

COURSE EVALUATIONS: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name PHIL 20665

Instructor's Name Anastasia Berg Quarter and Year Spring 2016

Today's Date 5/31/16 Your Year: 3rd year Major Comparative human development

I. Rate your Instructor's Performance—How well was the instructor able:

A. to explain the course material:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

B. to conduct discussions:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

D. to respond to written material:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

II. What were the special strong points of your instructor:

Anastasia was a truly excellent professor, ~~with~~ very knowledgeable with a lot of excitement about teaching our class. She has a lot of background in these topics and was therefore able to lecture and explain difficult concepts very well.

III. What could your instructor have done better? Suggestions?

I would not have minded a few smaller assignments (maybe a weekly discussion question post) to ensure that we all remained engaged in each class.

More Rating Metrics:

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Instructor						
Organized the course clearly.						X
Presented clear lectures.						X
Held my attention and made this course interesting.						X
Stimulated and facilitated questions and discussions.						X
Responded well to student questions.						X
Was available outside of class.						X
Was helpful during office hours.						X
Motivated independent thinking.						X
Overall						
This course met my expectations.						X
This course provided me with new insight and knowledge.						X
This course provided me with useful skills.						X
The content of this course was presented at an appropriate level.						X
I put my best effort into this course.						X
The class had a high level of morale/enthusiasm.					X	

COURSE EVALUATIONS: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name PHIL 20665

Instructor's Name Anastasia Berg Quarter and Year Spring 2016

Today's Date 5-31-16 Your Year: 4th Major Political Science

I. Rate your Instructor's Performance—How well was the instructor able:

A. to explain the course material:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

B. to conduct discussions:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

D. to respond to written material:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

II. What were the special strong points of your instructor: Anastasia brought in an incredible enthusiasm and excitement for the material. She was very engaging and related some of the lofty and abstract concepts to real world examples in an excellent way. She also facilitated discussion in a flexible yet focused manner.

III. What could your instructor have done better? Suggestions? None

More Rating Metrics:

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Instructor						
Organized the course clearly.					✓	
Presented clear lectures.					✓	
Held my attention and made this course interesting.						✓
Stimulated and facilitated questions and discussions.						✓
Responded well to student questions.						✓
Was available outside of class.						✓
Was helpful during office hours.						✓
Motivated independent thinking.						✓
Overall						
This course met my expectations.					✓	
This course provided me with new insight and knowledge.						✓
This course provided me with useful skills.			✗	✓		
The content of this course was presented at an appropriate level.					✓	
I put my best effort into this course.						✓
The class had a high level of morale/enthusiasm.					✓	✗

COURSE EVALUATIONS: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name PHIL 20665

Instructor's Name Anastasia Berg Quarter and Year Spring 2016

Today's Date 5/31/16 Your Year: 4th Major CHDV

I. Rate your Instructor's Performance—How well was the instructor able:

A. to explain the course material:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

B. to conduct discussions:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

D. to respond to written material:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

II. What were the special strong points of your instructor:

She was very energetic about the material and you could tell she had a good understanding of it. She also never made you speak if you didn't want to. It was a very low pressure environment.

III. What could your instructor have done better? Suggestions?

She maybe could have facilitated questions to kids who didn't have much to say.

More Rating Metrics:

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Instructor						
Organized the course clearly.					✓	
Presented clear lectures.					✓	
Held my attention and made this course interesting.					✓	
Stimulated and facilitated questions and discussions.						✓
Responded well to student questions.						✓
Was available outside of class.						✓
Was helpful during office hours.						✓
Motivated independent thinking.						✓
Overall						
This course met my expectations.						✓
This course provided me with new insight and knowledge.						✓
This course provided me with useful skills.					✓	
The content of this course was presented at an appropriate level.						✓
I put my best effort into this course.					✓	
The class had a high level of morale/enthusiasm.					✓	

COURSE EVALUATIONS: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name The emotions: philosophy & psychoanalysis Phil 20665
Instructor's Name Berg Quarter and Year Spring 16
Today's Date May 31 Your Year: JVNDV Major Phil & Econ

I. Rate your Instructor's Performance—How well was the instructor able:

A. to explain the course material:

Excellently Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

B. to conduct discussions:

Excellently Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

Excellently Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

D. to respond to written material:

Excellently Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

II. What were the special strong points of your instructor: animated, excited & passionate

III. What could your instructor have done better? Suggestions? guided discussion & made more clear what we should get out of every class.

More Rating Metrics:

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Instructor						
Organized the course clearly.					✓	
Presented clear lectures.					✓	
Held my attention and made this course interesting.					✓	
Stimulated and facilitated questions and discussions.					✓	
Responded well to student questions.					✓	
Was available outside of class.					✓	✓
Was helpful during office hours.						✓
Motivated independent thinking.				✓		
Overall						
This course met my expectations.				✓		
This course provided me with new insight and knowledge.				✓		
This course provided me with useful skills.				✓		
The content of this course was presented at an appropriate level.				✓		
I put my best effort into this course.				✓		
The class had a high level of morale/enthusiasm.				✓		

COURSE EVALUATIONS: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name PHIL 20665

Instructor's Name Berg Quarter and Year Spring 2016

Today's Date 31 May 2016 Your Year: 4th Major Psychology

I. Rate your Instructor's Performance—How well was the instructor able:

A. to explain the course material:

Excellently Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

B. to conduct discussions:

Excellently Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

Excellently Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

D. to respond to written material:

Excellently Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

II. What were the special strong points of your instructor: Very enthusiastic about the material. She also structured class in a way so that if you didn't understand the reading we would thoroughly go over it first before discussing. This was very useful.

III. What could your instructor have done better? Suggestions? I don't think the instructor had any major flaws -- the readings were reasonable and discussions lively -- but the class perhaps should be two 1.5 hour sessions instead of a 3 hour.

More Rating Metrics:

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Instructor						
Organized the course clearly.						X
Presented clear lectures.					X	
Held my attention and made this course interesting.					X	
Stimulated and facilitated questions and discussions.						X
Responded well to student questions.						X
Was available outside of class.					X	
Was helpful during office hours.						X
Motivated independent thinking.						X
Overall						
This course met my expectations.						X
This course provided me with new insight and knowledge.						X
This course provided me with useful skills.						X
The content of this course was presented at an appropriate level.						X
I put my best effort into this course.					X	
The class had a high level of morale/enthusiasm.					X	

COURSE EVALUATIONS: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name PHIL 20665: The Emotions: Philosophy & Psychoanalysis
Instructor's Name A. Berg Quarter and Year Spring 2016
Today's Date 5/31/16 Your Year: Fourth Major Philosophy

I. Rate your Instructor's Performance—How well was the instructor able:

A. to explain the course material:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

B. to conduct discussions:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

D. to respond to written material:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

II. What were the special strong points of your instructor: Very knowledgeable about the relevant topics and well-equipped to respond to questions outside the scope of the reading; always energetic and did well to keep discussion moving

III. What could your instructor have done better? Suggestions? No weaknesses really. Any troubles w/ the class - mostly discussions - were the fault of students being unprepared.

More Rating Metrics:

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Instructor						
Organized the course clearly.						X
Presented clear lectures.						X
Held my attention and made this course interesting.						X
Stimulated and facilitated questions and discussions.						X
Responded well to student questions.					X	
Was available outside of class.					X	
Was helpful during office hours.					X	
Motivated independent thinking.					X	
Overall						
This course met my expectations.				X		
This course provided me with new insight and knowledge.					X	
This course provided me with useful skills.					X	
The content of this course was presented at an appropriate level.					X	
I put my best effort into this course.					X	
The class had a high level of morale/enthusiasm.			X			

COURSE EVALUATIONS: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name PHIL 20665

Instructor's Name Anastasia Berg Quarter and Year 3rd 2016

Today's Date 5/31/16 Your Year: 2nd Major CHDV

I. Rate your Instructor's Performance—How well was the instructor able:

A. to explain the course material:

Excellent Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

B. to conduct discussions:

Excellent Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

Excellent Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

D. to respond to written material:

Excellent Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

II. What were the special strong points of your instructor: I appreciate the difficulty of the class and how it

allowed me to learn so much more about topics I had little background in.

Anastasia facilitated discussions quite well and always provided detailed examples to help us understand the material more concretely.

III. What could your instructor have done better? Suggestions? Some texts were challenging, perhaps breaking down important parts so the class discussion would be better, because sometimes people were confused.

Did an excellent job with the philosophy class and illustrating on the board. part of

More Rating Metrics:

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Instructor						
Organized the course clearly.					X	
Presented clear lectures.					X	
Held my attention and made this course interesting.						X
Stimulated and facilitated questions and discussions.						X
Responded well to student questions.						X
Was available outside of class.						X
Was helpful during office hours.					X	
Motivated independent thinking.						X
Overall						
This course met my expectations.						X
This course provided me with new insight and knowledge.						X
This course provided me with useful skills.						X
The content of this course was presented at an appropriate level.					X	
I put my best effort into this course.						X
The class had a high level of morale/enthusiasm.					X	

COURSE EVALUATIONS: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name PHIL 206605
Instructor's Name Anastasia Bers Quarter and Year Spring 2016
Today's Date May 31st Your Year: 4th Major Philosophy

I. Rate your Instructor's Performance—How well was the instructor able:

A. to explain the course material:

Excellently Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

B. to conduct discussions:

Excellently Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

Excellently Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

D. to respond to written material:

Excellently Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

II. What were the special strong points of your instructor: very approachable,
good discussion leader, friendly
clear, understanding

III. What could your instructor have done better? Suggestions? THE COURSE
COULD HAVE USED A MORE
COHERENT CENTRAL NARRATIVE TO TIE
THE READINGS TOGETHER, ~~ENTER~~ TO
AVOID FEELING AS THOUGH WE RUSHED
FROM ONE PERSPECTIVE TO ANOTHER

More Rating Metrics:

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Instructor						
Organized the course clearly.				/		
Presented clear lectures.					/	
Held my attention and made this course interesting.					/	
Stimulated and facilitated questions and discussions.						/
Responded well to student questions.						/
Was available outside of class.	/					
Was helpful during office hours.	/					
Motivated independent thinking.						/
Overall						
This course met my expectations.					/	
This course provided me with new insight and knowledge.						/
This course provided me with useful skills.						/
The content of this course was presented at an appropriate level.						/
I put my best effort into this course.						/
The class had a high level of morale/enthusiasm.				/		

COURSE EVALUATIONS: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name PHIL 20665

Instructor's Name Anastasiya Berg Quarter and Year Spring 2016

Today's Date 29.5.2016 Your Year: 3rd Major Psychology

I. Rate your Instructor's Performance—How well was the instructor able:

A. to explain the course material:

Excellently Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

B. to conduct discussions:

Excellently Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

Excellently Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

D. to respond to written material:

Excellently Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

II. What were the special strong points of your instructor: enthusiastic and willing to answer questions and clarify points of confusion. also she's clearly brilliant.

III. What could your instructor have done better? Suggestions? more structured discussion might have been nice. also although it would mean more work for students, I think having a weekly response (500 words?) would have given more incentive to read and read carefully.

More Rating Metrics:

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Instructor						
Organized the course clearly.					×	
Presented clear lectures.					×	
Held my attention and made this course interesting.					×	
Stimulated and facilitated questions and discussions.					×	
Responded well to student questions.					×	
Was available outside of class.	×					
Was helpful during office hours.	×					
Motivated independent thinking.				×		
Overall						
This course met my expectations.					×	
This course provided me with new insight and knowledge.					×	
This course provided me with useful skills.					×	
The content of this course was presented at an appropriate level.				×		
I put my best effort into this course.				×		
The class had a high level of morale/enthusiasm.				×		

COURSE EVALUATIONS: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name PHIL 20665 The Emotions

Instructor's Name Anastasia Berg Quarter and Year Spring 16

Today's Date 5/31/16 Your Year: 3rd Major Bio/Phil

I. Rate your Instructor's Performance—How well was the instructor able:

A. to explain the course material:

Excellentlly Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

B. to conduct discussions:

Excellentlly Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

Excellentlly Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

D. to respond to written material:

Excellentlly Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

II. What were the special strong points of your instructor: Very enthusiastic about the material, good at making class interested in discussing

III. What could your instructor have done better? Suggestions? Would have been nice if the discussions were led on bigger questions rather than on quick questions about details in the reading. Also would have been nice to read a couple authors more thoroughly rather than reading more authors.

More Rating Metrics:

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Instructor						
Organized the course clearly.					X	
Presented clear lectures.					X	
Held my attention and made this course interesting.					X	
Stimulated and facilitated questions and discussions.					X	
Responded well to student questions.						X
Was available outside of class.					X	
Was helpful during office hours.					X	
Motivated independent thinking.					X	
Overall						
This course met my expectations.					X	
This course provided me with new insight and knowledge.					X	
This course provided me with useful skills.					X	
The content of this course was presented at an appropriate level.					X	
I put my best effort into this course.					X	
The class had a high level of morale/enthusiasm.				X		

COURSE EVALUATIONS: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name The Emotions: Philosophy & Psychoanalysis PHIL 20665
 Instructor's Name Anastasia Berg Quarter and Year Spring 2016
 Today's Date 5/31/16 Your Year: 4th Major: Philosophy

I. Rate your Instructor's Performance—How well was the instructor able:

A. to explain the course material:

Excellently Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

B. to conduct discussions:

Excellently Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

Excellently Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

D. to respond to written material:

Excellently Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

II. What were the special strong points of your instructor: _____

Very clear speaker, often funny, and very open to help

III. What could your instructor have done better? Suggestions? _____

As a teacher, I don't know. Definitely didn't seem like this
was her first course. Only suggestion is to be less
ambitious with syllabus. We could've done the whole course
on one or two of the thinkers, and I would've felt like
I learned more & been less scattered that way.

(Tho some ppl may have appreciated the survey-nature of the
course)

More Rating Metrics:

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Instructor						
Organized the course clearly.				✓		
Presented clear lectures.						✓
Held my attention and made this course interesting.						✓
Stimulated and facilitated questions and discussions.						
Responded well to student questions.						✓
Was available outside of class.						✓
Was helpful during office hours.						✓
Motivated independent thinking.						✓
Overall						
This course met my expectations.					✓	
This course provided me with new insight and knowledge.						✓
This course provided me with useful skills.				✓		
The content of this course was presented at an appropriate level.					✓	
I put my best effort into this course.					✓	
The class had a high level of morale/enthusiasm.					✓	

COURSE EVALUATIONS: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name The Emotions: Philosophy + Psychoanalysis PHIL 20665
Instructor's Name Anastasia Berg Quarter and Year SPRING 2016
Today's Date 5/31/16 Your Year: 1st year Major Philosophy + allied fields

I. Rate your Instructor's Performance—How well was the instructor able:

A. to explain the course material:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

B. to conduct discussions:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

D. to respond to written material:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

II. What were the special strong points of your instructor:

Anastasia is very knowledgeable and cares about her students. I really enjoyed the class.

III. What could your instructor have done better? Suggestions?

My main concern for the course was remembering all the material. There were large readings, and I feel that it would be helpful to have outlines of the material after we discuss.

More Rating Metrics:

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Instructor						
Organized the course clearly.					✓	✓
Presented clear lectures.					✓	
Held my attention and made this course interesting.						✓
Stimulated and facilitated questions and discussions.						✓
Responded well to student questions.						✓
Was available outside of class.						✓
Was helpful during office hours.						✓
Motivated independent thinking.						✓
Overall						
This course met my expectations.						✓
This course provided me with new insight and knowledge.						✓
This course provided me with useful skills.						✓
The content of this course was presented at an appropriate level.						✓
I put my best effort into this course.						✓
The class had a high level of morale/enthusiasm.					✓	

COURSE EVALUATIONS: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name PHIL 20665

Instructor's Name Anastasia Berg Quarter and Year Spring 2016

Today's Date 5/31/16 Your Year: 2nd year Major Comparative Human Development

I. Rate your Instructor's Performance—How well was the instructor able:

A. to explain the course material:

Excellent Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

B. to conduct discussions:

Excellent Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

Excellent Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

D. to respond to written material:

Excellent Quite well Adequately Poorly (N/A)

II. What were the special strong points of your instructor: Anastasia allowed students to ask questions and she allowed for other students to attempt to answer that question and she would let her help summarize the clearly summarizing and made the reading more manageable/accessible

III. What could your instructor have done better? Suggestions? if giving more lectures, but that is more of a personal preference.

More Rating Metrics:

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Instructor						
Organized the course clearly.						✓
Presented clear lectures.						✓
Held my attention and made this course interesting.						✓
Stimulated and facilitated questions and discussions.						✓
Responded well to student questions.						✓
Was available outside of class.						✓
Was helpful during office hours.						✓
Motivated independent thinking.						✓
Overall						
This course met my expectations.						✓
This course provided me with new insight and knowledge.						✓
This course provided me with useful skills.						✓
The content of this course was presented at an appropriate level.						✓
I put my best effort into this course.						✓
The class had a high level of morale/enthusiasm.						✓

COURSE EVALUATIONS: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name PHIL 20665

Instructor's Name Anastasia Berg Quarter and Year Spring 2016

Today's Date 5-31-2016 Your Year: 2nd Year Major Anthropology / Comparative Human Development

I. Rate your Instructor's Performance—How well was the instructor able:

A. to explain the course material:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

B. to conduct discussions:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

D. to respond to written material:

Excellent

Quite well

Adequately

Poorly

(N/A)

II. What were the special strong points of your instructor:

- explained difficult material very well and in an interesting way
- very accommodating to students' different levels of experience with philosophy
- created a cohesive curriculum

III. What could your instructor have done better? Suggestions?

I like having a shorter midterm essay to get a feel for a professor's grading style.

More Rating Metrics:

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Instructor						
Organized the course clearly.						✓
Presented clear lectures.						✓
Held my attention and made this course interesting.						✓
Stimulated and facilitated questions and discussions.						✓
Responded well to student questions.						✓
Was available outside of class.						✓
Was helpful during office hours.	✓					
Motivated independent thinking.						✓
Overall						
This course met my expectations.						✓
This course provided me with new insight and knowledge.						✓
This course provided me with useful skills.					✓	
The content of this course was presented at an appropriate level.						✓
I put my best effort into this course.					✓	
The class had a high level of morale/enthusiasm.						✓

HUMA 11500: Philosophical Perspectives-1

Section 01 - Autumn 2015

8/18 enrolled

Written Comments: (This includes every written comment from the first quarter evaluations: Freshmen)

- Anastasia is very passionate about the texts we read and it shows during the class—sometimes she speaks a little too quickly but most of the time clear and discussions are very interesting and thought-provoking. Going to office hours to talk over graded papers was very useful because it allowed me to see where my writing is weak and where it has its strengths. Reading the comments interspersed within my paper also gave good feedback.
- Meeting with the professor was extremely helpful.
- Professor Berg was very knowledgeable and enthusiastic, making her explanations, both in and out of the class very helpful. At times though she would perhaps spend too much time lecturing, thus taking away from the discussion portion of the class. Much of the time she would “over-lecture” because many students did not do the reading, which is not her fault and handicaps her to an extent. However, I do think more discussion would be a good idea.
- My favorite portion is the discussion which is very useful in exposing the wealth of various interpretations and levels of understanding which respond to important subjects and passages. Having students “pass the ball” or select the next speaker is extremely helpful! [Pedagogy technique alert!]
- Last quarter, the discussion posts really helped me expand my thoughts on different readings while also giving me very interesting perspectives. Coming in to see the prof outside of class was incredibly helpful, especially when I missed class. Some of the discussions did seem to go off tangent, but were usually interesting regardless.
- I’ve generally really liked the class. I didn’t like chalk posts at the beginning of the quarter, but once I got used to doing them they were helpful. *Meeting about papers (with Anastasia) was probably the most useful thing I did last quarter.*
- Baton Passing was especially good, I like that. No complaints, thought everything worked really well. Keep it up I guess?

- Anastasia is helpful outside of class but therefore seems to have high expectations on papers. Very good at maintaining lively class, especially it's a 9am class. Not a lot of reading covered in class; focuses on delving very deep into a small portion of text. Comments on papers helpful and constructive. Very considerate towards students when it comes to deadlines.
- Anastasia is a very good professor. I liked how she handled her class, especially during discussion sessions, she allows for the class to follow their lines of thought but always manages to gently push the discussion in the direction it needs to be going. She draws attention to important sections of the text that helps us when we go to write papers or complete posts on chalk. I also liked the couple of sessions where we would not do discussion but instead take 30-40 min for her to kind of lecture on the text instead which gave us time to focus on learning about the material and not worry about the potential pressure of thinking of something to contribute to discussion.
- The class is at its best when the focus is on discussion and working through/debating the text as a group, and Anastasia does a good job creating/moderating discussion. The posts (and now the discussion questions) seem to do a good job creating discussion and involving the viewpoints of those who would otherwise be silent. Anastasia is excellent at being available outside of class. Occasionally discussion becomes bogged down on a single point and at these times I think it would be helpful for Anastasia to advance the discussion through lecture.
- Anastasia is very knowledgeable and passionate on the topic of philosophy. She is very helpful when students have questions and always available to meet. I am personally still a bit unsure of how to write an A-worthy paper and sometimes feel lost as to what she expects from our papers. . I don't find the chalk posts helpful, but find class discussions to be insightful and enlightening. I like when she guides the discussion because I feel that it elucidates what she wants us to get out of the readings.
- Liked/helpful: going over papers. Anastasia's lecture-like breaking down of the readings. Disliked/Not helpful: discussion maybe could have had more structure.
- Found extremely useful: one-on-one office hours. Likes: prompts always tend to be interesting, relevant and thought-provoking. Comments on papers always helpful. When discussion in class is a debate approach (between students). Dislikes: long awkward silences while waiting for a class response to a questions.
- Our discussions never had awkward silences because she kept the topics interesting and engaging. Office hours were very helpful. My writing improved significantly afterwards. She does a good job pausing and explaining the more difficult to understand sections of the text. Every day seem very well laid out. She is very thoughtful. When we divide up into small groups and break down the materials, office hours. The chalk post does not help me.

- Over the second half of the class I found that most of the problems of the first half persisted. The major problem as far as discussions continue to be very one-sided, and most of the time it was left for the students to just follow Anastasia's leading of the discussion. On the other hand, I found out that I was using a text editor that didn't allow me to see the running comments. I read those for my final paper and they were very useful.
- I think the discussion-style aspect of the class helped us better understand what we already took from our texts, however we did not necessarily take or understanding all that was in the books and this led to some problems I think in terms of the discussion because sometimes we ended up discussing things we did not necessarily understand. So I think that some establishment of what the text is saying, which does not have to be in a lecture style, before the discussion might help the flow of the class significantly.

What were the instructor's strengths? Weaknesses?

- Anastasia knows her philosophy extremely well. Possibly a little too well, because she demands a high level of precision of wording and meaning that is not always appropriate. As a teacher, she teaches the material well. She is not the best facilitator of discussion because she demands precision that most first years, me included, were often not prepared for. It was, however, her first class I believe, and she most certainly improved a ton as the year went on.
- Enthusiastic, knowledgeable, encouraged class discussion. However, she felt the need to make sure that EVERYONE understood the reading; coupled with the light workload, that made it easy for some students to take the class less than seriously. As a result, class discussions were often less productive than desired.

What, if anything, what would you change about this course and why?

- I would have had the second half of the quarter the whole year, because she improved as a teacher as the year went on.

- Increase the reading load a little, focus a little more on evaluation of the texts as opposed to understanding them, and find a way not to enable lazy students.

How productive was class discussion?

- The first half of the class was mostly us getting answers wrong to her questions. She changed course to more effective discussion later on, and those discussions were fun and interesting.
- Sometimes productive, sometimes not at all.

How has this course contributed to your education?

- I believe it has helped me think in a precise way. She demanded a good deal from us, but it definitely helped me understand what philosophy would be and how one would approach it.
- Fulfilled a requirement, gave me a stronger background in Ancient Greek philosophy.

The Instructor

N/A

Strongly
Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly
Agree

Organized the course clearly.	0%	0%	0%	13%	25%	50%
Presented clear lectures.	13%	0%	0%	0%	38%	38%
Held my attention and made this course interesting.	0%	0%	0%	0%	63%	25%
Stimulated and facilitated questions and discussions.	0%	0%	0%	25%	38%	25%
Responded well to student questions.	0%	0%	0%	25%	25%	38%
Was available outside of class.	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	63%
Was helpful during office hours.	25%	0%	13%	0%	0%	50%
Motivated independent thinking.	0%	0%	0%	25%	13%	38%

Overall

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
This course met my expectations.	0%	0%	0%	13%	63%	13%
This course provided me with new insight and knowledge.	0%	0%	0%	13%	25%	50%
This course provided me with useful skills.	0%	0%	0%	25%	25%	38%
The content of this course was presented at an appropriate level.	0%	0%	0%	0%	38%	50%
I put my best effort into this course.	0%	0%	0%	13%	50%	25%
The class had a high level of morale/enthusiasm.	0%	0%	13%	38%	13%	25%

HUMA 11600: Philosophical Perspectives-2

Section 01 - Winter 2016

Instructor(s): Artemyev Berg Anastasia

Number Enrolled: 18

Number of Responses: 17

Evaluation Comments

What were the instructor's strengths? Weaknesses?

- Anastasia was an engaging professor. She was enthusiastic when discussing the texts and facilitated class discussions well.
- Strengths: very knowledgeable and enthusiastic about the material, prepared Weaknesses: difficult to understand her point, or philosophy in general
- Anastasia was pretty good, a little disorganized, but otherwise quite nice.
- Energetic and knows the material really well. Sometimes gets carried away and can be confusing, but explains herself when asked questions.
- Anastasia is very good at interpreting and explaining the texts
- She is good at explaining the reading.
- Very engaging and open to students' questions during class, however sometimes discussions can get derailed and become confusing.

- Very passionate. Prompts for the most part were interesting to write on.
- Anastasia was an excellent instructor who understood the material extremely well and did a good job of presenting it in a regular manner. The grading was a bit random, but the class part was well done. She was very helpful to talk to about essays.
- Anastasia is honestly amazing. She kept the class interesting, and she is the reason why I stayed in the class/payed attention/etc. She does a good job making hard texts accessible. I thought she was also very easy to understand. Overall she is probably one of the best teachers I've ever had.
- The instructor explained what we were reading well, answered questions and motivated discussion well. However, a fair amount of reading was assigned for each class, most of which we did not cover as we were reading dense material, so although I did the reading for each class, I often felt unprepared for discussion, not knowing what part of the text we would focus on.
- Very articulate, makes sure to involve entire class in discussion, and more or less assures a reasonable level of understanding amongst students. Always prepared to pursue material to greater depth, always encourages students to meet at office hours, and is available as often as possible for them.
- Professor Berg was very knowledgeable about course material, and showed tremendous improvement in her ability to lecture and lead class discussion.
- Her strengths were she was very determined to make the texts and concepts involved in the class understandable to many students who never had to deal with philosophical texts prior to this class. Weaknesses were that she sometimes gave confusing instructions for assignments which led to frustration.

What, if anything, what would you change about this course and why?

- I would have more opportunities for class participation. Class discussions are great, but they don't work for everyone. More chalk posts would have been helpful. I would require chalk posts for every class.
- No more chalk posts/discussion questions. I feel that they didn't contribute to class discussions and were unnecessary.
- Replace discussion sessions with regular lectures.
- I would take the question posts down, but aside from that it was all pretty good
- We had chalk posts about the reading every week, which I thought were useful (made people more likely to do the reading and engage with it). But we also had "discussion questions" in groups every 2 weeks, which we didn't end up using and seems unnecessary.
- The writing assignments, I would change the prompts to make it more flexible, which means we could write on our own interest
- Would not like to do discussion question posts because we didn't discuss the proposed discussion questions in class, so it seemed like a little bit of a useless exercise
- Omit discussion questions posts. They were never used. Also, would like to read more outside opinion on the texts we read.
- More standardized grading please, and be straightforward with what is defined is and is not acceptable in an essay with regards to length and quality and content.
- Every week we were required to write a chalk post and respond to it. However, this quarter we were also required to write a discussion question a couple of times instead of the chalk post. I found the posts more helpful than the discussion questions; therefore, I think the course would still be beneficial, even without the discussion questions.
- More direction in what we should have prepared to discuss in class

- As a first year, I'm not sure I know what to change. I feel that assignments and coursework were reasonably appropriate at the least, and I have become a much better reader, writer, and critical thinker since I came to this course. I very much enjoyed being able to engage with the instructor and the material, and I felt that class facilitated this process in an organized way as much as possible.
- It's all good.
- I would get rid of the discussion questions added in the second quarter.

How productive was class discussion?

- The class discussions were dominated by a few students. For these students, they were probably helpful.
- Productive, but still difficult to follow
- Discussions often felt like they either deviated too much from the topic or did not conclude properly a specific topic.
- I was able to understand the texts much better through the discussion and I thought that it made me comprehend concepts I was not really fully aware of or understood
- Class discussions were fun, and helped me understand the reading better.
- Integral part of the class
- very productive. I get to know something I can't understand from reading the material
- Discussion in class was productive for the most part but conversation was easily derailed
- For the most part productive but I would like to see discussion help more in paper writing.

- Extremely productive, good balance of learning and talking. Difficult concepts were stressed and focused on.
- Class discussion was very productive. We got through all the readings, and I found them all understandable after. They also helped a lot with writing the essays required for the class.
- Fairly productive
- Very! Occasionally, nuances or particular principles of a particular writing are pursued to such depth as to exclude other material worthy of discussion (or necessary to be understood).
- Class discussions were usually fairly productive. Dependent on how much reading the students did.
- Class discussion was fairly productive but sometimes we would get behind the scheduled readings and instead of keeping caught up we kind of stayed in a lag for most of the two quarters.

How has this course contributed to your education?

- I think that it has enhanced my critical thinking skills.
- I feel more knowledgeable about philosophy
- I can now say that I have read most of western philosophical thought which is cool
- yeah I think so
- It gives me the basic understanding for philosophical thinking and makes me consider things in a more comprehensive way
- It's made me more keen on independent thinking.
- Helped me become a better writer and form clearer arguments.

- It's shown me what rigorous philosophy is and how I would approach it.
- I have become a much better writer, and my reading comprehension is better.
- Has introduced me to the philosophical way of thinking and some of the great thinkers, taught me some useful writing stuff
- Read some good books

The Instructor

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Organized the course clearly.	0%	0%	0%	24%	35%	41%
Presented clear lectures.	0%	0%	0%	35%	35%	29%
Held my attention and made this course interesting.	0%	0%	6%	24%	41%	29%
Stimulated and facilitated questions and discussions.	0%	0%	0%	12%	53%	35%

Responded well to student questions.	0%	0%	0%	18%	35%	41%
Was available outside of class.	0%	0%	0%	0%	18%	82%
Was helpful during office hours.	12%	0%	0%	12%	12%	65%
Motivated independent thinking.	0%	0%	6%	35%	18%	41%

Overall

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
This course met my expectations.	0%	0%	6%	24%	35%	35%
This course provided me with new insight and knowledge.	0%	0%	0%	12%	35%	53%

This course provided me with useful skills.	0%	6%	24%	12%	18%	41%
---	----	----	-----	-----	-----	------------

The content of this course was presented at an appropriate level.	0%	0%	0%	29%	29%	41%
---	----	----	----	-----	-----	------------

I put my best effort into this course.	0%	0%	18%	12%	29%	41%
--	----	----	-----	-----	-----	------------

The class had a high level of morale/enthusiasm.	0%	0%	12%	29%	29%	24%
--	----	----	-----	------------	------------	-----

Anastasia is very passionate about the texts we read and it shows during her class. Sometimes she speaks a little too quickly in class making it difficult to follow what she's saying but most of the time class and discussion are very interesting and thought provoking.

Going to office hours to talk over graded papers was very useful because it allowed me to see where my writing is weak and where it has its strengths. Reading the comments, interpretations within my paper also gave good feedback. The writing comments were less useful because the feedback my prof gave don't really help in my writing but it's understandable since we are all learning too.

Anastasia is very knowledgeable, passionate on the topic of philosophy. She is very helpful when students have questions, always available to meet. I am personally still a bit unsure of how to write an A-worthy paper, sometimes feel lost as to what she expects from our papers. I don't find the chalk posts helpful, but find class discussions to be insightful, enlightening. I like when she guides the discussion because I feel that it elucidates what she wants us to get out of the readings.

Liked/Helpful

- going over papers
- Anastasyia's lecture-like breaking down of the readings

Disliked/Not Helpful

- Discussions maybe could have had more structure
-

Found ^{extremely} Useful: one-on-one office hours

Likes:

- prompts always tend to be interesting, relevant + thought provoking
- comments on papers always helpful
- when discussion in class is a debate approach (between students)

Dislikes

- long awkward silences while writing
- for 2 class response to 2 question

Angus Evaluation

- 1 One discussion never had awkward silences because she kept the topic interesting & engaging
- 2 Office hours with her were very helpful & my major improved significantly afterwards.
- 3 She does a great job praising and explaining the work & "fixing" to understand & achieve the best.
- 4 Every day & every way well said out. She is very thorough.

Things that were helpful
when we divide up into small groups &
break down the material
Office hours

Things that were '4'
The book part does not help me

Course Evaluation

Over the second half of the class I found that most of the problems of the first half persisted. The major problem was how far that discussions continue to be very over-riden, and most of the time it was left for the students to just follow Anastasia's leading of the discussion.

On the other hand, I found out that I was using a text editor that didn't allow me to see the running comments. I read those for my final paper and they were very useful.

Written Evaluation

~~I think that the discussion side of the lecture style of the~~

- I think the discussion-style aspect of the class helped us better understand what we already took from our texts, however we did not necessarily take or understand all that was in the books and this lead to some problems I think in terms of the discussion because sometimes we ended up discussing things we did not necessarily understand. ~~So~~ So I think that some establishment of what the text is saying which does not have to be in a lecture style, before the discussion might help the flow of the class significantly.

Anastasia is very passionate about the texts we read and she shows during her class - sometimes she speaks a little too quickly in class making it difficult to follow what she's saying, but most of the time class and discussion are very interesting and thought provoking.

Going to office hours to talk over graded papers was very useful because it allowed me to see where my writing is weak and where it has its strengths. Reading the comments interspersed within my paper also gave good feedback. The writing seminars were less useful because the feedback my peers give doesn't really help in my writing, but it's understandable since we are all learning too.

I think distributing "discussion questions" well in advance, maybe even before the readings are completed, would benefit class discussions. It often seems like students need more time and direction when considering the texts.

Meeting with the professor was extremely helpful. The writing intern, unfortunately, was less so.

Also, alternating between philosophical texts and plays helped keep the course engaging. It also benefited students whose skills or interests were better suited to one type of text.

I explained more fully in the class evaluation, but Professor Berg was very knowledgeable and enthusiastic, making her explanations, both in and out of class, very helpful. At times, though, she would perhaps spend too much time lecturing, thus taking away from the discussion portion of the class. Much of the time, she would "over-lecture" because many students did not do the reading, which is not her fault and handicaps her to an extent. However, I do think more discussion would be a good idea.

Talk posts may be the only component of the class that I occasionally dislike; I believe this is more an issue of taste than anything else, but it seems not to provide strong & informed dialogue between posters: ~~replies are often~~

My favorite portion is the discussion which is very useful in exposing a wealth of various interpretations and levels of understanding with regard to important subjects: passages.

Having students "pass the ball" or select the next speaker is extremely helpful!

Last quarter, the discussion posts really helped me expand on my thoughts on different readings while also giving me very interesting perspectives. The second writing seminar was most useful, since we were able to peer edit each other's works. Coming in to see the prof outside of class was incredibly helpful, especially when I missed class. Some of the discussions did seem to go off tangent, but were usually interesting regardless.

- I've generally really liked this class. I didn't like chalk posts at the beginning of the quarters, but once I got used to doing them they were helpful. Meeting about papers (with Anastasia) was probably the most useful thing I did last quarter.

Discussions

- Pater Passing was ^{especially} good, I liked that
- No complaints, thought everything worked really well, keep it up I guess?

I guess sometimes I feel paper comments aren't fully instructive, but that refers to Thomas' comments on the last two. It's hard and not always pleasant, but I feel you do a good job

and more
just told
me some stuff
I did wrong

~~At the~~ Everything was pretty
good, second half of the quarter had
better discussions. Given comments on
the paper were helpful. I did not with
the instructor about the paper I'm sure
that would've been helpful, but I didn't en-
joy doing that - definitely will this quarter
Writing seminars were good. There is not
much to improve as far as I can see.

- Anastasia is helpful outside of class but therefore seems to have high expectations on papers
- very good at maintaining lively class, especially since it's a 9 am class
- Not a lot of readings covered in class; focuses on delving very deep into a small portion of text
- Comments on papers helpful and constructive
- Very considerate towards ~~students~~ students when it comes to deadlines

Anastasyia is a very good professor. I liked how she handled her class, especially during discussion sessions. She allows for the class to follow their lines of thought but always manages to gently push the discussion in the direction it needs to be going. She draws attention to important sections of the text that helps us when we go to write papers or complete posts on chalk. I also liked the couple of sessions where we would not do discussion but instead take 30-40 min for her to end of lecture on the text instead which gave us time to focus on learning about the material & not worry about the potential pressure of ~~the~~ thinking of something to contribute for discussion.

Written Evaluation

The class is at its best when the focus is on discussion and working through/debating the text as a group, and Anastasia does a good job creating/moderating discussion. The posts (and now the discussion questions) seem to do a good job creating discussion and involving the viewpoints of those who would otherwise be silent. Anastasia is excellent at being available outside of class.

Occasionally discussion becomes bogged down on a single point, and at these times I think it would be helpful for Anastasia to advance the discussion through lecture. Also, paper comments might be more useful if more specific areas of the paper were dealt with, as that can make the path to improvement more clear.

COURSE ASSISTANT EVALUATION: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name, number and section: Intro to Ethics PHIL 2100-3

Course Assistant's Name: Anastasia Quarter and Year: Spring 2015

Today's Date: 2nd May 2015 Your Year: 1 Major: _____

I. What were the C.A.'s primary duties in this course? Lead discussion, grade papers

II. Rate your C.A.'s performance -- how well was the C.A. able:

A. to explain the course material:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

B. to conduct discussions:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

D. to respond to written material:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

III. What were the special strong points of your course assistant? _____

She is very enthusiastic, knowledgeable, and passionate about the subject — in ways that really stood out from the lecturer

IV. What could your course assistant have done better? Suggestions? _____

Only thing is I wish discussions were longer, I learned much more from her than from lecture

COURSE ASSISTANT EVALUATION: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name, number and section: Introduction to Ethics; Phil 2100 (3)

Course Assistant's Name: Anastasia Berg Quarter and Year: Spring 2015

Today's Date: 05/29/15 Your Year: 1st Major: Political Science

I. What were the C.A.'s primary duties in this course? grading papers + leading discussion

II. Rate your C.A.'s performance -- how well was the C.A. able:

A. to explain the course material:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

B. to conduct discussions:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

D. to respond to written material:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

III. What were the special strong points of your course assistant?

she was very passionate about the material

IV. What could your course assistant have done better? Suggestions?

more guidance on papers

COURSE ASSISTANT EVALUATION: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name, number and section: PHIL 21000 : Intro to Ethics

Course Assistant's Name: Anastasia Berg Quarter and Year: Spring 2015

Today's Date: 5/29/2015 Your Year: 1 Major: Undeclared

I. What were the C.A.'s primary duties in this course? Lead the discussion and discuss
about papers, answers questions

II. Rate your C.A.'s performance -- how well was the C.A. able:

A. to explain the course material:
excellently quite ☒ well adequately poorly (not applicable)

B. to conduct discussions:
excellently quite ☒ well adequately poorly (not applicable)

C. to respond to questions and comments:
excellently quite ☒ well adequately poorly (not applicable)

D. to respond to written material:
excellently quite ☒ well adequately poorly (not applicable)

III. What were the special strong points of your course assistant? She's very friendly and
is very knowledgeable.

IV. What could your course assistant have done better? Suggestions? I feel that sometimes she
loses her point when explaining some concepts and her questions wording
is not quite straightforward.

COURSE ASSISTANT EVALUATION: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name, number and section: Introduction to Ethics PHIL 2600 (3)

Course Assistant's Name: Anastasia Berg Quarter and Year: Spring 2015

Today's Date: 5/29/15 Your Year: 1st Major: Economics

I. What were the C.A.'s primary duties in this course? grading, facilitating discussion

II. Rate your C.A.'s performance -- how well was the C.A. able:

A. to explain the course material:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

B. to conduct discussions:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

D. to respond to written material:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

III. What were the special strong points of your course assistant? Very thorough understanding

of material/texts very willing to help outside of class, good at responding to
points students make in discussion

IV. What could your course assistant have done better? Suggestions? Managing discussion section time-

we didn't have a lot of time to go thru certain concepts b/c spent too
long on one other concept.

COURSE ASSISTANT EVALUATION: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name, number and section: Introduction to Ethics, Phil 2100, 03

Course Assistant's Name: Anastasia Quarter and Year: Spring 2015

Today's Date: May 28, 2015 Your Year: 3rd Major: Environmental Studies & Philosophy

I. What were the C.A.'s primary duties in this course? lead discussion, hold office hours, grade papers

II. Rate your C.A.'s performance -- how well was the C.A. able:

A. to explain the course material:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

B. to conduct discussions:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

D. to respond to written material:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

III. What were the special strong points of your course assistant?

Anastasia gives very thorough written feedback on papers, not holding back any criticism ~~and~~ and she still grades very fairly. Good grasp of the important topics to cover in our short discussions

IV. What could your course assistant have done better? Suggestions?

Perhaps it was just the nature of the course ~~rather~~ the discussion sections, but Anastasia often seemed a bit rushed—not in a bad way, just in the sense that there was so much material to cover

COURSE ASSISTANT EVALUATION: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name, number and section: Intro to Ethics 21000 (Section 3)

Course Assistant's Name: Anastasia Berg Quarter and Year: Spring 2015

Today's Date: 5/29/15 Your Year: 3rd Major: philosophy

I. What were the C.A.'s primary duties in this course? grade papers, facilitate discussions during Friday sections, answer student questions

II. Rate your C.A.'s performance -- how well was the C.A. able:

A. to explain the course material:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

B. to conduct discussions:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

D. to respond to written material:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

and she can draw students into the ~~the~~ discussions.

and ~~could~~ she brings many students into the discussion.

III. What were the special strong points of your course assistant?

Anastasia is very enthusiastic during section meetings. Her explanations of the text were clear and thorough. She takes students' questions seriously. Wonderful TA.

She makes herself available ~~inside~~ outside of her office hours.
normal

IV. What could your course assistant have done better? Suggestions?

COURSE ASSISTANT EVALUATION: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Section 3
Course name, number and section: Philosophy 21000/ Intro to Ethics

Course Assistant's Name: Anastasia Berg Quarter and Year: Spring 2015

Today's Date: 5/29/15 Your Year: 2018 Major: Philosophy and EALC

I. What were the C.A.'s primary duties in this course? To provide feedback for papers, and to moderate/organize discussion section

II. Rate your C.A.'s performance -- how well was the C.A. able:

A. to explain the course material:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

B. to conduct discussions:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

D. to respond to written material:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

III. What were the special strong points of your course assistant?

Anastasia's knowledge of the material and ability to lead discussions from that was excellent.

IV. What could your course assistant have done better? Suggestions?

I think any "could be done better" hinges upon the class prep preparation, maybe a mid week reminder for readings would help

COURSE ASSISTANT EVALUATION: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name, number and section: Introduction to Ethics Phil 2100 (3)

Course Assistant's Name: Anastasia Berg Quarter and Year: Spring 2015

Today's Date: 5/29/15 Your Year: 3rd Major: philosophy

I. What were the C.A.'s primary duties in this course? Held discussion sections, had office hours, and
graded papers

II. Rate your C.A.'s performance -- how well was the C.A. able:

A. to explain the course material:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

B. to conduct discussions:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

D. to respond to written material:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

III. What were the special strong points of your course assistant? She was quite determined to make the texts
we read as concrete as possible, and she really pushed every student to try out interpretations in discussion.
She was quite patient and made it for a moment, even Kant lived.

IV. What could your course assistant have done better? Suggestions? _____

COURSE ASSISTANT EVALUATION: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name, number and section: Introduction to Ethics - Phil 2100 Section 3

Course Assistant's Name: Anastasia Artemev Quarter and Year: Spring 2015

Today's Date: 5/29/15 Your Year: 2 Major: Political Science

I. What were the C.A.'s primary duties in this course? To lead discussion and explain
course readings

II. Rate your C.A.'s performance -- how well was the C.A. able:

A. to explain the course material:
excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

B. to conduct discussions:
excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

C. to respond to questions and comments:
excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

D. to respond to written material:
excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

III. What were the special strong points of your course assistant? She was good at giving
examples of what a philosopher's ideas might look like in the real world

IV. What could your course assistant have done better? Suggestions? We spent a lot of time
talking around the point of the reading, rather than really explaining what
the authors were saying

COURSE ASSISTANT EVALUATION: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name, number and section: Intro. to Ethics, PHIL 2100, (3)

Course Assistant's Name: Anastasia A. Berg Quarter and Year: Spring 2015

Today's Date: 5/24/2015 Your Year: 2nd Major: Economics & Philosophy

I. What were the C.A.'s primary duties in this course? Leading Discussion sections, providing
guidance & grading on papers, office hours.

II. Rate your C.A.'s performance -- how well was the C.A. able:

A. to explain the course material:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

B. to conduct discussions:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

D. to respond to written material:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

III. What were the special strong points of your course assistant? Anastasia was ~~one~~ likely the best

TA I've had - she ~~is~~ pushes back against your ideas to make sure you have a solid
understanding of the material and provides incredible feedback - I learned a ton this quarter.

IV. What could your course assistant have done better? Suggestions? Nothing, maybe faster on the
paper grades but not at the cost of the detail of the comments. She did everything
very well this quarter!

COURSE ASSISTANT EVALUATION: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name, number and section: PHIL 21000 Introduction to Ethics Sec 3

Course Assistant's Name: Alexander Borg Quarter and Year: Spring 2015

Today's Date: May 29 Your Year: IV Major: Mathematics

I. What were the C.A.'s primary duties in this course? Hold discussion section, hold office hours, grade papers.

II. Rate your C.A.'s performance -- how well was the C.A. able:

A. to explain the course material:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

B. to conduct discussions:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

D. to respond to written material:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

III. What were the special strong points of your course assistant? She is very enthusiastic and charitable to student; explains the material well

IV. What could your course assistant have done better? Suggestions? Sometimes she dwells on certain minor points for too long. But that improved through the quarter.

COURSE ASSISTANT EVALUATION: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name, number and section: PHIL 21000 Intro to Ethics

Course Assistant's Name: Anastasia Berg Quarter and Year: Spring 2015

Today's Date: 5.29.2015 Your Year: First Major: Fundamentals

I. What were the C.A.'s primary duties in this course? grade papers, lead discussion

II. Rate your C.A.'s performance -- how well was the C.A. able:

A. to explain the course material:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

B. to conduct discussions:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

D. to respond to written material:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

III. What were the special strong points of your course assistant?

The CA knew a great deal about the texts and explained them lucidly and helpfully. Her comments on papers were extensive and also very helpful.

IV. What could your course assistant have done better? Suggestions?

Occasionally in discussion she would sort of lecture after then trying to lead discussion, and would sometimes fault ~~about~~ redundancy. But for the most part discussions were also good.

COURSE ASSISTANT EVALUATION: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name, number and section: PHIL 2106 * Section 7

Course Assistant's Name: Anusha Bery Quarter and Year: Spring 2005

Today's Date: 5/25/15 Your Year: First Major: Undeclared

I. What were the C.A.'s primary duties in this course? Grading papers, leading discussions, & the readings

II. Rate your C.A.'s performance -- how well was the C.A. able:

A. to explain the course material:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

B. to conduct discussions:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

D. to respond to written material:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

III. What were the special strong points of your course assistant?

Very good at explaining

difficult aspects of the texts we're read for class, and extremely thorough when it

comes to giving comments on papers.

IV. What could your course assistant have done better? Suggestions?

Nothing in particular - everything

was very well run.

COURSE ASSISTANT EVALUATION: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name, number and section: PHIL 2100, 12:30 discussion section

Course Assistant's Name: ANASTASIA BERG Quarter and Year: SPRING 2015

Today's Date: 5/29/15 Your Year: 1st Major: UNDECIDED

I. What were the C.A.'s primary duties in this course? To grade papers and facilitate more specific discussion and analysis of the papers.

II. Rate your C.A.'s performance -- how well was the C.A. able:

A. to explain the course material:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

B. to conduct discussions:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

D. to respond to written material:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

III. What were the special strong points of your course assistant? Very specific, incisive comments

on papers. Very good explanation of major points and conflicts in specific texts (especially Kant) in limited time. Very responsive and easy to meet/communicate with.

IV. What could your course assistant have done better? Suggestions? CA did not plan out time in

discussion section especially well and often did not leave enough time for discussion.

COURSE ASSISTANT EVALUATION: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name, number and section: PHIL 2100 (4)

Course Assistant's Name: Anastasia Quarter and Year: Spring, 2015

Today's Date: May 29th Your Year: 2018 Major: Econ & Philosophy

I. What were the C.A.'s primary duties in this course? Teaching in discussion group, ~~text~~ prompt
discussions ~~for~~ criticism on the texts assigned, etc

II. Rate your C.A.'s performance -- how well was the C.A. able:

A. to explain the course material:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

B. to conduct discussions:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

D. to respond to written material:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

III. What were the special strong points of your course assistant? ① Impeccable strong knowledge on
the course materials ② eager to help and very available after
class ③ Always give us detailed, actionable advice on paper writing

IV. What could your course assistant have done better? Suggestions? I don't think there is any.

COURSE ASSISTANT EVALUATION: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name, number and section: Phil 21000, Section #4

Course Assistant's Name: Anastasia Berg Quarter and Year: Spring 2015

Today's Date: 5-29 Your Year: 1st Major: Pol Sci & Phil

I. What were the C.A.'s primary duties in this course? Leading weekly discussion sections

II. Rate your C.A.'s performance -- how well was the C.A. able:

A. to explain the course material:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

B. to conduct discussions:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

D. to respond to written material:

excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

III. What were the special strong points of your course assistant?

She gave very thorough feedback on assignments & responded well to student suggestions/comments.

IV. What could your course assistant have done better? Suggestions?

For the first half of the quarter - spending more discussion time on particularly difficult readings/concepts.

COURSE ASSISTANT EVALUATION: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name, number and section: Phil 2100 Section 4

Course Assistant's Name: Anastasia Berg Quarter and Year: Spring 2015

Today's Date: 5-29-15 Your Year: 2 Major: Physics, Philosophy

I. What were the C.A.'s primary duties in this course? Lead discussions, provide
help and support for papers

II. Rate your C.A.'s performance -- how well was the C.A. able:

A. to explain the course material:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

B. to conduct discussions:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

D. to respond to written material:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

III. What were the special strong points of your course assistant?

provided a lot of
helpful feedback on papers, also always very
willing to talk about anything and help with anything

IV. What could your course assistant have done better? Suggestions?

Her main problem to
me was simply that she talked very quickly and
was difficult a lot of the time to understand
clearly the points she was trying to make

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM TO STUART 202.

COURSE ASSISTANT EVALUATION: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name, number and section: phil 2100 (4)

Course Assistant's Name: Anastasia Berg Quarter and Year: Spring 2015

Today's Date: May 29 Your Year: 2 Major: Computer Science

I. What were the C.A.'s primary duties in this course? leading discussion / meeting about papers

II. Rate your C.A.'s performance -- how well was the C.A. able:

A. to explain the course material:
excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

B. to conduct discussions:
excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

C. to respond to questions and comments:
excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

D. to respond to written material:
excellently quite well adequately poorly (not applicable)

III. What were the special strong points of your course assistant?

She was very available to meet about papers, and able to dissect material well. Also paper comments were elaborate, detailed and precise so that the next paper could be better.

IV. What could your course assistant have done better? Suggestions?

She could dive too deep to quickly at times - better pacing would have been nice.

COURSE ASSISTANT EVALUATION: FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE

Course name, number and section: Intro to Ethics, PHIL 21000, 4

Course Assistant's Name: Anastasia Artemov Berg Quarter and Year: Spring 2015

Today's Date: May 29, 2015 Your Year: 1 Major: Philosophy

I. What were the C.A.'s primary duties in this course? Lead discussion sections
and assess papers.

II. Rate your C.A.'s performance -- how well was the C.A. able:

A. to explain the course material:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

B. to conduct discussions:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

C. to respond to questions and comments:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

D. to respond to written material:

excellently

quite well

adequately

poorly

(not applicable)

III. What were the special strong points of your course assistant?

She is very enthusiastic
and encouraged everybody to participate. She also provided
exceptionally thorough and helpful feedback on papers.

IV. What could your course assistant have done better? Suggestions?

HUMA 12400: Human Being And Citizen-2

Section 13 - Winter 2013

Instructor(s): Steinberg H.

Number Enrolled: 13

Number of Responses: 10

What were the teaching assistant's or writing intern's strengths? Weaknesses?

- Anastasia was really great. She was really really intense grading and editing papers and would tear them apart but was always available for meetings and would always explain her edits and make sure that our papers were great.
- Anastasia wrote extensive, helpful comments on both of the out of class essays, and explained concepts well during writing seminars.
- Strength: Always available, challenged us, very specific on what she wanted Weakness: Maybe too challenging...
- Fantastic with grammar, fine details, and critiquing essays in general. Also clearly well versed in Aristotelian ethics (clearly displayed in the one class on the Ethics that she taught).
- Anastasia gave fantastic feedback on papers.

The Teaching Assistant(s)

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Were available outside of class.	0%	0%	0%	0%	30%	70%
Were helpful with assignments.	0%	0%	0%	20%	20%	60%

Discussion Sections, Problem Sessions, Writing Tutorials

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Were well coordinated with this course and contributed to it.	10%	0%	10%	10%	20%	50%
Provided well-designed materials.	10%	0%	0%	10%	40%	40%

HUMA 19100: Humanities Writing Seminars

Section 53 - Winter 2013

Instructor(s): Steinberg H.

Number Enrolled: 13

Number of Responses: 2

Evaluation Comments

What were the instructor's strengths? Weaknesses?

- Anastasia gets us to work maybe a bit too hard, with all of the drafts and editing in combination with readings, other classes, and extra curriculars. But we sure do learn a lot. Quickly.

The Teaching Assistant(s)

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Were available outside of class.	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%

Were helpful with assignments.	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%
--------------------------------	----	----	----	----	------------	----

Discussion Sections, Problem Sessions, Writing Tutorials

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Were well coordinated with this course and contributed to it.	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%
Provided well-designed materials.	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%

SOSC 15300: Classics Soc/Polit Thought-3

Section 04 - Spring 2012

Instructor(s): Wedeen Lisa

Number Enrolled: 21

Number of Responses: 15

What were the teaching assistant's or writing intern's strengths? Weaknesses?

- Anastasia was helpful in explaining things simpler than the professor during class discussions and when she taught.
- Anastasia Artemyev Berg went to the trouble to set up a time to meet with each of us individually at the very beginning of the quarter, and she also cleared up some of my confusion over the final paper when we met at the end of the quarter. She also offered some good comments during discussions, but she was best at leading discussion during the two classes she taught. No weaknesses come to mind.
- Anastasia was always pleasant and helpful. On the couple of occasions that she led the class, she did reasonably well, and although she obviously lacks the experience of Professor Wedeen, with time, I suspect she'll develop into a very effective teacher.
- Anastasia was great. She had a strong knowledge of all the texts she read and would often contribute helpfully in discussions. She was also always willing to meet outside of class to discuss essays and her comments were very helpful.
- Extremely approachable and available outside of class.
- Anastasia is extremely smart and her lectures give insight to how our readings fit into the grand scheme of intellectual history. She was very friendly and supportive, and made herself very available outside of class.
- She's very personable and engaged in the classroom. I would have appreciated if she would've done more board work. Also, she needs to remember sometimes that we don't all have as extensive knowledge as she does.
- Anastasia was very knowledgeable about each topic and very willing to help students understand concepts or improve their writing.
- Anastasia was great in and outside of class. She was very friendly and open to meeting with students during office hours. During class, she often offered helpful and insightful comments that would contribute to our class discussions.
- Strengths: She was excellent at presenting the material and leading the discussions when she was in charge of the class. Weaknesses: A little intellectually intimidating.

- Very helpful outside of class giving lots of feedback on assignments. Lectures were clear and interesting. Captured and presented the key points of the texts well.
- She was a little bit harsh and that put me off a bit. But she was extremely knowledgeable and always made good points, she was just a bit intimidating.

The Teaching Assistant(s)

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Were available outside of class.	7%	0%	0%	0%	13%	67%
Were helpful with assignments.	13%	0%	0%	0%	20%	53%

Discussion Sections, Problem Sessions, Writing Tutorials

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

Were well coordinated with this course and contributed to it.	40%	7%	0%	0%	0%	33%
Provided well-designed materials.	47%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%

SOSC 15200: Classics Soc/Polit Thought-2

Section 12 - Winter 2012

Instructor(s): Marin Mara

Number Enrolled: 19

Number of Responses: 9

What were the teaching assistant's or writing intern's strengths? Weaknesses?

- Anastasia was really nice and great about making sure you knew she was reachable through office hours and through email. I thought she was really nice about looking over your outline or whatever and giving feedback, and if you had questions about the text and what it meant she was really nice about answering that too.

- Great fashion sense! Also very smart, gave good comments, and helped stimulate class discussion when it was fading.
- I think the two discussions she led are well-designed and helpful. She is also very willing to help outside of class.
- She is extremely helpful. She can be intimidating and she can go on a rant about an issue that you already understand but, to make sure you really do, she continuously emphasizes it. She is really helpful and is always available for OH.

The Teaching Assistant(s)

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Were available outside of class.	0%	0%	0%	11%	22%	56%
Were helpful with assignments.	0%	0%	0%	33%	22%	44%

Discussion Sections, Problem Sessions, Writing Tutorials

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-----	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

Were well coordinated with this course and contributed to it.	44%	0%	0%	11%	11%	11%
Provided well-designed materials.	44%	0%	0%	11%	11%	11%

HUMA 11700: Philosophical Perspectives-3

Section 02 - Spring 2013

Instructor(s): Vasudevan Anubav

Number Enrolled: 8

Number of Responses: 4

What were the teaching assistant's or writing intern's strengths? Weaknesses?

- Sometimes comments and instruction given on papers during writing seminars were not very clear but overall Anastasia was very helpful and available.
- Anastasia gave great feedback and ideas. She really helped me to improve my drafts and to understand the readings better.
- Anastasia seemed kind of abrasive to me at first, but ended up being very helpful in guiding the development of our essays - if you don't waste her time, she can be an incredibly good resource and also be pretty nice.

The Teaching Assistant(s)

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Were available outside of class.	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Were helpful with assignments.	0%	0%	25%	0%	25%	50%

Discussion Sections, Problem Sessions, Writing Tutorials

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Were well coordinated with this course and contributed	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%

to it.

Provided well-designed materials.

0%

0%

0%

0%

50%

50%

HUMA 12100: Greek Thought And Literature-2

Section 02 - Winter 2014

Instructor(s): Bresson Alain

Number Enrolled: 13

Number of Responses: 6

What were the teaching assistant's or writing intern's strengths? Weaknesses?

- She was way too intense and expected us to spend an unreasonable amount of time reading other classmates' essays but she was very helpful in her essay comments and helped me be a better writer.
- Anastasia is heavily invested in making her students better writers.
- The TA had good enthusiasm and led the writing seminars well- however, the set-up of the seminars did not seem helpful at all.
- Berg is knowledgeable. She is kind of hard to approach. However, she brings the best out of you because she's so demanding

• **The Teaching Assistant(s)**

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Were available outside of class.	0%	0%	0%	17%	0%	83%
Were helpful with assignments.	0%	0%	0%	17%	17%	67%

• **Discussion Sections, Problem Sessions, Writing Tutorials**

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Were well coordinated with this course and contributed to it.	0%	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%
Provided well-designed materials.	0%	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%