4.605 Introduction to the History and Theory of Architecture
Survey Window: Spring 2013 End of Term

(back)

Schmidt, Sebastian, Assistant Recitation Instructo - Overall rating: 6.2

Teaching in Recitation

Quality of Teaching	Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Neutral, 7=Strongly Agree, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)		
	AVG 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	RESPONSES	STDEV
Stimulated interest	6.0	6	0.89
Displayed thorough knowledge of subject material	6.2	6	0.98
Helped me learn	6.2	6	0.75

	Rating Scale: 1=Very Poor, 7=Excellent, N/A=Not Applicable (7 is best)		
	AVG 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	RESPONSES	STDEV
Overall rating	6.2	6	0.75

Comments on teaching (strengths, areas for improvement)

Student 23941 - I was really glad that we got a lot of feedback on my essays. It was a lot more than I expected, and even though I wasn't able to rewrite them on time, they were extremely helpful for future reference as well.

Student 45284 - A great section leader who asked excellent questions and provided insightful commentary. He was supportive and understanding.

Student 45645 - Knowledgeable, nice, worked hard to get us to participate in recitation. As a general comment about grading - and actually this applies to Todd, not Sebastian - I found the grading of my midterm to be really subpar. There were no explanations given about wrong answers on drawing questions, and similarly potentially subjective questions. The essay responses all just had numbers next to them, without indication of where points were being taken off. The exam was not even signed by Todd, indicating that he graded it. It just seemed rather hastily done. I think it's important that graders convey to the student what information is missing or incorrect on an exam - otherwise what's the point of taking an exam?!

Student 47755 - I had a hard time hearing a lot of the comments in recitation. For small classes in which group input forms much of the content, a circle of desks (or parabola facing the screen) would be helpful. It would also allow me to better put names to faces.

(back)