

ASSISTANTSHIP EVALUATION FORM

PH.D. PROGRAM IN GERONTOLOGY

Check one: student self-evaluation

 supervisor evaluation

Name of student: _____ Eilon Caspi _____

Type of Assistantship:

Research

Teaching

Administrative

Assistantship site (center or institute, if applicable): Qualitative Methods course cross-listed with the MGS Department of Public Policy and Public Affairs

Supervisor: _____ Donna Haig Friedman _____

Dates of placement: Fall Indicate year: _____ 2006 _____

 Spring Indicate year: _____

 Other (specify dates): _____

Description of assistantship assignment:

(See attached job description)

MULTI-METHOD RESEARCH DESIGN USING QUALITATIVE METHODS

PPOLGL609 and Geron 609L-Fall 2006; 4:00-6:30 PM;
Donna Haig Friedman, Course Instructor

Teaching Assistant Job Description

The Teaching Assistant (TA) position for this advanced qualitative methods research course is designed to maximize learning opportunities for enrolled graduate students.

Specifically, the TA will work with the faculty member to:

- organize and distribute course materials to students in a timely fashion;
- ensure that the LCD/computer setup is in place for each course session;
- assist in planning, delivering and facilitating content presentations and interactive learning activities for each session;
- develop learning formats aimed at enabling students to use the NVIVO software tool for organizing and systematically analyzing high volumes of qualitative data;
- provide 'hands-on' assistance to each student to lead to their mastery of the qualitative analysis process using the NVIVO software;
- assist in communications with students regarding a range of issues related to mastery of course material and course logistics;
- assist in coaching students and grading their course assignments.

Attitude –Application to Work**Comments on attitude:**

From start to finish, Eilon approached the teaching assistantship work with a positive energy and with a deep commitment to ensuring that students received a high quality learning experience *in every respect*. In fact, student participants commented on the positive impact of his enthusiasm and love for qualitative research; they reported that his energy increased their own energy levels, especially with respect to their learning and using N-Vivo, a qualitative analysis software tool.

- Outstanding in enthusiasm
- Very interested and industrious
- Average in diligence and interest
- Somewhat indifferent
- Definitely not interested

Dependability**Comments on dependability:**

I depended upon Eilon with high confidence and without exception. Characteristically, he thought ahead about content and process issues; on one occasion, he courageously provided me with critical feedback; as a result, my thinking and planning shifted. That he could and would provide such feedback increased my (already high) sense of confidence in his abilities. He provided TA to students between classes throughout the semester. I could count on him to take care of the necessary materials/equipment for each session. He was always on target with timetables that we established for accomplishment of planning or grading tasks.

- Completely dependable
- Above average in dependability
- Usually dependable
- Sometimes neglectful or careless
- Unreliable

Initiative**Comments on initiative:**

Throughout the semester, Eilon showed enormous initiative. In particular, he proactively shared his ideas on how we could handle particular aspects of the course, including (1) N-Vivo assignments and steps for learning how to use the tool, (2) processes for giving feedback on assignments, (3) structures for teamwork activities, (4) changes in the syllabus and (5) feedback to me on course/session improvements. In every case, he was attentive to the timeliness of decisions on these issues.

- Proceeds well on his/her own
- Goes ahead independently at times
- Does all assigned work
- Hesitates
- Must be pushed frequently

Quality of Work**Comments on quality of work:**

Eilon's work was always of an exceptional quality. For example, we worked together on grading every assignment. Sixteen students participated in the course and each student had five assignments which we graded as a two-person team. Eilon always approached the review of students' work with a deep commitment to providing extensive and sensitively worded feedback. As a result, each student received extensive feedback from each of us on every assignment and according to tight timelines. Eilon's contributions to the content of the course sessions were also outstanding; I am quite certain that my teaching improved as a result.

- Excellent
- Very good
- Average
- Below average
- Very poor

Relations with Others

Comments on relations with others:

The course participants highly value Eilon as a person and as a substantive resource. He found ways to provide individualized technical assistance and critical feedback with enormous sensitivity; frequently he voiced his sense that our joint feedback should strike a balance such that students could very clearly understand the specific areas for improvement, while still feeling energized about proceeding ahead with their research. His sensitivity was especially evident as we graded assignments and as he provided individualized technical assistance to students and to small teams of students as they were learning to use N-Vivo.

- Exceptionally well accepted
- Works well with others
- Gets along satisfactorily
- Has difficulty working with others
- Works very poorly with others
- Not applicable

Quantity of Work

Comments on quantity of work:

The sheer quantity of Eilon's work is evident in the following ways. He provided:

- Extensive feedback to students on their assignments;
- Extensive accessibility to students during a 3-4 week period in which they were learning to use N-Vivo for small team work and for their individual learning;
- Extensive detail by email on directions and clarifications related to glitches and functionality of N-Vivo; and
- Extensive communication re: the monthly qualitative workshop led by Bob Weiss, both to invite students to participate and to share the summaries of workshop discussions with all the students, whether or not they attended the workshops.

- Unusually high output
- More than average
- Normal amount
- Below average
- Low output, slow

Judgment

Comments on judgment:

There were a number of complex issues that arose with some of the students during the semester, including teamwork tensions, personal crises, as well as styles of participation in session discussions. In every case, Eilon demonstrated exceptional maturity and thoughtfulness as we considered options for handling those issues. In other areas, such as adjustment of the syllabus, planning the sequence of activities within each session, development of standards for grading assignments and so on, I found that I could trust Eilon to be balanced and mature in his thinking. I highly valued the perspectives he brought to our deliberations.

- Exceptionally mature in judgement
- Above average in making decisions
- Usually makes the right decision
- Often uses poor judgement
- Consistently uses poor judgement

Not applicable

Attendance

Comments on attendance:

Not only was Eilon regular in attendance. In addition---beyond the call of duty---he made himself available to students for technical assistance at times that were convenient to them. He also provided immediate responses to email communications from students on the weekends and during evening periods.

Regular
 Irregular

Overall Performance

Outstanding
 Very good
 Average
 Marginal
 Unsatisfactory

Comments on overall performance (please include the student's outstanding qualities as well as those that the student should strive to improve):

As you can surmise from all of the comments and ratings above, I have nothing but high praise for Eilon's work as teaching assistant for my course this past fall. Due to the contributions he made in our meetings, in between class sessions and during class sessions, the learning experience for students and the teaching/learning experience for me was of the highest quality. In fact, I have never had a more pleasurable or satisfying teaching experience. Based upon what students have told me, my views are widely shared by the student participants in the course.

THE FOLLOWING THREE QUESTIONS ARE TO BE ANSWERED BY THE FACULTY SUPERVISOR ONLY:

This report has been discussed with the student: Yes No

Based on this review, would you recommend that the student continue to receive assistantship funding for next year? Yes No

Absolutely! Eilon is an exceptional researcher and teacher. I am confident that he will make enormous contributions to the professional skill development of other students and of any faculty member with whom he works in the future.

If yes, would you like to continue to be his/her supervisor? Yes No

If Eilon so desired to do TA work for this course (spring 2008), I would be very eager to have him join me in the process again!

Supervisor's Signature:

Donna Haig Friedman

Date:

12-21-06