MEMORANDUM

Date: February 7, 2014

To: Peter C. Mundy, PhD
   UC Davis MIND Institute
   Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences

From: Laura R. Lacy, PhD
       Program Administrator, Autism Research Training Program


Enclosed for your information are copies of the evaluations – overall series and your individual teaching evaluations for the Philosophy of Autism Research disciplinary topic sessions. For your records, I’ve also attached the schedule for this series.

Please let me know whether or not you would like me to forward the originals of your individual evaluations to the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences and/or School of Education for inclusion in your permanent record.

Should you have questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me.

Enclosures
Interdisciplinary Training For Autism Researchers  
Core Curriculum Course Evaluations  
Seminar Series/ Faculty Presenters

SEMINAR OR SEMINAR SERIES TOPIC: Philosophy of Autism Research  (Nov 25 – Dec 16, 2013)  
DATE OF REVIEW: December 16, 2013  
6 Postdoctoral fellow, funded by ARTP  
4 Postdoctoral fellow, funded through other sources  
1 Graduate Student  
Faculty Member  
Other (please specify)  

Faculty: David Amaral, PhD (lead/ did not teach); Cynthia Gates, JD, RN; Irva Hertz-Picciotto, PhD; Sally Rogers, PhD; Peter Mundy, PhD; Judy Van de Water, PhD; Sally Ozonoff, PhD

A. SEMINAR / SEMINAR SERIES.  

1. PLEASE EVALUATE ALONG THE DIMENSIONS IDENTIFIED BELOW (Check appropriate cell)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNABLE TO ASSESS</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>BELOW AVERAGE</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>ABOVE AVERAGE</th>
<th>OUTSTANDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE-OF-THE-ART CONTENT OF SUBJECT MATTER</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARITY AND ORGANIZATION OF DISCUSSIONS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST IN SUBJECT MATTER GENERATED BY DISCUSSIONS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL OF INTEREST AND RELEVANCE OF READINGS TO TOPIC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABILITY TO GENERATE TRAINEE PARTICIPATION AND DISCUSSION</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL RATING OF THIS SERIES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. COMMENTS; PLEASE PROVIDE CONSTRUCTIVE / PERTINENT COMMENTS ABOUT THIS SEMINAR OR SEMINAR SERIES.  
   • This was a particularly informative. I especially appreciated having the discussion with the lawyer. It made me think that next time we should invite several IRB folks so that we could have a panel discussion.  
   • I really enjoyed the discussion about categorical vs. dimensional approaches (Mundy/Rogers)-very thought-provoking
**B. INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTOR:**

**PETER C. MUNDY, PHD (DEC 9, 2013)**

**PLEASE EVALUATE THIS INSTRUCTOR ALONG THE FOLLOWING DIMENSIONS**

*Using the following system for each:*

- X – no opportunity to judge
- 5 = Outstanding
- 4 = Above average
- 3 = Average
- 2 = Below average
- 1 = Poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor’s knowledge of the subject</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to stimulate the interest of trainees</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness to trainee’s feedback</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the assigned reading(s)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of seminar/lecture, focus of material</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative functions: timeliness, quantity of reading, syllabus, etc.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of expectations for trainees</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall evaluation of instructor (if desired, use space below for comments)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second reading assigned came across as suggested in the wording of the email we received, but ended up being a major focus of the discussion. It would be nice to get a clearer statement of the expectation to be fully prepared. Otherwise, very productive and enlightening discussion.
B. INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTOR:  

PLEASE EVALUATE THIS INSTRUCTOR ALONG THE FOLLOWING DIMENSIONS

Using the following system for each:

X = no opportunity to judge
5 = Outstanding
4 = Above average
3 = Average
2 = Below average
1 = Poor

1. Instructor’s knowledge of the subject 4
2. Ability to stimulate the interest of trainees 4
3. Responsiveness to trainee’s feedback 4
4. Quality of the assigned reading(s) 4
5. Organization of seminar/lecture, focus of material 4
6. Administrative functions: timeliness, quantity of reading, syllabus, etc. 4
7. Appropriateness of expectations for trainees 4
8. Overall evaluation of instructor (if desired, use space below for comments)
B. INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTOR:  

PETER C. MUNDY, PHD (DEC 9, 2013)

PLEASE EVALUATE THIS INSTRUCTOR ALONG THE FOLLOWING DIMENSIONS
Using the following system for each:
   X = no opportunity to judge
   5 = Outstanding
   4 = Above average
   3 = Average
   2 = Below average
   1 = Poor

1. Instructor’s knowledge of the subject  
2. Ability to stimulate the interest of trainees  
3. Responsiveness to trainee’s feedback  
4. Quality of the assigned reading(s)  
5. Organization of seminar/lecture, focus of material  
6. Administrative functions: timeliness, quantity of reading, syllabus, etc.  
7. Appropriateness of expectations for trainees  
8. Overall evaluation of instructor (if desired, use space below for comments)
B. INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTOR:  

PLEASE EVALUATE THIS INSTRUCTOR ALONG THE FOLLOWING DIMENSIONS

Using the following system for each:

X = no opportunity to judge
5 = Outstanding
4 = Above average
3 = Average
2 = Below average
1 = Poor

1. Instructor’s knowledge of the subject  
2. Ability to stimulate the interest of trainees  
3. Responsiveness to trainee’s feedback  
4. Quality of the assigned reading(s)  
5. Organization of seminar/lecture, focus of material  
6. Administrative functions: timeliness, quantity of reading, syllabus, etc.  
7. Appropriateness of expectations for trainees  
8. Overall evaluation of instructor (if desired, use space below for comments)
B. INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTOR:  

PLEASE EVALUATE THIS INSTRUCTOR ALONG THE FOLLOWING DIMENSIONS

Using the following system for each:

- X = no opportunity to judge
- 5 = Outstanding
- 4 = Above average
- 3 = Average
- 2 = Below average
- 1 = Poor

1. Instructor's knowledge of the subject
   - 4

2. Ability to stimulate the interest of trainees
   - 4

3. Responsiveness to trainee's feedback
   - 4

4. Quality of the assigned reading(s)
   - 4

5. Organization of seminar/lecture, focus of material
   - 4

6. Administrative functions: timeliness, quantity of reading, syllabus, etc.
   - 4

7. Appropriateness of expectations for trainees
   - 4

8. Overall evaluation of instructor (if desired, use space below for comments)
   - 4
B. INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTOR:  

PETER C. MUNDY, PHD (DEC 9, 2013)

PLEASE EVALUATE THIS INSTRUCTOR ALONG THE FOLLOWING DIMENSIONS
Using the following system for each:

X – no opportunity to judge
5 = Outstanding
4 = Above average
3 = Average
2 = Below average
1 = Poor

1. Instructor’s knowledge of the subject
   5

2. Ability to stimulate the interest of trainees
   5

3. Responsiveness to trainee’s feedback
   5

4. Quality of the assigned reading(s)
   5

5. Organization of seminar/lecture, focus of material
   5

6. Administrative functions: timeliness, quantity of reading, syllabus, etc.
   5

7. Appropriateness of expectations for trainees
   5

8. Overall evaluation of instructor (if desired, use space below for comments)
   5
B. INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTOR:  

PLEASE EVALUATE THIS INSTRUCTOR ALONG THE FOLLOWING DIMENSIONS

Using the following system for each:

X – no opportunity to judge
5 = Outstanding
4 = Above average
3 = Average
2 = Below average
1 = Poor

1. Instructor’s knowledge of the subject  
   5

2. Ability to stimulate the interest of trainees  
   4

3. Responsiveness to trainee’s feedback  
   4

4. Quality of the assigned reading(s)  
   4

5. Organization of seminar/lecture, focus of material  
   4

6. Administrative functions: timeliness, quantity of reading, syllabus, etc.  
   4

7. Appropriateness of expectations for trainees  
   4

8. Overall evaluation of instructor (if desired, use space below for comments)  
   4
B. INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTOR:  

PLEASE EVALUATE THIS INSTRUCTOR ALONG THE FOLLOWING DIMENSIONS

Using the following system for each:

X = no opportunity to judge
5 = Outstanding
4 = Above average
3 = Average
2 = Below average
1 = Poor

1. Instructor’s knowledge of the subject  
   Rating: 5

2. Ability to stimulate the interest of trainees  
   Rating: 5

3. Responsiveness to trainee’s feedback  
   Rating: 5

4. Quality of the assigned reading(s)  
   Rating: 5

5. Organization of seminar/lecture, focus of material  
   Rating: 5

6. Administrative functions: timeliness, quantity of reading, syllabus, etc.  
   Rating: 5

7. Appropriateness of expectations for trainees  
   Rating: 5

8. Overall evaluation of instructor (if desired, use space below for comments)  
   Rating: 5
B. INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTOR:  

PETER C. MUNDY, PHD (DEC 9, 2013)

PLEASE EVALUATE THIS INSTRUCTOR ALONG THE FOLLOWING DIMENSIONS

Using the following system for each:
X = no opportunity to judge
5 = Outstanding
4 = Above average
3 = Average
2 = Below average
1 = Poor

1. Instructor’s knowledge of the subject
   5

2. Ability to stimulate the interest of trainees
   4

3. Responsiveness to trainee’s feedback
   4

4. Quality of the assigned reading(s)
   5

5. Organization of seminar/lecture, focus of material
   5

6. Administrative functions: timeliness, quantity of reading, syllabus, etc.
   5

7. Appropriateness of expectations for trainees
   5

8. Overall evaluation of instructor (if desired, use space below for comments)
B. INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTOR:  

PETER C. MUNDY, PHD (DEC 9, 2013)

PLEASE EVALUATE THIS INSTRUCTOR ALONG THE FOLLOWING DIMENSIONS
Using the following system for each:
X = no opportunity to judge
5 = Outstanding
4 = Above average
3 = Average
2 = Below average
1 = Poor

1. Instructor’s knowledge of the subject
   5

2. Ability to stimulate the interest of trainees
   5

3. Responsiveness to trainee’s feedback
   5

4. Quality of the assigned reading(s)
   5

5. Organization of seminar/lecture, focus of material
   5

6. Administrative functions: timeliness, quantity of reading, syllabus, etc.
   5

7. Appropriateness of expectations for trainees
   5

8. Overall evaluation of instructor (if desired, use space below for comments)
   5
# Autism Research Training Program

*Interdisciplinary Training for Autism Researchers*

## Seminar Schedule: Philosophy of Autism

**November 25 – December 16, 2013**  
**9:15 am – 10:35 am**

Faculty: David Amaral, PhD (lead); Cynthia Gates, RN, JD; Irva Hertz-Picciotto, PhD; Peter Mundy, PhD; Sally Ozonoff, PhD; Sally Rogers, PhD; Judy Van De Water, PhD

## Topic Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 25</td>
<td>The Ethics of Providing Research Data to Subjects And Their Families</td>
<td>Cynthia Gates, JD, RN, CIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2</td>
<td>The Controversy Around Vaccines &amp; Neurodevelopmental Disorders</td>
<td>Irva Hertz-Picciotto, PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 9</td>
<td>Categorical and Dimensional Approaches to Research on ASD</td>
<td>Sally Rogers, PhD &amp; Peter Mundy, PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 16</td>
<td>The Dilemmas of Developing a Diagnostic Test for ASD</td>
<td>Judy Van de Water, PhD &amp; Sally Ozonoff, PhD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Readings

- 11/25/13
- 12/02/13
- 12/09/13
- 12/16/13