

Alexandru Radulescu

Evidence of Teaching Qualifications

1. Courses Taught as Instructor

Summary of Quantitative Data:

Students were asked to state their answers using a number between 1 and 9 (inclusive), with 9 the best possible evaluation, and 1 the worst possible.

| Prompt | PHIL 127B, 2012 | PHIL 31, 2011 | PHIL 117, 2010 | PHIL 128A, 2009 |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Concerned about student learning | 8 | 9 | 8 | 8.50 |
| Class well prepared and organized | 8 | 9 | 8 | 8.50 |
| Students felt welcome to seek help | 8 | 9 | 9 | 8.50 |
| Good communication skills | 8 | 8.50 | 8 | 9 |
| Learned something valuable | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| Overall rating of the instructor | 8 | 9 | 8 | 8.50 |
| Overall rating of the course | 8 | N/A | 8 | 9 |

All Student Comments, Unedited:

PHIL 127B: Philosophy of Language, Fall 2012

1. Absolutely incredible professor! Lectures are clear to the point, organized, and engaging. He is a really tough grader, I felt I deserved a higher grade on the midterm. Other than that, we need more professors like Professor Radulescu!
2. Amazing class; well structured/taught. I appreciated our instructors willingness to help during class / lecture hours as well as during office hours. This is a class I will certainly recommend to others and one that I will miss. This class has reinstalled my desire to practice philosophy and was challenging.
3. Professor Radulescu has a talent for engaging students in intellectual material that would normally be deemed difficult to comprehend. The class discussions are well organized and informative.
4. Strengths: Instructor has a mastery of the subject and source materials. Instructor is very good at communicating complex and difficult ideas. Instructor is patient, respectful, reasonable, concerned with clarity and concerned with being understood. Weakness: Grading system relies on 2 papers alone this is problematic for a very difficult and complex subject as this. It was hard to ???? as a student I had met the professors expectations of what I needed to understand before writing the papers.
5. This was great overview presentation of a history of Phil of Lang. It has been very useful in other classes. Handouts or occasional comprehension checktype quizzes may have helped some students confusions.
6. Alex is a cool dude, but his lectures are difficult to take notes on. Because he doesnt write things on the board he often moves too fast over important parts or repeats something for a prolonged period. Also, due to his conversational style and lack of board writing its hard to tell whats worth writing. Sometimes youll find yourself trying to keep up scribbling down what amounts to mumbling or musing on a topic possibly unrelated to the topic at hand. Lecture organization and pacing could use some work.

7. Strength: Willingness to help and knowledge of course material. Weakness: Should give positive feedback on midterm so we know what we are doing right. Offer extra credit and explain concepts more with concrete examples.
8. Alex had a good grasp of the material. He was very articulate and he explained the material clearly. He was very friendly towards the students and I always felt welcome seeking help both during office hours and via e-mail. I found it more entertaining that we covered more than just one philosopher and theory in this course, but I think it would have been a lot more helpful if we couldve focused on less theories.
9. Criticism: Maybe could have thrown in a few more challenging assignments to diversify the percentage of the homework/exams. Overall thought Radulescu is brilliant! He really knows his stuff. His lectures were extremely organized and concise. I thought he did an excellent job of addressing student in class questions. He also did a good job of facilitating in class discussions. Great professor!
10. Alex is very knowledgeable and understand the material he is teaching very well. At times it gets a bit mundane.
11. Alex did pretty well at explaining everything. Never really got off topic. It was difficult only having two assignments easy to leave this class off until the assignments were due, but overall interesting class. Less intimidating than it sounds.
12. Considering the difficulty of the material one could assume the lectures would be as dense if not more dense. Not so, Alex made the lectures and text comprehensible, manageable, and interesting. The chosen text for the course was great. Lectures on point and class assignments doable. Overall a wonderful course and wonderful instructor. Few professors have such profound mastery of the material and texts as Alex does.
13. Professor: Good Class: Meh
14. Professor Radulescu strength is the knowledge of the material. The way he presents it helps give direction in the read. His weakness is hard to pick out. It can be sometimes his writing is not clear. The nature of the course is rather difficult to comprehend and clarity is ?????? in demand.
15. I got bored fast but I might have ADHD.
16. You have a great knowledge of the material and I respect that, but during lectures can you be a bit more into the lecture (crack jokes like Kaplan).
17. Very smart. Helpful outside of class. Maybe too smart, a little hard to understand lectures at first because they are not at a basic enough level. But if you seek help after lass, He is very eager to help/explain.
18. Alex explained everything very clearly, but progress was slowed by many questions. Perhaps a discussion section would be useful, since many of the questions were simply comprehension questions and did not at all expand on the ideas presented.
19. Professor was extremely knowledgeable and made this difficult subject very simple to understand.
20. Alex was a great instructor. He had a good grasp of the material. He was also encouraging in terms of class participation. A weakness for me is that his tests were a bit too difficult, but this could be partly my fault in not having studied enough. Which I thought I did. Overall loved the material.

PHIL 31: Logic – First Course, Summer 2011

1. Great lectures!
2. Good pace. Clear expectations. Fair. Overall great instructor
3. Very good . . . good luck on job hunt!
4. Excellent Professor. Very direct with what he does. Very helpful. One of my favorites.
5. The material was incredibly difficult but Alex was incredibly well organized and his lectures were purposeful in that they were very effective in teaching the material. Great class, great instructor! Would definitely recommend.
6. I thought Professor Alex did a great job expanding on the basics of techniques of logic. He followed the text (Terry Text) very well and answered all of my questions fully. For a summer class, it was well worth the learning experience.
7. Strengths: Willing to help students.
8. Alex is easy to approach and very nice. He seems to lack a bit of confidence but it definitely grew as the course progressed.
9. Strength: Great lecturer. Clear and concise. Helpful and adaptable. Weakness: More availability for OH.
10. Alex is the best. He is a lifesaver. I took this class in Fall 2010 and had to withdraw because I simply wasn't learning anything. Logic has been a much better experience this time around. I understand the material more than I ever thought I could and it's all due to Alex's support and teaching methods. He is so easy to talk to. He's the perfect balance. He wants students to learn so he doesn't give answers out right away. He encourages us which is what has helped me grow. Thanks for everything Alex. You're truly impacted my life.
11. Strengths: very brilliant. Knows material well and is approachable. Weakness: He is not suitable for such an introductory class.
12. It seemed like the way it was structured is to teach us how to use the logic 2010 program. Not use the logic.
13. Knows material well. Too logical. Should also teach higher levels.
14. This course is extremely hard. Ta made it slightly harder assuming we knew things and went too fast. I understand it is a summer course but class interaction would have helped a lot, there was little to none. He also assigned us hw that no one knew how to do. The class had to protest in order to get full credit for turning it in late. I was at the other Tas OH and caught a pop up email message from this TA after this lecture where we all protested and he just said we should have read the reading. Umm Yes but explain! I don't know what all these letters mean.
15. Strengths: Alex was straight forward and helped introduce logic in a clear manner as I would understand the lectures and the course materials from what he writes on the chalkboard. Alex is very approachable in OH and they definitely are worth my time; his teachings has definitely influenced me to continue taking logic courses. Weakness: Lack of communication/class participation.

PHIL 117: Late 19th & Early 20th-Century Philosophy, Summer 2010

1. Alex Radulescu is kind, patient; clear and concise exposition of horrid modern philosophy texts that was Buddhist in its calm, a balletic flexibility at moments. A ballerina who can do improv, happily followed the thoughts and qs of students. He was very nice too. A deep underlying kindness. I learned more than I wanted to about Wittgenstein, Moore, and Austin.
2. Professor Radulescu was a very valuable instructor to have. His lectures were great supplements to the assigned readings. His greatest strength is ability to communicate clearly complicated philosophy passages and arguments. This makes for lively discussions between the whole class. He also always makes an effort to respond to his student(s) questions in the most appropriate way. That is identifying where a given question belongs in our lecture.
3. Alex was really helpful and made the course material understandable and interesting. He was very open to meeting outside of class and outside of office hours. One of the best professors I've had @ UCLA. I would definitely take him again b/c he makes material understandable and at the same time a challenge to want to work on.
4. The material has been interesting and the professor is obviously knowledgeable of it, but the class would be more interesting if there were class discussions. I felt that there was little or no discussion or even much opportunity for it. One thing that may have helped would have been written assignments for each of the readings to help us think more about them and allow us to expand on the course ideas to prepare us for the midterm and final.
5. (+): chose an interesting subject for the class. Very willing to help out students in office hours etc. Wrote constructive comments on midterm paper. (-): lectures were boring at times.
6. Strengths: clear presentation of difficult material. Responsive to student questions. Conveyed, interest in material. Weakness: would have liked a bit more context for the questions addressed (ex their importance in the history of philosophy).
7. The reading through most of the class was new. The class on 9/7 was one you stepped away from that which I found to be beneficial. I did all of the readings before class and needed more deciphering of what Moore / Wittgenstein / Austin were saying.
8. Alex Radulescu did an excellent job teaching this class. He explained all the important details from the book that may have been confusing and explained it thoroughly in lecture. The midterm prompts were straight forward and simple thanks to his well presented lectures. I have nothing negative to say. Great teacher.
9. The material was boring which may have effected the presentation of the instructor. But the instructor was good considering what he was teaching.
10. Pace is about right, although some weeks should have more reading so less will need to be done during high-stress weeks. You are entertaining when not hesitant, embrace that. Diagrams were always helpful. Exams are also well designed, although less writing about more critical information is usually (for philosophy courses) more efficacious.
11. The instructor was very knowledgeable of the material and presented it in such a way that made it easier to understand. The lectures were always interesting.
12. Although Alex (as well as the student body) had no interest in the material, he was incredibly knowledgeable about the material...it was more interesting than other courses, but nothing I would recommend. Alex is great, I have nothing but the best to say about him personally.

13. Alex is an affable instructor. For the most part, I enjoyed being a student in his class although at times it was difficult to follow his lecture without any confusion. Overall, great individual with much potential. With that said, he still has much to fulfill before he actualizes his full potential.
14. The course material is dry and didn't spark much interest or discussion in the classroom. Perhaps more interesting philosophers or philosophies would lead to more classroom engagement.
15. This course was interesting as it covered philosophers not often discussed in other classes. The discussions were lacking, though that was not really the instructors fault. Alex is a good lecturer but more prompting for discussion would have been beneficial.

PHIL 128A: Philosophy of Mathematics, Summer 2009

1. Alex is a very good teacher. Very intelligent, knowledgeable, personable, unbiased, fair, straightforward and articulate. I enjoyed the class and have obtained a richer knowledge of the subject. Alex cares about students understanding the subject and is very patient in helping students understand the nuances. The only thing I would appreciate is to actually refer more to the text sometimes (like pg. numbers) as this would help us to be better able to decipher the readings in the future when we don't have the benefit of his instruction. But overall his lectures were very clear and articulate.
2. Strength: His understanding of the subject is great. His explanation is great. His concern and understanding of his students was great. Weakness: need to engage more and help more w/the papers. Need to be more organized w/ his writing on the board. Needs to improve the hand writing.
3. Alex was very well spoken. He communicated the lectures in a very logical manner, which I appreciated. The material itself I found very interesting. Alex does a good job of presenting Frege. It is clear he knows a lot about this subject. He also has patience, which is an excellent ability for a teacher.
4. Tough subject material. Good work explaining.