Lauren

Last Modified: 04/27/2016
Filter By: Report Subgroup

1. What section are you in?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	1 Fri 10:05 Sarah		0	0%
2	2 Fri 10:05 Halina		0	0%
3	3 Fri 10:05 Jenn		0	0%
4	4 Fri 1:40 Jonathan		0	0%
5	5 Thurs 9:00 Rose		0	0%
6	6 Thurs 9:00 Lindsay		0	0%
8	8 Thurs 12:30 Rose		0	0%
9	9 Thurs 12:30 Lindsay		0	0%
11	11 Thurs 4:00 Halina		0	0%
13	13 Weds 10:05 Ryan		0	0%
14	14 Weds 10:05 Andrew		0	0%
16	16 Weds 1:40 Ryan		0	0%
17	17 Weds 1:40 Jenn		0	0%
18	18 Fri 1:40 Lauren	▬▬▬▬	15	52%
19	19 Tues 9:00 Julie		0	0%
20	20 Tues 9:00 Andrew		0	0%
22	21 Tues 12:30 Irene		0	0%
23	22 Tues 12:30 Lauren	▬▬▬▬	14	48%
25	23 Tues 4:00 Irene		0	0%
	Total		29	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	18
Max Value	23
Mean	20.41
Variance	6.47
Standard Deviation	2.54
Total Responses	29

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

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Freshman		17	59%
2	Sophomore		7	24%
3	Junior		4	14%
4	Senior		1	3%
5	Took AP Bio in high school		20	69%
6	pre-health professional		19	66%
7	Pratt		3	10%
8	Trinity, likely bio major		9	31%
9	Trinity, non-bio major		14	48%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	9
Total Responses	29

3. Please rate the level to which you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your TA by filling in the appropriate bubble. You may leave blank any items you do not wish to respond to or that you feel do not apply. My TA:

#	Question	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Mean
1	was well prepared for teaching the lab each week.	0	0	0	5	24	29	4.83
2	demonstrated a thorough grasp of the material.	0	0	0	8	21	29	4.72
3	clearly communicated the goals & objectives of the lab.	0	0	0	6	23	29	4.79
4	presented material in a well-organized fashion.	0	0	0	6	23	29	4.79
5	integrated information from lecture into lab.	0	0	1	7	21	29	4.69
6	demonstrated interest & enthusiasm in his/her teaching.	0	0	0	4	25	29	4.86
7	was accessible out of class (via office hrs, email, etc.).	0	0	1	6	22	29	4.72
8	encouraged participation by all students in class.	0	0	1	5	23	29	4.76
9	encouraged questions and comments from students.	0	0	0	7	22	29	4.76
10	encouraged students to apply knowledge and concepts.	0	0	0	5	24	29	4.83
11	gave students time to answer his/her questions before rephrasing or redirecting the question.	0	0	0	6	23	29	4.79
12	noticed indications that students need help in lab and responded appropriately to questions.	0	0	2	6	20	28	4.64
13	could usually tell when students are having difficulty understanding material and adjusts his/her explanations to meet these difficulties.	0	0	2	6	20	28	4.64
14	helped students figure out answers to questions for themselves.	0	0	0	9	20	29	4.69
15	used additional examples during teaching to aid in comprehension of difficult subject matter.	0	0	2	9	18	29	4.55
16	provided helpful feedback and comments on written assignments.	0	0	2	5	22	29	4.69
17	overall did a great job.	0	0	0	3	26	29	4.90

Statistic	was well prepared for teaching the lab each week.	demonstrated a thorough grasp of the material.	clearly communicated the goals & objectives of the lab.	presented material in a well-organized fashion.	integrated information from lecture into lab.	demonstrated interest & enthusiasm in his/her teaching.	was accessible out of class (via office hrs, email, etc.).	encouraged participation by all students in class.	encouraged questions and comments from students.	encouraged students to apply knowledge and concepts.	gave students time to answer his/her questions before rephrasing or redirecting the question.	noticed indications that students need help in lab and responded appropriately to questions.	could usually tell when students are having difficulty understanding material and adjusts his/her explanations to meet these difficulties.	helped students figure out answers to questions for themselves.	used additional examples during teaching to aid in comprehension of difficult subject matter.	provided helpful feedback and comments on written assignments.	overall did a great job.
Min Value	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	4
Max Value	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mean	4.83	4.72	4.79	4.79	4.69	4.86	4.72	4.76	4.76	4.83	4.79	4.64	4.64	4.69	4.55	4.69	4.90
Variance	0.15	0.21	0.17	0.17	0.29	0.12	0.28	0.26	0.19	0.15	0.17	0.39	0.39	0.22	0.40	0.36	0.10
Standard Deviation	0.38	0.45	0.41	0.41	0.54	0.35	0.53	0.51	0.44	0.38	0.41	0.62	0.62	0.47	0.63	0.60	0.31
Total Responses	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	28	28	29	29	29	29

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

Text Response
Lauren was great with answering questions and explaining the material presented in lab.
Very knowledgeable and helpful, was always kind and willing to explain things to those who didn't understand. Also asked us questions to make us think instead of just giving us the answer. When we did get the question right, she went more in depth into the concept and further refined our understanding of Biology.
Was very clear and informative in explaining concepts
She was awesome!
Overall an engaging and good TA
Our TA made sure we understood what we were doing and kept the lab section fun
Lauren was so kind and fun. I looked forward to lab every week. She worked really hard to get to know all of the students and I felt she really enjoyed getting to know me. She made this my favorite lab at Duke so far.
Asked leading questions, presented material in a clear, understandable manner.
Explained things in a less formal way that made it easy to understand.
My TA was accessible for asking questions about the previous test once we got them back in lab
She was able to give examples that clarified concepts that were tested on quizzes and exams.
Lauren was incredibly responsive to questions over email. She's so friendly and efficient, and I look forward to going to lab with her.
Lauren was an excellent TA. She helped us out in class without offering answers too soon and was able to thoroughly explain whenever I had difficulties. She gave constructive feedback on all lab assignments. Her enthusiasm for the material and additional videos etc. she showed made lab time enjoyable.
She was very enthusiastic, which made for an environment conducive to learning
Lauren was always willing to answer questions, and she definitely helped to clear up any difficult concepts.
Very open to answering questions
She was extremely good at explaining the concepts.
Lauren was consistently attentive, eager to help, understanding of difficulties, and very informative.
Always knew what she was talking about, always friendly and willing to help.
-open and willing to explain concepts
Providing examples on difficult bio concepts
Clarity in explaining background and introductory concepts; helpfulness when parts of a lab appeared confounding.
Lauren was really good at explaining the concepts in very easy to understand ways.
Asked us questions that provoked good discussions.
My TA did a very good job of elaborating on concepts that might've been daunting initially.
They demonstrated an enthusiasm about the more practical applications of biology in various fields of knowledge.
She is really good at explaining concepts in a non-condescending way.
Very enthusiastic and shared what was interesting about a topic to her in order to help us understand and get more excited.
Lauren was very understanding of the specifics of the lab, and allowed us to learn the concepts without busy work. Lauren was also super-friendly and genuinely interested in the various things that we were doing. She had extensive knowledge of the lab material, and was able to explain anything we didn't understand.

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	29

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

Text Response
Lauren might want to brush up on a few topics that came up in lab that are not really her field of expertise, but overall she did a great job!
Nothing.
Maybe go at a faster pace for some labs
I can't think of anything. Lauren is fantastic.
Integrating lecture material.
I think my TA did a good job, but I think she could have improved on her coordination of class-wide discussions. We were good once we broke into groups, but when we talked as an entire class, she could have taken command more.
The only thing I'd say is that I think some other classes did some exercises to kind of sort information we had learned in lecture that week before starting the lab, for example making a cheat sheet about dN/dS and the other tests. I thought this seemed helpful, but also runs the risk of making long labs even lengthier. Overall, I don't think Lauren needs to change much!
Nothing comes to mind!
Nothing much
Lauren just needs to continue her current methods of being a TA.
Honestly nothing, she's a great TA.
N/A
Sometimes we spent way too much time on more trivial parts of the lab.
-nothing really
Integrate lecture information into lab concepts more clearly or directly.
I think maybe it would be nice to spend a q & a session on maybe confusing topics if there is extra time? This maybe too much work though.
My TA did everything very well. No complaints
Clarify grading expectations for certain assignments.
nothing!
Encouraging participation from everyone in class.
Not much. Lauren was a great TA.

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	21

6. Further comments about your TA:

Text Response
10/10
Lauren was awesome!!
YOU ARE AWESOME!!
She was an awesome TA!
She was super willing to discuss her personal experiences in biology which was great for thinking about my future in biology. She also drew upon this outside knowledge to give us interesting and informative examples in discussion and through videos which demonstrated the concepts we were focusing on.
She was one of the most helpful components for this course.
Lauren rocks! She's a superstar
N/A
Excellent TA overall
She was wonderful!
pretty good TA. very enthusiastic and willing to help and explain things. nice.
Really great job!!
Lauren was really knowledgeable and friendly. She made the classroom have a pretty relaxing environment.
Loved my TA this semester
She was awesome! Super accommodating and helpful :)

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	15

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

#	Question	Not so much 1	2	Some 3	4	Very much 5	Total Responses	Mean
1	7 Evidence for Evolution (carnivorous plants)	3	8	3	6	8	28	3.29
2	1 Transmission Genetics (VGL problems for Mendelian genetics)	3	7	13	3	2	28	2.79
3	2 Domesticating Dogs (dog coat SNPs)	3	6	11	6	2	28	2.93
4	4 PTC Genotyping (genotyping ability to taste PTC)	4	5	4	6	9	28	3.39
5	3 Quantitative Genetics (Bugsville)	4	6	9	6	3	28	2.93
6	14 Human Evolution	3	5	11	6	3	28	3.04
7	5 Natural Selection (beans in rocks)	6	4	6	8	4	28	3.00
8	6 Population Genetics (Allele A1 exercise)	4	6	10	4	4	28	2.93
9	8 Molecular Evolution & Bioinformatics (MK/dN/dS/pi tests on Drosophila genes)	10	6	6	2	4	28	2.43
10	9 Natural Selection in Fruit Flies (eye color selective sweep)	5	4	9	4	6	28	3.07
11	10 Mating Behavior & Speciation (fly mating)	6	4	5	5	8	28	3.18
12	11 Speciation (Mimulus flower traits)	3	13	8	2	2	28	2.54
13	12 Domesticating Dogs (phylogenetics)	4	6	6	7	5	28	3.11
14	13 Macroevoltion (mammal skulls)	3	6	6	8	5	28	3.21

Statistic	7 Evidence for Evolution (carnivorous plants)	1 Transmission Genetics (VGL problems for Mendelian genetics)	2 Domesticating Dogs (dog coat SNPs)	4 PTC Genotyping (genotyping ability to taste PTC)	3 Quantitative Genetics (Bugsville)	14 Human Evolution	5 Natural Selection (beans in rocks)	6 Population Genetics (Allele A1 exercise)	8 Molecular Evolution & Bioinformatics (MK/dN/dS/pi tests on Drosophila genes)	9 Natural Selection in Fruit Flies (eye color selective sweep)	10 Mating Behavior & Speciation (fly mating)	11 Speciation (Mimulus flower traits)	12 Domesticating Dogs (phylogenetics)	13 Macroevoltion (mammal skulls)
Min Value	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Max Value	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mean	3.29	2.79	2.93	3.39	2.93	3.04	3.00	2.93	2.43	3.07	3.18	2.54	3.11	3.21
Variance	2.06	1.06	1.18	2.17	1.48	1.29	1.93	1.55	2.03	1.92	2.37	1.07	1.80	1.66
Standard Deviation	1.44	1.03	1.09	1.47	1.21	1.14	1.39	1.25	1.43	1.39	1.54	1.04	1.34	1.29
Total Responses	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28

8. This exercise helped me to better understand course subject matter and concepts.

#	Question	Not so much 1	2	Some 3	4	Very much 5	Total Responses	Mean
1	7 Evidence for Evolution (carnivorous plants)	2	5	7	8	7	29	3.45
2	1 Transmission Genetics (VGL problems for Mendelian genetics)	1	2	9	6	11	29	3.83
3	2 Domesticating Dogs (dog coat SNPs)	1	2	12	9	5	29	3.52
4	4 PTC Genotyping (genotyping ability to taste PTC)	1	4	9	5	10	29	3.66
5	3 Quantitative Genetics (Bugsville)	1	2	9	11	6	29	3.66
6	14 Human Evolution	2	1	15	6	5	29	3.38
7	5 Natural Selection (beans in rocks)	1	4	10	9	5	29	3.45
8	6 Population Genetics (Allele A1 exercise)	2	3	8	7	9	29	3.62
9	8 Molecular Evolution & Bioinformatics (MK/dN/dS/pi tests on Drosophila genes)	4	3	7	5	10	29	3.48
10	9 Natural Selection in Fruit Flies (eye color selective sweep)	1	2	6	12	8	29	3.83
11	10 Mating Behavior & Speciation (fly mating)	1	2	7	11	8	29	3.79
12	11 Speciation (Mimulus flower traits)	1	7	12	4	5	29	3.17
13	12 Domesticating Dogs (phylogenetics)	1	3	6	10	9	29	3.79
14	13 Macroevoltion (mammal skulls)	2	1	12	11	3	29	3.41

Statistic	7 Evidence for Evolution (carnivorous plants)	1 Transmission Genetics (VGL problems for Mendelian genetics)	2 Domesticating Dogs (dog coat SNPs)	4 PTC Genotyping (genotyping ability to taste PTC)	3 Quantitative Genetics (Bugsville)	14 Human Evolution	5 Natural Selection (beans in rocks)	6 Population Genetics (Allele A1 exercise)	8 Molecular Evolution & Bioinformatics (MK/dN/dS/pi tests on Drosophila genes)	9 Natural Selection in Fruit Flies (eye color selective sweep)	10 Mating Behavior & Speciation (fly mating)	11 Speciation (Mimulus flower traits)	12 Domesticating Dogs (phylogenetics)	13 Macroevoltion (mammal skulls)
Min Value	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Max Value	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mean	3.45	3.83	3.52	3.66	3.66	3.38	3.45	3.62	3.48	3.83	3.79	3.17	3.79	3.41
Variance	1.54	1.29	0.97	1.45	1.02	1.10	1.11	1.53	2.04	1.08	1.10	1.22	1.24	0.97
Standard Deviation	1.24	1.14	0.99	1.20	1.01	1.05	1.06	1.24	1.43	1.04	1.05	1.10	1.11	0.98
Total Responses	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29

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

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	7 Evidence for Evolution (carnivorous plants)		0	0%
2	1 Transmission Genetics (VGL problems for Mendelian genetics)		3	10%
3	2 Domesticating Dogs (dog coat SNPs)		0	0%
4	4 PTC Genotyping (genotyping ability to taste PTC)		0	0%
5	3 Quantitative Genetics (Bugsville)		0	0%
6	14 Human Evolution		0	0%
7	5 Natural Selection (beans in rocks)		0	0%
8	6 Population Genetics (Allele A1 exercise)		3	10%
9	8 Molecular Evolution & Bioinformatics (MK/dN/dS/pi tests onDrosophila genes)		19	66%
10	9 Natural Selection in Fruit Flies (eye color selective sweep)		0	0%
11	10 Mating Behavior & Speciation (fly mating)		0	0%
12	11 Speciation (Mimulus flower traits)		1	3%
13	12 Domesticating Dogs (phylogenetics)		3	10%
14	13 Macroevolution (mammal skulls)		0	0%
	Total		29	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	2
Max Value	13
Mean	8.69
Variance	7.29
Standard Deviation	2.70
Total Responses	29

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

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	1 Not so much		1	3%
2	2		2	7%
3	3 Some		12	41%
4	4		11	38%
5	5 Very much		3	10%
	Total		29	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	5
Mean	3.45
Variance	0.83
Standard Deviation	0.91
Total Responses	29

11. Further comments about the lab exercises:

Text Response
Sorry for the harsh ratings on how interesting labs were, I'm in Pratt and just not into biology at all.
I really did not enjoy lab 8 but I have to admit that they helped me understand the tests.
It would be better if the labs were more quantitative, although I understand that the class itself isn't. Overall, I think the labs do help but they aren't that interesting, at least for me.
Generally interesting and relevant to in-class material. Good way of applying concepts learned in class to the real world.
The assignment which gave out random genes and asked to test them didn't work out well at all. Some groups received multiple "bad" genes, and as such, had to do much more work than others, which made the lab very uninteresting and unenjoyable.

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	5

12. Which lab exercise did you find most interesting?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	7 Evidence for Evolution (carnivorous plants)		7	24%
2	1 Transmission Genetics (VGL problems for Mendelian genetics)		1	3%
3	2 Domesticating Dogs (dog coat SNPs)		0	0%
4	4 PTC Genotyping (genotyping ability to taste PTC)		3	10%
5	3 Quantitative Genetics (Bugsville)		1	3%
6	14 Human Evolution		0	0%
7	5 Natural Selection (beans in rocks)		2	7%
8	6 Population Genetics (Allele A1 exercise)		0	0%
9	8 Molecular Evolution & Bioinformatics (MK/dN/dS/pi tests onDrosophila genes)		0	0%
10	9 Natural Selection in Fruit Flies (eye color selective sweep)		3	10%
11	10 Mating Behavior & Speciation (fly mating)		5	17%
12	11 Speciation (Mimulus flower traits)		0	0%
13	12 Domesticating Dogs (phylogenetics)		5	17%
14	13 Macroevolution (mammal skulls)		2	7%
	Total		29	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	14
Mean	7.52
Variance	24.47
Standard Deviation	4.95
Total Responses	29

13. Which lab exercise did you find least interesting?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	7 Evidence for Evolution (carnivorous plants)		2	7%
2	1 Transmission Genetics (VGL problems for Mendelian genetics)		3	10%
3	2 Domesticating Dogs (dog coat SNPs)		1	3%
4	4 PTC Genotyping (genotyping ability to taste PTC)		0	0%
5	3 Quantitative Genetics (Bugsville)		4	14%
6	14 Human Evolution		0	0%
7	5 Natural Selection (beans in rocks)		0	0%
8	6 Population Genetics (Allele A1 exercise)		4	14%
9	8 Molecular Evolution & Bioinformatics (MK/dN/dS/pi tests onDrosophila genes)		8	28%
10	9 Natural Selection in Fruit Flies (eye color selective sweep)		0	0%
11	10 Mating Behavior & Speciation (fly mating)		1	3%
12	11 Speciation (Mimulus flower traits)		5	17%
13	12 Domesticating Dogs (phylogenetics)		1	3%
14	13 Macroevolution (mammal skulls)		0	0%
	Total		29	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	13
Mean	7.55
Variance	13.68
Standard Deviation	3.70
Total Responses	29

14. Which lab exercise did you find most useful?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	7 Evidence for Evolution (carnivorous plants)		2	7%
2	1 Transmission Genetics (VGL problems for Mendelian genetics)		7	24%
3	2 Domesticating Dogs (dog coat SNPs)		0	0%
4	4 PTC Genotyping (genotyping ability to taste PTC)		2	7%
5	3 Quantitative Genetics (Bugsville)		0	0%
6	14 Human Evolution		1	3%
7	5 Natural Selection (beans in rocks)		1	3%
8	6 Population Genetics (Allele A1 exercise)		3	10%
9	8 Molecular Evolution & Bioinformatics (MK/dN/dS/pi tests onDrosophila genes)		10	34%
10	9 Natural Selection in Fruit Flies (eye color selective sweep)		0	0%
11	10 Mating Behavior & Speciation (fly mating)		1	3%
12	11 Speciation (Mimulus flower traits)		0	0%
13	12 Domesticating Dogs (phylogenetics)		2	7%
14	13 Macroevolution (mammal skulls)		0	0%
	Total		29	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	13
Mean	6.48
Variance	13.90
Standard Deviation	3.73
Total Responses	29

15. Which lab exercise did you find least useful?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	7 Evidence for Evolution (carnivorous plants)		2	7%
2	1 Transmission Genetics (VGL problems for Mendelian genetics)		5	17%
3	2 Domesticating Dogs (dog coat SNPs)		1	3%
4	4 PTC Genotyping (genotyping ability to taste PTC)		1	3%
5	3 Quantitative Genetics (Bugsville)		0	0%
6	14 Human Evolution		0	0%
7	5 Natural Selection (beans in rocks)		7	24%
8	6 Population Genetics (Allele A1 exercise)		0	0%
9	8 Molecular Evolution & Bioinformatics (MK/dN/dS/pi tests onDrosophila genes)		4	14%
10	9 Natural Selection in Fruit Flies (eye color selective sweep)		2	7%
11	10 Mating Behavior & Speciation (fly mating)		1	3%
12	11 Speciation (Mimulus flower traits)		4	14%
13	12 Domesticating Dogs (phylogenetics)		0	0%
14	13 Macroevolution (mammal skulls)		2	7%
	Total		29	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	14
Mean	7.28
Variance	16.71
Standard Deviation	4.09
Total Responses	29