| SPRING 2019 COURSE SURVEY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Please indicate your opinion regarding the statements below on a scale of 1-5 (1=strongly disagree, $5=$ strongly agree) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ZOOLOGY 101 | ZOOLOGY 102 | ZOOLOGY 151 | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOO 152 CASE | ZOOLOGY 260 | ZOOLOGY 300 | ZOOLOGY 301 | ZOOLOGY 400 | ZOOLOGY 400 | ZOOLOGY 470 |
| Response Rate: | 51\% | 52\% | 53\% | 49\% | 30\% | 45\% | 27\% | 10\% | 25\% (Amann) | 39\% (Fox) | 36\% |
| I appreciate this subject better as a result of taking this course. | 3.9 | 4.08 | 3.44 | 3.68 | 4.23 | 4.36 | 3.68 | 3.67 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.1 |
| I understand the scientific process better as a result of taking this course. | 3.88 | 3.81 | 3.64 | 3.66 | 4.23 | 3.84 | 3.58 | 4 | 5 | 3.83 | 3.9 |
| Overall, I would recommend this course to other students. | 3.66 | 3.88 | 3.25 | 3.29 | 4.87 | 4.23 | 3.11 | 4 | 4.75 | 4.5 | 3.68 |
| The course helped me to understand how concepts presented in this course relate to those in other biosciences courses. | 4.04 | 4.07 | 3.88 | 3.89 | 3.60 | 4.16 | 3.68 | 3.5 | 4.75 | 4.58 | 4.06 |
| The course helped me to understand the main concepts in this subject area. | 4.22 | 4.24 | 3.87 | 4.03 | 3.34 | 4.39 | 3.95 | 4.33 | 4.75 | 4.67 | 4.1 |
| The course helped me to understand the relationships among these main concepts. | 4.12 | 4.24 | 3.86 | 3.96 | 3.77 | 4.41 | 3.84 | 4.33 | 4.75 | 4.58 | 3.94 |
| The course helped me to understand the relevance of this particular subject to real-world issues or everyday life. | 4.15 | 4.11 | 3.9 | 4.03 | 3.68 | 4.49 | 3.32 | 3 | 4.75 | 4.92 | 4.23 |
| The exams and assignments were well designed to test the knowledge I was expected to gain in this course. | 3.7 | 3.88 | 3.06 | 3.75 | 3.81 | 4.05 | 3.47 | 4 | 4.5 | 4.42 | 3.48 |
| This course compared favorably to others I have taken in the biosciences. | 3.63 | 3.84 | 3.08 | 3.32 | 3.83 | 4.15 | 3.16 | 4 | 4.75 | 4.42 | 3.55 |
| This course helped to develop my ability to think through a problem and solve it. | 3.75 | 3.87 | 3.45 | 3.71 | 4.23 | 4.07 | 3.89 | 4 | 4.75 | 4.5 | 3.9 |
| This course stimulated my desire to take additional courses in this subject area. | 3.33 | 3.52 | 3.09 | 3.32 | 3.72 | 3.85 | 3.05 | 3.33 | 4.75 | 4.33 | 3.29 |
| What is your overall opinion of this course? Text Responses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average | 3.85 | 3.94 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.94 | 4.17 | 3.51 | 3.87 | 4.74 | 4.46 | 3.82 |
|  | ZOOLOGY 500 | ZOOLOGY 510 | ZOOLOGY 511 | ZOOLOGY 520 | ZOOLOGY 521 | ZOOLOGY 611 | ZOOLOGY 655 | ZOOLOGY 677 | ZOOLOGY 911 | ZOOLOGY 955 | ZOOLOGY 960 |
| Response Rate: | 40\% | 45\% | 39\% | 47\% | 43\% | 54\% | 47\% | 54\% | 18\% | 14\% | 33\% |
| I appreciate this subject better as a result of taking this course. | 4.33 | 4.53 | 4.25 | 4.53 | 4.57 | 4.55 | 4.75 | 4.57 | 5 | 4 |  |
| I understand the scientific process better as a result of taking this course. | 4.21 | 4.09 | 3.87 | 3.82 | 3.77 | 4.3 | 4.88 | 4.43 | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| Overall, I would recommend this course to other students. | 4.46 | 4.48 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 5 | 4.57 | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| The course helped me to understand how concepts presented in this course relate to those in other biosciences courses. | 4.38 | 4.55 | 4.18 | 4.18 | 3.97 | 4.45 | 3.88 | 4.43 | 5 | 3 |  |
| The course helped me to understand the main concepts in this subject area. | 4.29 | 4.58 | 4.24 | 4.38 | 4.64 | 4.5 | 4.38 | 4.57 | 5 | 4 |  |
| The course helped me to understand the relationships among these main concepts. | 4.19 | 4.55 | 4.37 | 4.38 | 4.67 | 4.5 | 4 | 4.57 | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| The course helped me to understand the relevance of this particular subject to real-world issues or everyday life. | 4.44 | 4.64 | 3.99 | 4.53 | 4.17 | 4.6 | 4.25 | 4.57 | 5 | 5 |  |
| The exams and assignments were well designed to test the knowledge I was expected to gain in this course. | 3.98 | 4.33 | 4.24 | 4.12 | 4.35 | 4.45 | 4.88 | 4.43 | 5 | 3 |  |
| This course compared favorably to others I have taken in the biosciences. | 4.08 | 4.42 | 4.29 | 4.15 | 4.33 | 4.55 | 4.88 | 4.43 | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| This course helped to develop my ability to think through a problem and solve it. | 3.67 | 4.15 | 3.68 | 4.06 | 3.96 | 4.1 | 4.13 | 4.29 | 5 | 3 |  |
| This course stimulated my desire to take additional courses in this subject area. | 4.17 | 4.18 | 3.94 | 4 | 4.25 | 4.15 | 4.5 | 4.29 | 5 | 3 |  |
| Average | 4.19 | 4.39 | 4.08 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.4 | 4.38 | 4.46 | 5 | 3.73 | 2.91 |


| Course | ZOOLOGY 101 | ZOOLOGY 101 | ZOOLOGY 101 | ZOOLOGY 260 | ZOOLOGY 300 | ZOOLOGY 301001 | ZOOLOGY 400-1 | ZOOLOGY 400-3 | ZOOLOGY 470 | ZOOLOGY 500 | ZOOLOGY 510001 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Instructor | Emily Stanley | Lauren Riters | Sharon Thoma | Anthony Ives | Prashant Sharma | Prashant Sharma | Kurt Amann | Barry Fox | Jeff Hardin | Michael Koenigs | Jake Vander Zanden |
| Total Surveyed | 578 | 578 | 578 | 135 | 70 | 15 | 16 | 31 | 87 | 122 | 74 |
| Total Completed | 297 | 297 | 297 | 58 | 20 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 33 | 44 | 32 |
| Response Rate | 51\% | 51\% | 51\% | 43\% | 29\% | 13\% | 25\% | 35\% | 38\% | 36\% | 43\% |
| Please indicate your opinion regarding the statements below on a scale of 1-5 (1=strongly disagree, $5=$ strongly agree) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The instructor was enthusiastic about the subject. | 4.26 | 4.6 | 4.64 | 4.79 | 4.75 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4.64 | 4.05 | 4.91 |
| The instructor stimulated my interest. | 3.54 | 4.21 | 4.22 | 4.46 | 3.95 | 5 | 4.75 | 4.55 | 4.21 | 3.95 | 4.66 |
| The instructor defined course objectives, expectations, and requirements clearly. | 4 | 4.39 | 4.52 | 4.48 | 4 | 5 | 4.25 | 4.64 | 4.03 | 4.28 | 4.69 |
| The instructor explained the relationships among concepts/course topics. | 4.07 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.53 | 3.9 | 5 | 4.75 | 4.73 | 4.03 | 3.6 | 4.69 |
| Class meetings were well planned and organized. | 4.2 | 4.55 | 4.61 | 4.69 | 4.25 | 5 | 4.5 | 4.45 | 4.41 | 4.42 | 4.69 |
| Regardless of the grade I received, I learned a lot from this instructor. | 3.89 | 4.41 | 4.43 | 4.53 | 3.95 | 5 | 5 | 4.73 | 4.33 | 3.84 | 4.75 |
| This instructor's methods for evaluating student performance (e.g. assignments and grading techniques) were well designed and fair. | 3.87 | 4.09 | 4.14 | 4.19 | 3.4 | 5 | 4.75 | 4.36 | 3.55 | 4.35 | 4.5 |
| The instructor was available for consultation in the form of emails, questions after class, and office hours. | 4.17 | 4.29 | 4.4 | 4.34 | 4.37 | 5 | 4.75 | 4.36 | 3.85 | 3.93 | 4.39 |
| Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher. | 3.87 | 4.4 | 4.45 | 4.57 | 4.05 | 5 | 4.75 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 3.98 | 4.75 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course | ZOOLOGY 51000 | ZOOLOGY 52000 | ZOOLOGY 611 | ZOOLOGY 655 | ZOOLOGY 677001 | ZOOLOGY 911 | ZOOLOGY 911 | ZOOLOGY 911 | ZOOLOGY 955 | ZOOLOGY 960001 |  |
| Instructor | John Lyons | Anna Pidgeon | Scott Hartman | Yevgenya Grinbla | Peter Guiden | Jake Vander Zanden | Emily Stanley | Hilary Dugan | Jake Vander Zan | William Bement | Department Avg |
| Total Surveyed | 74 | 73 | 37 | 17 | 13 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 7 | 6 |  |
| Total Completed | 32 | 39 | 19 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |  |
| Response Rate | 43\% | 53\% | 51\% | 47\% | 46\% | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 14\% | 33\% |  |
| Please indicate your opinion regarding the statements below on a scale of 1-5 (1=strongly disagree, $5=$ strongly agree) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The instructor was enthusiastic about the subject. | 4.75 | 4.33 | 4.84 | 4.75 | 4.67 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4.53 |
| The instructor stimulated my interest. | 4.47 | 3.92 | 4.68 | 4.75 | 4.5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4.07 |
| The instructor defined course objectives, expectations, and requirements clearly. | 4.59 | 4.44 | 4.63 | 4.5 | 4.33 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4.33 |
| The instructor explained the relationships among concepts/course topics. | 4.63 | 4.44 | 4.63 | 4.38 | 4.5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4.28 |
| Class meetings were well planned and organized. | 4.56 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.75 | 4.5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4.47 |
| Regardless of the grade I received, I learned a lot from this instructor. | 4.69 | 4.44 | 4.68 | 5 | 4.67 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4.29 |
| This instructor's methods for evaluating student performance (e.g. assignments and grading techniques) were well designed and fair. | 4.47 | 4.08 | 4.74 | 4.75 | 4.67 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4.08 |
| The instructor was available for consultation in the form of emails, questions after class, and office hours. | 4.39 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.75 | 4.67 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4.29 |
| Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher. | 4.56 | 4.23 | 4.74 | 4.75 | 4.67 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4.28 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Instructor |  | Otegui |  | Kruger |  |  | Butler |  | Blair |  |  |
| Total Surveyed |  | 639 | 639 | 212 |  |  | 212 |  |  |  |  |
| Total Completed | 221 | 260 | 293 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 190 | 193 |  |  |
| Response Rate (percent) | 35 | 41 | 46 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 44 | 45 |  |  |


| Please indicate your opinion regarding the statements below on a scale of 1-5 (1=strongly disagree, $5=$ strongly agree) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The instructor was enthusiastic about the subject. | 4.85 | B | B | 4.42 | 4.43 | 4.40 | 4.31 | 4.50 | 4.81 |
| The instructor stimulated my interest. | 4.50 | 0 | 0 | 4.40 | 4.23 | 4.77 | 4.23 | 3.43 | 3.90 |
| The instructor defined course objectives, expectations, and requirements clearly. | 4.40 | T | T | 4.54 | 4.29 | 4.46 | 4.27 | 3.57 | 3.66 |
| The instructor explained the relationships among concepts/course topics. | 4.62 | A | A | 4.54 | 4.35 | 4.54 | 4.32 | 3.51 | 3.85 |
| Class meetings were well planned and organized. | 4.72 | N | N | 4.69 | 4.48 | 4.64 | 4.37 | 3.88 | 4.03 |
| Regardless of the grade I received, I learned a lot from this instructor. | 4.59 | Y | Y | 4.73 | 4.73 | 4.90 | 4.81 | 3.51 | 4.01 |
| This instructor's methods for evaluating student performance (e.g. assignments and grading techniques) were well designed and fair. | 4.22 |  |  | 4.60 | 4.38 | 4.66 | 4.35 | 3.23 | 3.65 |
| The instructor was available for consultation in the form of emails, questions after class, and office hours. | 4.52 |  |  | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.48 | 4.32 | 4.06 | 4.20 |
| Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher. | 4.57 |  |  | 4.48 | 4.35 | 4.67 | 4.27 | 3.53 | 4.01 |


| Course | ZOOLOGY 101 | ZOOLOGY 101 | ZOOLOGY 101 | ZOOLOGY 102 | ZOOLOGY 102 | ZOOLOGY 102 | ZOOLOGY 102 | ZOOLOGY 102 | ZOOLOGY 102 | ZOOLOGY 102 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TA | Jacob Kraus | Miranda Mecha | Juanita Diaz | Mary Dinsmore | Christine Grebe | Illiana Anise | Emma Svenson | Bijit Khadka | Sarah Edlund | Jasmine Wyant |
| Total Surveyed |  |  |  | 57 | 58 | 57 | 39 | 56 | 58 | 61 |
| Total Completed |  |  |  | 33 | 31 | 32 | 16 | 32 | 26 | 36 |
| Response Rate | 3\% | 3\% | 2\% | 58\% | 53\% | 56\% | 41\% | 57\% | 45\% | 59\% |
| The TA was clear in presenting subject matter. | 4.40 | 4.40 | 4.30 | 4.53 | 4.56 | 4.51 | 4.00 | 4.24 | 4.92 | 4.67 |
| The TA was well organized. | 4.60 | 4.40 | 4.50 | 4.57 | 4.60 | 4.54 | 4.65 | 4.39 | 4.92 | 4.69 |
| The TA made me feel comfortable to ask questions. | 4.20 | 4.50 | 4.30 | 3.75 | 4.57 | 4.58 | 4.65 | 3.90 | 5.00 | 4.76 |
| The TA presented the material in an interesting and engaging way. | 4.00 | 4.10 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 4.15 | 4.34 | 4.12 | 3.56 | 4.87 | 4.60 |
| Assignments and tests handled by the TA were returned promptly with useful feedback. | 4.10 | 4.30 | 3.20 | 4.50 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.65 | 4.25 | 4.83 | 4.50 |
| The TA was available during office hours or by appointment. | 4.60 | 4.50 | 4.20 | 4.00 | 4.02 | 4.01 | 4.65 | 3.99 | 4.80 | 4.25 |
| Considering everything (class size, course objectives, etc.), the TA was an effective teacher. | 4.30 | 4.40 | 4.60 | 4.25 | 4.48 | 4.46 | 4.35 | 4.15 | 4.97 | 4.67 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ZOOLOGY 151 | ZOOLOGY 151 | ZOOLOGY 151 | ZOOLOGY 151 | ZOOLOGY 151 | ZOOLOGY 151 |  |
| TA | Holly Cho | Carmel Assa | Larry Werner | Hassan Zagloul | Ethan Nethery | Bilal Malas | Nicole Kuha | Eric Hammond | Drew Bantlin |  |
| Total Surveyed | 65 | 43 | 21 | 42 | 62 | 41 | 40 | 107 | 100 |  |
| Total Completed | 37 | 19 | - 7 | 25 | 35 | 17 | 19 | 57 | 60 |  |
| Response Rate | 57\% | 44\% | 33\% | 60\% | 56\% | 41\% | 48\% | 53\% | 60\% |  |
| The TA was clear in presenting subject matter. | 4.67 | 4.62 | 3.14 | 4.52 | 4.68 | 4.07 | 4.42 | 2.84 | 4.70 |  |
| The TA was well organized. | 4.67 | 4.54 | 2.71 | 4.36 | 4.71 | 3.90 | 4.40 | 3.35 | 4.71 |  |
| The TA made me feel comfortable to ask questions. | 4.64 | 4.85 | 3.00 | 4.76 | 4.82 | 4.35 | 4.40 | 3.58 | 4.68 |  |
| The TA presented the material in an interesting and engaging way. | 4.43 | 4.34 | 3.29 | 4.64 | 4.54 | 3.36 | 4.00 | 3.33 | 4.39 |  |
| Assignments and tests handled by the TA were returned promptly with useful feedback. | 4.54 | 4.56 | 1.71 | 4.32 | 4.18 | 3.71 | 4.37 | 3.58 | 4.52 |  |
| The TA was available during office hours or by appointment. | 4.52 | 4.85 | 3.43 | 4.19 | 4.47 | 3.70 | 4.17 | 3.57 | 4.56 |  |
| Considering everything (class size, course objectives, etc.), the TA was an effective teacher. | 4.67 | 4.56 | 3.00 | 4.64 | 4.73 | 3.83 | 4.43 | 2.95 | 4.73 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course | ZOOLOGY 151 | ZOOLOGY 151 | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOOLOGY 152 |
| TA | Sahar Javadi Novashnagh | Ryan Geygan | Karen Hill | Andrew Powers | Diana Guzman Colo | Nicole Tu-Maun | Harrison Catoe | Rachel Schindler | Porter Pavalko | Yi-Ming Weng |
| Total Surveyed | 86 | 82 | 44 | 41 | 42 | 40 | 42 | 44 | 43 | 42 |
| Total Completed | 36 | 43 | 20 | 14 | 20 | 21 | 27 | 18 | 21 | 17 |
| Response Rate | 42\% | 52\% | 45\% | 34\% | 48\% | 53\% | 64\% | 41\% | 49\% | 40\% |
| The TA was clear in presenting subject matter. | 3.20 | 4.54 | 4.67 | 4.39 | 4.05 | 4.77 | 4.40 | 4.38 | 3.63 | 4.06 |
| The TA was well organized. | 3.36 | 4.33 | 4.52 | 4.14 | 4.16 | 4.73 | 4.40 | 4.42 | 3.67 | 4.23 |
| The TA made me feel comfortable to ask questions. | 3.59 | 4.56 | 4.82 | 4.34 | 4.84 | 4.85 | 4.76 | 4.46 | 3.60 | 4.77 |
| The TA presented the material in an interesting and engaging way. | 2.96 | 4.52 | 4.53 | 4.59 | 3.98 | 4.68 | 4.40 | 3.92 | 3.00 | 4.04 |
| Assignments and tests handled by the TA were returned promptly with useful feedback. | 3.51 | 4.43 | 4.63 | 4.01 | 4.26 | 4.57 | 4.63 | 4.17 | 3.82 | 3.88 |
| The TA was available during office hours or by appointment. | 3.51 | 4.32 | 4.54 | 4.27 | 4.51 | 4.62 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 3.58 | 4.35 |
| Considering everything (class size, course objectives, etc.), the TA was an effective teacher. | 3.39 | 4.63 | 4.72 | 4.54 | 4.47 | 4.85 | 4.50 | 4.38 | 3.58 | 4.35 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Course | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOOLOGY 152 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TA | Lianna Johnson | Andrew Zuehlke | Michael Howe | Jade Kochanski | Khuram Zaman | Jorge De Los Santos Funes | Thor Jeppson | Kelly Schmit | Andrew Bennett | Kayla Wandsnider |
| Total Surveyed | 39 | 44 | 43 | 44 | 41 | 41 | 42 | 66 | 82 | 84 |
| Total Completed | 18 | 17 | 20 | 23 | 14 | 22 | 24 | 27 | 36 | 37 |
| Response Rate | 46\% | 39\% | 47\% | 52\% | 34\% | 54\% | 57\% | 41\% | 44\% | 44\% |
| The TA was clear in presenting subject matter. | 4.50 | 4.66 | 4.00 | 4.49 | 3.94 | 3.98 | 4.62 | 4.30 | 4.41 | 3.62 |
| The TA was well organized. | 4.67 | 4.60 | 3.86 | 4.52 | 3.46 | 4.00 | 4.66 | 4.47 | 4.43 | 3.97 |
| The TA made me feel comfortable to ask questions. | 4.56 | 4.71 | 4.16 | 4.62 | 4.07 | 4.74 | 4.71 | 4.71 | 4.21 | 4.22 |
| The TA presented the material in an interesting and engaging way. | 4.33 | 4.43 | 3.71 | 4.37 | 4.17 | 4.33 | 4.51 | 4.03 | 4.04 | 3.56 |
| Assignments and tests handled by the TA were returned promptly with useful feedback. | 4.39 | 4.29 | 3.53 | 4.37 | 2.53 | 2.99 | 4.24 | 4.42 | 3.27 | 3.88 |
| The TA was available during office hours or by appointment. | 4.78 | 4.36 | 4.14 | 4.24 | 3.82 | 4.21 | 4.37 | 4.36 | 3.80 | 4.19 |
| Considering everything (class size, course objectives, etc.), the TA was an effective teacher. | 4.67 | 4.66 | 4.00 | 4.43 | 3.75 | 3.99 | 4.51 | 4.46 | 4.38 | 3.72 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOOLOGY 152 | ZOOLOGY 153 | ZOOLOGY 153 | ZOOLOGY 260 | ZOOLOGY 300 |
| TA | Savannah Gentr | John Rodstrom | Yihan Li | Hannah Richerson | Madison Hankins | Jenni Schimansk | Sahar Javadi Novashnagh | Ryan Geygan | Michael Bosch | Andrew Ontano |
| Total Surveyed | 85 | 20 | 82 | 81 | 44 | 88 | 23 | 24 | 48 | 70 |
| Total Completed | 31 | 10 | 46 | 43 | 20 | 45 | 10 | 9 | 21 | 12 |
| Response Rate | 36\% | 50\% | 56\% | 53\% | 45\% | 51\% | 43\% | 38\% | 44\% | 17\% |
| The TA was clear in presenting subject matter. | 4.20 | 4.20 | 4.05 | 4.68 | 4.24 | 3.86 | 3.22 | 4.44 | 4.00 | 3.18 |
| The TA was well organized. | 4.31 | 4.20 | 4.18 | 4.62 | 4.67 | 4.17 | 3.56 | 4.56 | 4.19 | 3.30 |
| The TA made me feel comfortable to ask questions. | 4.54 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.80 | 4.72 | 4.14 | 3.56 | 4.56 | 4.29 | 3.27 |
| The TA presented the material in an interesting and engaging way. | 4.17 | 4.10 | 4.08 | 4.67 | 4.20 | 3.51 | 3.22 | 4.33 | 3.71 | 3.27 |
| Assignments and tests handled by the TA were returned promptly with useful feedback. | 4.07 | 4.20 | 4.05 | 4.58 | 4.04 | 4.01 | 3.78 | 4.44 | 4.05 | 3.36 |
| The TA was available during office hours or by appointment. | 4.20 | 4.50 | 4.16 | 4.57 | 4.14 | 4.14 | 3.56 | 3.89 | 4.10 | 3.45 |
| Considering everything (class size, course objectives, etc.), the TA was an effective teacher. | 4.22 | 4.50 | 4.24 | 4.82 | 4.40 | 3.93 | 3.33 | 4.56 | 4.05 | 3.27 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course | ZOOLOGY 301 | ZOOLOGY 470 | ZOOLOGY 511 | ZOOLOGY 511 | ZOOLOGY 521 | ZOOLOGY 521 | ZOOLOGY 521 | ZOOLOGY 611 |  |  |
| TA | Guilherme <br> Gainett <br> Cardoso M C <br> Florez | Sterling Martin | Robert Mooney | Benjamin Martin | Maia Persche | Paul Schilke | Jennifer Schneider | Jacki Whisenant |  |  |
| Total Surveyed | 15 | 87 | 49 | 49 | 18 | 16 | 17 | 18 |  |  |
| Total Completed | 2 | 29 | 17 | 17 | 12 | 6 | 4 | 9 |  |  |
| Response Rate | 13\% | 33\% | 35\% | 35\% | 67\% | 38\% | 24\% | 50\% |  |  |
| The TA was clear in presenting subject matter. | 4.50 | 3.64 | 4.76 | 4.61 | 4.92 | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.72 |  |  |
| The TA was well organized. | 4.50 | 3.68 | 4.64 | 4.59 | 4.83 | 5.00 | 4.25 | 4.57 |  |  |
| The TA made me feel comfortable to ask questions. | 5.00 | 3.78 | 4.64 | 4.25 | 4.83 | 4.83 | 4.50 | 4.79 |  |  |
| The TA presented the material in an interesting and engaging way. | 5.00 | 3.75 | 4.57 | 4.47 | 4.67 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.57 |  |  |
| Assignments and tests handled by the TA were returned promptly with useful feedback. | 5.00 | 3.61 | 4.47 | 4.42 | 4.75 | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.65 |  |  |
| The TA was available during office hours or by appointment. | 5.00 | 3.82 | 4.50 | 4.40 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.25 | 4.65 |  |  |


| Considering everything (class size, course objectives, etc.), the TA was an effective teacher. | 5.00 | 3.78 | 4.69 | 4.36 | 4.83 | 5.00 | 4.25 | 4.72 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course | ZOO 152 CASE | ZOO 152 CASE | ZOO 152 CASE | ZOO 152 CASE | ZOO 152 CASE | ZOO 152 CASE | ZOO 152 CASE | ZOO 152 CASE | ZOO 152 CASE |
| TA | Andrea Weissge | Evan Wilson | Jacob Henden | Lindsey Tiegs | Mauriel Rodrigues | (Megan Morrisor | Olivia Cope | Ricardo Rivera | Roger Daley |
| Total Surveyed | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 |
| Total Completed | 5 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Response Rate | 11\% | 9\% | 5\% | 9\% | 9\% | 20\% | 14\% | 16\% | 18\% |
| The TA was clear in presenting subject matter. | 4.40 | 3.75 | 3.50 | 4.00 | 4.75 | 4.56 | 3.83 | 4.57 | 3.00 |
| The TA was well organized. | 3.80 | 3.75 | 2.00 | 3.50 | 4.75 | 4.33 | 4.00 | 4.29 | 2.63 |
| The TA made me feel comfortable to ask questions. | 4.00 | 3.75 | 3.00 | 3.50 | 3.75 | 4.56 | 4.17 | 3.00 | 2.13 |
| The TA presented the material in an interesting and engaging way. | 4.80 | 4.75 | 3.00 | 4.50 | 5.00 | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.57 | 4.00 |
| Assignments and tests handled by the TA were returned promptly with useful feedback. | 4.00 | 4.25 | 2.00 | 3.25 | 5.00 | 4.33 | 3.83 | 4.00 | 3.25 |
| The TA was available during office hours or by appointment. | 4.60 | 4.25 | 4.00 | 4.25 | 4.50 | 4.56 | 4.00 | 3.57 | 4.00 |
| Considering everything (class size, course objectives, etc.), the TA was an effective teacher. | 4.40 | 4.00 | 3.50 | 4.25 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 3.13 |

