Student ASE Evaluation for Ashish Venkat
Department of Computer Science and Engineering

CSE 240A - Princ/Computer Architecture (Tullsen, Dean Michael)
Fall 2013

Number of Evaluations Submitted: 59
Number of Students Enrolled: 87

1. The Teaching Assistant was well organized and prepared for class.

   28 (47.5%): Strongly Agree
   20 (33.9%): Agree
   3 (5.1%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
   1 (1.7%): Disagree
   0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
   7 (11.9%): Not Applicable

2. The Teaching Assistant consistently arrived at lecture, section/lab, office hours and exams on time.

   31 (52.5%): Strongly Agree
   19 (32.2%): Agree
   4 (6.8%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
   0 (0.0%): Disagree
   0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
   5 (8.5%): Not Applicable

3. The Teaching Assistant presented course material clearly and answered questions accurately in class.

   24 (40.7%): Strongly Agree
   23 (39.0%): Agree
   6 (10.2%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
   2 (3.4%): Disagree
   1 (1.7%): Strongly Disagree
   3 (5.1%): Not Applicable
4. The Teaching Assistant helped develop my thinking skills on the subject.

25 (42.4%): Strongly Agree
21 (35.6%): Agree
8 (13.6%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
2 (3.4%): Disagree
1 (1.7%): Strongly Disagree
2 (3.4%): Not Applicable

5. Feedback from the Teaching Assistant on assignments, exams and/or papers was helpful and constructive.

26 (44.1%): Strongly Agree
24 (40.7%): Agree
5 (8.5%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
4 (6.8%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

6. The Teaching Assistant's explanations were appropriate, being neither too complicated nor too simple.

27 (45.8%): Strongly Agree
21 (35.6%): Agree
5 (8.5%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
2 (3.4%): Disagree
3 (5.1%): Strongly Disagree
1 (1.7%): Not Applicable

7. The Teaching Assistant answered questions clearly and effectively, helping students to make connections among the course readings, assignments, and lectures.

26 (44.1%): Strongly Agree
23 (39.0%): Agree
3 (5.1%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
3 (5.1%): Disagree
3 (5.1%): Strongly Disagree
1 (1.7%): Not Applicable

8. The Teaching Assistant was genuinely interested in and enthusiastic about teaching.

30 (50.8%): Strongly Agree
18 (30.5%): Agree
5 (8.5%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
5 (8.5%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
1 (1.7%): Not Applicable
9. The Teaching Assistant was accessible to students outside of class (office hours, e-mail, etc.).

33 (55.9%): Strongly Agree
18 (30.5%): Agree
5 (8.5%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
1 (1.7%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
2 (3.4%): Not Applicable

10. The Teaching Assistant effectively connected the section/lab exercises with the material covered in lecture.

25 (43.1%): Strongly Agree
20 (34.5%): Agree
8 (13.8%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
2 (3.4%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
3 (5.2%): Not Applicable
1: [No Response]

11. In terms of communication skills, did the Teaching Assistant demonstrate any of the following? (check all that apply)

41 (82.0%): No issues
2 (4.0%): Too quiet
0 (0.0%): Too loud
3 (6.0%): Too fast
0 (0.0%): Too slow
1 (2.0%): Poor grammar and/or English language skills
1 (2.0%): Used filler words such as "um"
2 (4.0%): Other (please describe)

- I never met the TA, or had the chance to ask him any questions. My only interaction with him was the notes on returned homework assignments, which provided some feedback but not much

- strong accent

12. I would recommend this Teaching Assistant to other students.

30 (50.8%): Strongly Agree
19 (32.2%): Agree
7 (11.9%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
3 (5.1%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
13. Please describe this person's greatest strengths as a Teaching Assistant.

- Nice person, and hard-working, always available even at late night on the piazza.
- He cares about the subject. He cares about teaching. He cares about whether students are actually learning
  - Extremely accessible and helpful, over piazza, email and in person
  - Very patient and calm when working through problems and solutions
  - Though he was the only TA for a very large graduate class that was struggling, he performed greatly
  - His assignments were extremely useful in learning the material
- Ashish has a very good command over the subject and is able to answer questions with real world examples and logical reasons behind why a problem needs to be solved a certain way or why a design decision is made a certain way. He is also very approachable and patient while explaining concepts or clearing doubts.
- Clear understanding of the subject material.
- Commendable that he managed Piazza questions by himself for such a large class; seemed like he had good command of architecture knowledge and was generally on the same page as the professor.
- Good command over subject.
- Good understanding of the material
- He is very well-versed with the subject.
- He was very responsive on Piazza. He graded homeworks on time. He understands the subject well.
- His great knowledge in computer architecture and hardworking on Piazza.
- His in-depth knowledge of the course material.
  The concepts got very tricky during the course and it was very easy to create confusing scenarios but Ashish handled them with clarity and focus on the important things rather than getting lost in trivial details.
- Knowledgeable about computer architecture
- Knowledgeable about the subject, dedicated, helpfulness.
- Knows material very well.
- Patience and expertise
- Professional skill in this realm
- Quick and clear answer
- Responds fast on piazza.
- Strong technical skills.
• subject matter expert - knows ins and outs of Computer Architecture
great resource for students. glad to have him as the TA for this course.
his HW solutions were detailed and one could learn a lot from them.
always helpful and connects well with students needs and pains.

• Understanding of subject

• very responsible TA, spend a lot of time answering students questions, and write detailed answer of homework.

14. Please describe this person's greatest weaknesses as a Teaching Assistant.

• I think the TA has great computer architecture knowledge, and love to teach. To the less experienced learner on this area, I think it would be good to have more consistency and rigorous explanation for the problem sets.

  Handwriting on the returned homework is hard to read.

• - He can be proactive about conveying feedback to the instructor about how the class is perceiving the course, based on the response to assignments and the performances in the exams.

• A bit vague when answering some questions.

• did no find any

• I found none.

• Many times would not clarify definitions required to answer questions, with the reasoning it would give too much away. However, the definition of the problems are not the answers and are instead needed in order to understand what the question is asking.

• More organisation is needed, plus the level of the discussions was probably too high. More organised approach was needed, covering all the fundamentals well.

• No yet discovered.

• None that I am aware of

• Poor at communicating understanding of material to students. Afraid of revealing the answers to problems so rather than clarifying questions very often questions became less clear.

• Responses to questions about homework problems and projects were often ambiguous, inconsistent, and made people even more confused.

• Sometimes the homework is based on some assumption differ from the professor's lecture. And the description is ambiguous.

• There could have been discussion sessions to better explain some of the concepts of the lecture.

• too strict

• Unhelpful to the point where students would probably have been better off not receiving any help rather than get conflicting information from multiple sources (multiple posts on piazza, hw files, class website, piazza website). Many assignments have multiple "clarifying" posts on piazza that often failed to clarify, spawning even more questions and ambiguous answers from the TA. In his attempts to not "give away the answer," the TA would provide a vague answer C when a
student asks if A or B is correct, even though C does not directly imply A or B. The only way to get a direct answer it seems is to attend OH, which is not always an option for students with conflicting schedules.

The TA requires detail on homework assignments and project submissions but fails to do so himself when he is posting said assignments, and students take the hit for his mistakes. For example, I once asked a question in his OH about an assumption and he told me it was ok, but later marked me off for it. He has typos and confusing statements in his write-ups and it is extremely frustrating combing through the many piazza posts to try and consolidate/make sense of all his statements. His project submission details were arbitrary and when students failed to follow them (because he kept updating the files with little notification) he gave an arbitrary time window to correct it. In the future, please keep all your info in one place! Not in the hw pdf and also in multiple instructor's notes on piazza!

I found this TA to be one of the least helpful TA's in my time at UCSD (and previous academic career). This is surprising because given the level of detail required to succeed in this course, I would expect the TA to put in the same amount of effort and detail.

15. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

Please provide any additional constructive comments

- UCSD should do more to recognize good TA's.
  - They should definitely consider appointing 2 TA's to a class of this size and nature!

- An awesome TA

- For being the only TA for a class of this size, he did a very good job.

- I wish Ashish all the best in his future endeavors, expecting him do breakthrough work on the next generation of processors.

- More clear homework instruction will be more preferred.

- The workload of this CSE240A was huge....

- Very good work!

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, Computer Science and Engineering, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.