BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



9500 GILMAN DRIVE LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

Course and Instructor Evaluation Summary Computational Social Sciences Program

Brockbank, Erik
CSS 2 - Data/Model Programming: CSS (A)
Spring Quarter 2022

Number of Students Enrolled: 28 Number of Evaluations Submitted: 14

PLEASE COMMENT ON THE FOLLOWING:

1. Your class level is

0 (0.0%): Freshman
0 (0.0%): Sophomore
6 (42.9%): Junior
8 (57.1%): Senior
0 (0.0%): Graduate
0 (0.0%): Extension
0 (0.0%): Visitor

2. Your reason for taking this class is

1 (7.1%): Major 11 (78.6%): Minor 0 (0.0%): Gen. Ed. 0 (0.0%): Elective 2 (14.3%): Interest

3. What grade do you expect in this class?

11 (84.6%): A
2 (15.4%): B
0 (0.0%): C
0 (0.0%): D
0 (0.0%): F
0 (0.0%): P
0 (0.0%): NP

1: [No Response]

GENERAL QUESTIONS

4. I learned a great deal from this course.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

0 (0.0%): Disagree

1 (7.1%): Neither Agree nor Disagree

3 (21.4%): Agree

10 (71.4%): Strongly Agree 0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

5. How many hours a week do you spend studying outside of class on average?

0 (0.0%): 0-1 0 (0.0%): 2-3 4-5 4 (28.6%): 6-7 5 (35.7%): 2 (14.3%): 8-9 2 (14.3%): 10-11 0 (0.0%): 12-13 0 (0.0%): 14-15 0 (0.0%): 16-17 1 (7.1%): 18-19 0 (0.0%): 20 or more

6. How often do you attend this course?

0 (0.0%): Very Rarely

9 (64.3%): Some of the Time 5 (35.7%): Most of the Time

COURSE MATERIAL CSS 2

7. The course material is intellectually stimulating.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

0 (0.0%): Disagree

0 (0.0%): Neither Agree nor Disagree

5 (41.7%): Agree

7 (58.3%): Strongly Agree 0 (0.0%): Not Applicable 2: [No Response]

8. Assignments promote learning.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

0 (0.0%): Disagree

1 (7.7%): Neither Agree nor Disagree

2 (15.4%): Agree

10 (76.9%): Strongly Agree 0 (0.0%): Not Applicable 1: [No Response]

9. Required reading is useful.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

0 (0.0%): Disagree

0 (0.0%): Neither Agree nor Disagree

1 (7.7%): Agree

5 (38.5%): Strongly Agree 7 (53.8%): Not Applicable 1: [No Response]

10. This course is difficult relative to others.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

0 (0.0%): Disagree

6 (46.2%): Neither Agree nor Disagree

5 (38.5%): Agree

2 (15.4%): Strongly Agree 0 (0.0%): Not Applicable 1: [No Response]

11. Exams are representative of the course material.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

0 (0.0%): Disagree

0 (0.0%): Neither Agree nor Disagree

1 (7.7%): Agree

3 (23.1%): Strongly Agree 9 (69.2%): Not Applicable 1: [No Response]

12. Do you recommend this course overall?

13 (100.0%): Yes 0 (0.0%): No

1: [No Response]

13. Course CSS 2:

- Cool course, felt a lot like COGS 108 to me, but a little less intense and fast paced, and I felt like the material was covered very well.
- It is a great next step from CSS 2. You will learn a lot about coding as well as research methods.
- It taught a lot of different analysis techniques and I definitely feel like I came away with a lot more knowledge than I usually do after a class especially a lower division one.

14. Exams/Quizzes/Papers:

- The problem sets were very difficult and took me about 8 hours each.
- Datasets used for the labs and problem sets are very interesting.

15. Reading [title(s) and comments]:

[No Responses]

INSTRUCTOR Erik Brockbank

16. Instructor displays a proficient command of the material.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

0 (0.0%): Disagree

0 (0.0%): Neither Agree nor Disagree

3 (23.1%): Agree

10 (76.9%): Strongly Agree 0 (0.0%): Not Applicable 1: [No Response]

17. Instructor is well prepared for classes.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

0 (0.0%): Disagree

1 (7.7%): Neither Agree nor Disagree

2 (15.4%): Agree

10 (76.9%): Strongly Agree 0 (0.0%): Not Applicable 1: [No Response]

18. Instructor's speech is clear and audible.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

0 (0.0%): Disagree

0 (0.0%): Neither Agree nor Disagree

2 (15.4%): Agree

11 (84.6%): Strongly Agree 0 (0.0%): Not Applicable 1: [No Response]

19. Instructor explains the course material well.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

1 (7.7%): Disagree

0 (0.0%): Neither Agree nor Disagree

1 (7.7%): Agree

11 (84.6%): Strongly Agree 0 (0.0%): Not Applicable [No Response]

20. Lectures hold your attention.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

1 (7.7%): Disagree

0 (0.0%): Neither Agree nor Disagree

5 (38.5%): Agree

7 (53.8%): Strongly Agree 0 (0.0%): Not Applicable 1: [No Response]

The data used in this report is provided to the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs by Course and Professor Evaluations (CAPE), a student-run organization. Please visit the CAPE website at cape.ucsd.edu if you have questions about the data or how it is collected.

21. Instructor's lecture style facilitates note-taking.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

1 (7.7%): Disagree

1 (7.7%): Neither Agree nor Disagree

3 (23.1%): Agree

6 (46.2%): Strongly Agree 2 (15.4%): Not Applicable 1: [No Response]

22. Instructor shows concern for students' learning.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

0 (0.0%): Disagree

0 (0.0%): Neither Agree nor Disagree

3 (23.1%): Agree

10 (76.9%): Strongly Agree 0 (0.0%): Not Applicable 1: [No Response]

23. Instructor promotes appropriate questions/discussion.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

1 (7.7%): Disagree

1 (7.7%): Neither Agree nor Disagree

2 (15.4%): Agree

9 (69.2%): Strongly Agree 0 (0.0%): Not Applicable 1: [No Response]

24. Instructor is accessible outside of class.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

0 (0.0%): Disagree

0 (0.0%): Neither Agree nor Disagree

4 (30.8%): Agree

8 (61.5%): Strongly Agree 1 (7.7%): Not Applicable 1: [No Response]

25. Instructor starts and finishes class on time.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

1 (7.7%): Disagree

0 (0.0%): Neither Agree nor Disagree

4 (30.8%): Agree

8 (61.5%): Strongly Agree 0 (0.0%): Not Applicable 1: [No Response] 26. Instructor is effective in promoting academic integrity.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

0 (0.0%): Disagree

2 (15.4%): Neither Agree nor Disagree

3 (23.1%): Agree

7 (53.8%): Strongly Agree 1 (7.7%): Not Applicable 1: [No Response]

27. The instructor practiced effective teaching strategies that acknowledged and valued differences among students, including differences of race and gender identity.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

0 (0.0%): Disagree

1 (7.7%): Neither Agree nor Disagree

2 (15.4%): Agree

8 (61.5%): Strongly Agree 2 (15.4%): Not Applicable 1: [No Response]

28. Instructor Erik Brockbank:

- Very funny and explains things very well. Was very willing to stay after class to help me when I had questions.
- He was very understanding and tried to help students as much as possible. Feedback was always constructive and helpful and it was clear he took time thinking through it.
- Erik is probably one of the best graduate student instructors I've had at UCSD. You can tell from his lecture code that he has made an enormous amount of effort to make sure that we understand the fundamental concepts, instead of just telling us to use some built-in functions in certain Python libraries. He demonstrated that one can teach machine learning to a group of students with different levels of programming experience without making labs or problem sets unnecessarily hard. He's also very accessible, accommodating, and open to all kinds of ideas for final projects.
- Great professor and person overall, would definitely take one of his classes again. 10/10
- Professor Brockbank was a great professor! He covered pretty dense statistical and boring
 material pretty well, and more than that he shows a lot of care for his students and he is very
 understanding.

29. Do you recommend this professor overall?

13 (100.0%): Yes 0 (0.0%): No

1: [No Response]

Custom Question 5

30. Please provide examples of the ways the instructor did or did not create a learning environment that welcomed, challenged, and supported all students.

[No Responses]

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, Computational Social Sciences, 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.