall lab course design.

Honestly, nothing really comes to mind. Maybe drawing stronger parallels to the lecture material.

She really was a great TA. I do not have anything I would have wanted her to do differently

i can't think of anything, Emily was fantastic!

I felt that my TA did all she could to help me better learn biology

Nothing that I can think of

NOTHING!!! SHE WAS AMAZING AND REALLY CARED ABOUT ALL OF US LEARNING THINGS.

nothing, she was perfect

Nothing. She is actually the best.

Nothing she did a great job.

Nothing

Nothing!

can't think of a thing

Instead of caramelized popcorn stick to movie theater butter flavor.

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	17

5. Further comments about your TA:

**Text Response**

By far and away one of the best TAs I've had. Nice, encouraging, took the labs seriously but made them fun and interesting at the same time.

I

Emily was a fantastic TA this semester! She was always highly enthusiastic and knowledgeable about the lab material and always willing to stay after lab finished if students needed extra time to finish labs or had questions to be answered.

Emily has been one of the best TAs I've had at Duke. She was always so enthusiastic about teaching and helping students. She made lab enjoyable and academically engaging.

Really top notch.

Great TA

SHE IS THE BOMB DIGGITY DAWG!!!

She is the best TA I have had at Duke. She was so good at teaching. Really receptive, very efficient, very creative. She made lab enjoyable. She helped me a lot outside of class with lecture material. She was great.

She's great!

Loved her!

Emily is hands down my favorite TA that I've ever had and did an amazing job. She brought us snacks to motivate us to do work and was just all around great.

Emily is the best! I wish she could be my TA for all of my classes!

Emily is probably the best TA I've had at Duke. Although I hated having to do Bio labs one of the few enjoyable parts of the lab was having her as a TA. She was always kind and had a sense of humor while still being extremely knowledgeable in the topics we studied in lab. I have had TAs before in labs that had no idea what they were doing and when problems arose they could not help. Emily was the complete opposite of that and it was a pleasure to attend her lab section.

Emily is the best TA's I've had at Duke so far.

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	14








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

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	1 Evidence for Evolution (carnivorous plants)		1	4%
2	2 Transmission Genetics (VGL problems for Mendelian genetics)		6	26%
3	3 SNPs & Genome-wide Associations (patient genotype data)		1	4%
4	4 PTC Genotyping (genotyping ability to taste PTC)		1	4%
5	5 Quantitative Genetics (Bugsville)		0	0%
6	6 Darwinian Snails (crabs eating snails)		0	0%
7	7 Frequency-dependent Natural Selection (beans in rocks)		0	0%
8	8 Population Genetics (Allele A1 exercise)		0	0%
9	9 Molecular Evolution & Bioinformatics ( MK/dN/dS/pi tests onDrosophila genes)		14	61%
10	10 Natural Selection in Fruit Flies (eye color selective sweep)		0	0%
11	11 Mating Behavior & Speciation (fly mating)		0	0%
12	12 Speciation (Mimulus flower traits)		0	0%
13	13 Domesticating Dogs (phylogenetics)		0	0%
14	14 Macroevolution (mammal skulls)		0	0%
	Total		23	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	9
Mean	6.35
Variance	11.69
Standard Deviation	3.42
Total Responses	23



9. 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		4	18%
4	4		14	64%
5	5 Very much		4	18%
	Total		22	



Statistic	Value
Min Value	3
Max Value	5
Mean	4.00
Variance	0.38
Standard Deviation	0.62
Total Responses	22

10. Further comments about the lab exercises:

Text Response
I thought they were very hands-on which I liked
The lab exercises helped with my understanding. More so than the exercises it was my TA's explanation and supplementary materials that really enhanced my learning. Emily was a wonderful TA. She made lab enjoyable, and efficient
Overall they were all right. My bias is that of an ECE student that did not want to be forced to tasked a bio class in the first place

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	3

11. What section are you in?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	1 Fri 10:05 Mercy		0	0%
2	2 Fri 10:05 Shelby		0	0%
3	3 Fri 10:05 Casey		0	0%
4	4 Fri 1:40 Mercy		0	0%
5	5 Thurs 9:00 Mike		0	0%
6	6 Thurs 9:00 Rose		0	0%
7	7 Thurs 9:00 Koko		0	0%
8	8 Thurs 12:30 Anna		0	0%
9	9 Thurs 12:30 Jenn		0	0%
10	10 Thurs 12:30 Koko		0	0%
11	11 Thurs 4:00 Anna		0	0%
12	12 Thurs 4:00 Ellee		0	0%
13	13 Weds 10:05 Ryan		0	0%
14	14 Weds 10:05 Bob		0	0%
15	15 Weds 10:05 Shelby		0	0%
16	16 Weds 1:40 Ryan		0	0%
17	17 Weds 1:40 Halina		0	0%
18	18 Weds 1:40 Erin		0	0%
19	19 Tues 9:00 Rose		0	0%
20	20 Tues 9:00 Bob		0	0%
21	21 Tues 9:00 Erin		0	0%
22	22 Tues 12:30 Mike		0	0%
23	23 Tues 12:30 Emily		11	48%
24	24 Tues 12:30 Anna		0	0%
25	25 Tues 4:00 Jenn		0	0%
26	26 Tues 4:00 Emily		12	52%
27	27 Tues 4:00 Tiffany		0	0%
28	28 Mon 3:05 Anna		0	0%
29	29 Mon 3:05 Shelby		0	0%
30	30 Thurs 4:00 Chris		0	0%
31	31 Fri 1:40 Halina		0	0%
32	32 Fri 1:40 Tiffany		0	0%
33	33 Mon 3:05 Tiffany		0	0%
	Total		23	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	23
Max Value	26
Mean	24.57
Variance	2.35
Standard Deviation	1.53
Total Responses	23

12. Which lab exercise did you find most interesting?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	1 Evidence for Evolution (carnivorous plants)		2	9%
2	2 Transmission Genetics (VGL problems for Mendelian genetics)		0	0%
3	3 SNPs & Genome-wide Associations (patient genotype data)		0	0%
4	4 PTC Genotyping (genotyping ability to taste PTC)		2	9%
5	5 Quantitative Genetics (Bugsville)		0	0%
6	6 Darwinian Snails (crabs eating snails)		0	0%
7	7 Frequency-dependent Natural Selection (beans in rocks)		3	13%
8	8 Population Genetics (Allele A1 exercise)		2	9%
9	9 Molecular Evolution & Bioinformatics (MK/dN/dS/pi tests on Drosophila genes)		0	0%
10	10 Natural Selection in Fruit Flies (eye color selective sweep)		0	0%
11	11 Mating Behavior & Speciation (fly mating)		3	13%
12	12 Speciation (Mimulus flower traits)		1	4%
13	13 Domesticating Dogs (phylogenetics)		6	26%
14	14 Macroevolution (mammal skulls)		4	17%
	Total		23	










Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	14
Mean	9.83
Variance	17.88
Standard Deviation	4.23
Total Responses	23

13. Which lab exercise did you find least interesting?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	1 Evidence for Evolution (carnivorous plants)		6	26%
2	2 Transmission Genetics (VGL problems for Mendelian genetics)		0	0%
3	3 SNPs & Genome-wide Associations (patient genotype data)		0	0%
4	4 PTC Genotyping (genotyping ability to taste PTC)		2	9%
5	5 Quantitative Genetics (Bugsville)		1	4%
6	6 Darwinian Snails (crabs eating snails)		2	9%
7	7 Frequency-dependent Natural Selection (beans in rocks)		2	9%
8	8 Population Genetics (Allele A1 exercise)		1	4%
9	9 Molecular Evolution & Bioinformatics (MK/dN/dS/pi tests on Drosophila genes)		2	9%
10	10 Natural Selection in Fruit Flies (eye color selective sweep)		0	0%
11	11 Mating Behavior & Speciation (fly mating)		5	22%
12	12 Speciation (Mimulus flower traits)		2	9%
13	13 Domesticating Dogs (phylogenetics)		0	0%
14	14 Macroevolution (mammal skulls)		0	0%
	Total		23	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	12
Mean	6.52
Variance	16.99
Standard Deviation	4.12
Total Responses	23

14. Which lab exercise did you find most useful?

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

Statistic	Value
Min Value	2
Max Value	13
Mean	7.74
Variance	6.20
Standard Deviation	2.49
Total Responses	23

15. Which lab exercise did you find least useful?

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

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	14
Mean	8.30
Variance	20.95
Standard Deviation	4.58
Total Responses	23