



---

---

## Fall 2019 Individual Report FAS-GENED 1058-Tech Ethics: AI, Biotech, and the Future of Human Nature 001L Jordan Kokot

Project Title: **2019 Fall Harvard FAS Course Evaluation**

Course Audience: **616**

Responses Received: **525**

Response Ratio: **85%**

---

### Report Comments

Note:

The order that the questions appear on this report is not the same as the way the questions were displayed to students. The order has been changed to make the report more readable.

---

Creation Date: **Thursday, January 23, 2020**

blue®

---

## General Course Questions

### Course General Questions

	Count	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Course Mean	FAS Mean
Evaluate the course overall.	495	27%	35%	28%	7%	3%	3.75	4.17
Course materials (readings, audio-visual materials, textbooks, lab manuals, website, etc.)	483	30%	35%	24%	8%	4%	3.78	4.15
Assignments (exams, essays, problem sets, language homework, etc.)	490	24%	29%	30%	11%	6%	3.55	4.00
Feedback you received on work you produced in this course	492	34%	29%	20%	11%	6%	3.76	3.95
Section component of the course	489	44%	29%	16%	8%	3%	4.02	4.10

**Course**

1. Evaluate the course overall.

Graphs illustrating the information in the accessible table that should immediately follow it.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Excellent	5	132	27%
Very Good	4	174	35%
Good	3	138	28%
Fair	2	35	7%
Unsatisfactory	1	16	3%
Statistics			Value
Response Ratio			80%
Mean			3.75
Median			4.00
Standard Deviation			1.03

2. Course materials (readings, audio-visual materials, textbooks, lab manuals, website, etc.)

Graphs illustrating the information in the accessible table that should immediately follow it.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Excellent	5	143	30%
Very Good	4	167	35%
Good	3	114	24%
Fair	2	40	8%
Unsatisfactory	1	19	4%
Statistics			Value
Response Ratio			78%
Mean			3.78
Median			4.00
Standard Deviation			1.08

3. Assignments (exams, essays, problem sets, language homework, etc.)

Graphs illustrating the information in the accessible table that should immediately follow it.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Excellent	5	118	24%
Very Good	4	144	29%
Good	3	145	30%
Fair	2	56	11%
Unsatisfactory	1	27	6%
Statistics			Value
Response Ratio			80%
Mean			3.55
Median			4.00
Standard Deviation			1.14

4. Feedback you received on work you produced in this course

Graphs illustrating the information in the accessible table that should immediately follow it.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Excellent	5	169	34%
Very Good	4	145	29%
Good	3	97	20%
Fair	2	53	11%
Unsatisfactory	1	28	6%
Statistics			Value
Response Ratio			80%
Mean			3.76
Median			4.00
Standard Deviation			1.20

5. Section component of the course

Graphs illustrating the information in the accessible table that should immediately follow it.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Excellent	5	214	44%
Very Good	4	143	29%
Good	3	77	16%
Fair	2	38	8%
Unsatisfactory	1	17	3%
Statistics			Value
Response Ratio			79%
Mean			4.02
Median			4.00
Standard Deviation			1.10

**Requirements - What did this course require of you?**

**On average, how many hours per week did you spend on coursework outside of class? Enter a whole number between 0 and 168.**

The top range is 168 but displayed below are frequency bars for those who answered up to 30. The mean reflects the entire range.

On average, how many hours per week did you spend on coursework outside of class? Enter a whole number between 0 and 168.

Graphs illustrating the information in the accessible table that should immediately follow it.

Statistics	Value
Response Ratio	75%
Mean	3.52
Median	3.00
Mode	3
Standard Deviation	2.00

### How difficult did you find this course?

How difficult did you find this course?

Graphs illustrating the information in the accessible table that should immediately follow it.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage	Statistics	Value
Very Difficult	5	9	2%	Response Ratio	79%
Difficult	4	87	18%	Mean	2.84
Moderate	3	238	49%	Median	3.00
Easy	2	125	26%	Standard Deviation	0.85
Very Easy	1	29	6%		

### What was/were your reason(s) for enrolling in this course? (Please check all that apply)

Options	Count
Elective	156
Concentration or Department Requirement	60
Secondary Field or Language Citation Requirement	15
Undergraduate General Education Requirement	323
Expository Writing Requirement	1
Pre-Med Requirement	1
Divisional Distribution Requirement	28
Quantitative Reasoning with Data Requirement	4

### Recommendations - Would you recommend this course?

#### How strongly would you recommend this course to your peers?

How strongly would you recommend this course to your peers?

Graphs illustrating the information in the accessible table that should immediately follow it.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage	Statistics	Value
Recommend with Enthusiasm	5	143	29%	Response Ratio	80%
Likely to Recommend	4	170	34%	Mean	3.78
Recommend with Reservations	3	128	26%	Median	4.00
Unlikely to Recommend	2	33	7%	Standard Deviation	1.06
Definitely not Recommend	1	19	4%		

## Evaluation of Section Leaders

### Section Leader Questions

	Count	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Instructor Mean	FAS Mean
Evaluate your Section Leader overall.	19	58%	32%	5%	5%	0%	4.42	4.48
Gives effective lectures or presentations, if applicable	19	74%	11%	11%	5%	0%	4.53	4.40
Facilitates discussion and encourages participation	19	74%	16%	5%	5%	0%	4.58	4.44
Is accessible outside of class (including after class, office hours, e-mail, etc.)	19	53%	26%	21%	0%	0%	4.32	4.55
Generates enthusiasm for the subject matter	19	68%	26%	5%	0%	0%	4.63	4.41
Gives useful feedback on assignments	19	53%	26%	16%	0%	5%	4.21	4.37
Returns assignments in a timely fashion	19	21%	21%	21%	32%	5%	3.21	4.44

## Section Leader

1. Evaluate your Section Leader overall.

Graphs illustrating the information in the accessible table that should immediately follow it.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Excellent	5	11	58%
Very Good	4	6	32%
Good	3	1	5%
Fair	2	1	5%
Unsatisfactory	1	0	0%
Statistics			Value
Response Ratio			3%
Mean			4.42
Median			5.00
Standard Deviation			0.84

3. Facilitates discussion and encourages participation

Graphs illustrating the information in the accessible table that should immediately follow it.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Excellent	5	14	74%
Very Good	4	3	16%
Good	3	1	5%
Fair	2	1	5%
Unsatisfactory	1	0	0%
Statistics			Value
Response Ratio			3%
Mean			4.58
Median			5.00
Standard Deviation			0.84

2. Gives effective lectures or presentations, if applicable

Graphs illustrating the information in the accessible table that should immediately follow it.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Excellent	5	14	74%
Very Good	4	2	11%
Good	3	2	11%
Fair	2	1	5%
Unsatisfactory	1	0	0%
Statistics			Value
Response Ratio			3%
Mean			4.53
Median			5.00
Standard Deviation			0.90

4. Is accessible outside of class (including after class, office hours, e-mail, etc.)

Graphs illustrating the information in the accessible table that should immediately follow it.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Excellent	5	10	53%
Very Good	4	5	26%
Good	3	4	21%
Fair	2	0	0%
Unsatisfactory	1	0	0%
Statistics			Value
Response Ratio			3%
Mean			4.32
Median			5.00
Standard Deviation			0.82

5. Generates enthusiasm for the subject matter

Graphs illustrating the information in the accessible table that should immediately follow it.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Excellent	5	13	68%
Very Good	4	5	26%
Good	3	1	5%
Fair	2	0	0%
Unsatisfactory	1	0	0%
Statistics			Value
Response Ratio			3%
Mean			4.63
Median			5.00
Standard Deviation			0.60

6. Gives useful feedback on assignments

Graphs illustrating the information in the accessible table that should immediately follow it.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Excellent	5	10	53%
Very Good	4	5	26%
Good	3	3	16%
Fair	2	0	0%
Unsatisfactory	1	1	5%
Statistics			Value
Response Ratio			3%
Mean			4.21
Median			5.00
Standard Deviation			1.08

7. Returns assignments in a timely fashion

Graphs illustrating the information in the accessible table that should immediately follow it.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Excellent	5	4	21%
Very Good	4	4	21%
Good	3	4	21%
Fair	2	6	32%
Unsatisfactory	1	1	5%
Statistics			Value
Response Ratio			3%
Mean			3.21
Median			3.00
Standard Deviation			1.27



---

## Section Leader Comments

Please comment on your Section Leader's teaching.

Comments
I thought Jordan was a great section leader. He has a way with words and did a great job of making the information accessible.
Jordan was awesome! His feedback was always direct and helpful, and the section was very fun. He controlled the flow of discussion just enough to keep us on track, but often let us run wild and debate and discuss the material, which made it very fun. Doing debates and other activities in section was also always very fun.
Jordan is amazing! He's good at leading section and is able to synthesize the different comments made by students, as well as drawing out important points.
Jordan is one of the most insightful and competent TFs I have been in section with. He lead the discussion incredibly effectively without dominating it, which is rare in a TF. His ability to understand the point that someone is trying to make and repeat it back to them ten times more eloquently was inspiring to see, and he never failed to extract value from a student's contribution, no matter how tangential or ill formed. I also appreciate how he made extra time for students outside of section despite the logistical difficulty of doing so.
Jordan was amazing, Honestly top TF I have ever had.
Best section I have had at Harvard
Jordan is the man. Very smart, engaging, and fun to be around. I really appreciate the way he ran section, facilitating debate and discussion. The only thing I'd say is that I wish assignments were returned in a more timely fashion. Often times students were left to write their next assignment fully not knowing how they performed on the one they submitted 2-3 weeks prior.
As mentioned earlier, Jordan was a great section TF who always provided me with incredibly useful feedback on my assignments to the point where he was giving me pointers for my next paper because he wanted me to do well and knew that I struggled with this type of writing as I hadn't done anything as theoretical as this in my lifetime. Jordan always ran a very active section and encouraged participation from everyone. He was very accepting of all viewpoints in an argument and always did his best to make everyone's comments useful to the discussion and always tried his best to push back on arguments in order to get the most out of section as possible. Jordan was also always incredibly responsive to emails and worked with my schedule to meet with me because I had a class which interfered with his office hours.
Jordan should let the students talk more. Most of the section consisted of someone making a point and then him restating the point. I would love to see more dialogue between students.
Loved my section leader!
Jordan was fairly casual and welcoming in his approach – he seemed to have a keen sense for proper pedagogy and I enjoyed section with him. Did at times have slightly standoffish remarks that would make him less approachable, but overall very effective teacher.